

TAMÁS NÓTÁRI*

On Some Aspects of the Roman Concept of Authority

Abstract. When scrutinizing the concept of authority, presenting the basic definition of *auctoritas*, the capacity of increase and augmentation, Hannah Arendt appositely quotes the relevant passage by Cicero, according to which the task of founding the state, the human community, as well as the preservation of what has already been founded, highly resembles the function of the *numen*, the divine operation (Cicero, *De re publica* 1, 7. „Neque enim est ulla res in qua propius ad deorum *numen* virtus accedat humana, quam civitatis aut condere novas aut conservare conditas.”); and in connection with this, she states that, from this aspect, the Romans regarded religious and political activity as being almost identical. The paper will examine various aspects of the *numen*, one of the most important phenomena of Roman religion (I.), its etymology (II.), the institution of the triumphus, a phenomenon seeming to be relevant from this point of view (III.), then the concept of *numen Augusti*, incorporating these elements of the religious sphere into the legitimation of power. (IV.)

Keywords: authority, *auctoritas*, *numen*, *imperium*, triumphus

I. The concept of Augustus’s *numen* is of utmost importance from several points of view with respect to the subsequent cult of the emperor since it is not only the late Octavianus who, as a living person, is invested with the *numen* that could be put to use in public life, his given name, Augustus, carries in itself the expression *augus*, which bears religious connotations.¹ The leader having *imperium* and *auctoritas* in the Roman conceptual sphere, represents a certain archetype; because *imperium* originally meant nothing else than *mana*, the charisma of the leader, i.e. one’s capacity of implementing, of giving birth to something in other persons.² The expression of *numen*—especially in ancient Roman sources—is mentioned in connection with the gods, the senate, the Roman people, as well as in connection with the mind on a more abstract, philosophical level, as a superhuman force in itself which is nevertheless most frequently connected to a person of some kind; Rose defines the concept in

* Senior Assistant Professor, Reformed University „Károli Gáspár”, Faculty of Law and Political Science Department of Roman Law, H-1042 Budapest, Viola u. 2–4.
E-mail: tamasnotari@yahoo.de

¹ Wagenvoort, H.: *Roman Dynamism. Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion*. Leiden, 1956. 12.

² Köves-Zulau, Th.: *Bevezetés a római vallás és monda történetébe* (Introduction to the history of Roman religion and myth). Budapest, 1995. 31.

perfect accordance with the meanings occurring in these sources: „*Numen signifies a superhuman force, impersonal in itself but regularly belonging to a person (a god of some kind) or occasionally to an exceptionally important body of human beings, as the Roman senate or people.*”³ This does not seem to be especially surprising, as the senate fulfilled numerous religious functions. The religious identity and divine origin of the Quirites was widely accepted as well, and Cicero also drew a parallel between the *aminus* and the *princeps deus* in *Somnium Scipionis*.⁴ Thus, the *numen*, especially according to the dynamistic trend, connected to Wagenvoort’s name, signified—to use this Polynesian expression—a kind of *mana*, a mysterious force dwelling in a thing or in a person.⁵

The *numen Augusti*, the concept of the charismatic leader, representing the deity in a special way, can be understood precisely by investigating the ambivalent relationship of Roman religion with the *epiphany*, the *numinous* experience of the divine presence; here it becomes visible that certain subsequent outcomes were already present in their germs in the most ancient Roman religion.⁶ The *triumphus* is the archetypal–numinous event of the embodiment of the deity, *in concreto* Iuppiter, surrounded by numerous preventive rites. It is not by chance that pondering over the role of the *numen* in antique religion (*Antike, magische, faustische numina*)⁷ Oswald Spengler mentions that the Roman cult of the emperor—which must be clearly separated from the oriental cult of the sovereign because of their different origins—is a natural consequence of Roman religion, and the role of the *triumphator* must be regarded as its precedent, as Iuppiter’s *numen* was embodied in the consul holding the *triumphus* during the triumphal procession.⁸ It should be noted that the Jupitorean role of the presence of the *triumphator*’s embodying the divine *numen* was, among other things, a numinous, awe-inspiring experience for the Romans, because Roman religion—unlike Greek religion—tried to avoid the divine presence, the epiphany; e.g. this was the reason for the complete turning around, the *circumactio corporis* after finishing the prayer, as well as

³ Rose, H. J.: Numen and mana. *Harvard Theological Review*, 44. 1951. 109.

⁴ Cicero *De re publica* 6, 15. *Homines enim sunt hac lege generati, qui tuerentur illum globum, quem in hoc templo medio vides, quae terra dicitur, iisque animus datus est ex illis sempiternis ignibus quae sidera et stellas vocatis, quae globosae et rotundae, divinis animatae mentibus, circos suos orbisque conficiunt celeritate mirabili.*

⁵ Köves-Zulau: *Bevezetés a római vallás... op. cit.* 29.

⁶ *Ibid.* 177.

⁷ Spengler, O.: *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*. München, 1991. 517–522.

⁸ *Ibid.* 521. sq.

the well-known *fas sit vidisse*⁹ formula, meaning: „I should not be blamed for seeing it.”¹⁰

II. The first occurrence of the word *numen* can be found—in *concreto* in a genitival and an attributive construction belonging to a god’s name—in Accius,¹¹ later near the genitives of the words *deus* and *divus*,¹² referring to a particular god, e.g. Ceres¹³ or Iuppiter,¹⁴ as well as in an attributive construction with the adjective *divinum*.¹⁵ It characteristically occurs in verbal constructions near the verbs denoting ritual activities,¹⁶ whereas in attributive constructions it appears near adjectives denoting piety, anger, reconciliability, or, on the contrary, implacability.¹⁷ In Augustus’s time the *numen* can also mean the deity himself, previously having meant only one of his properties or functions¹⁸—a typical example for this can be found in the *prooemium* of the *Aeneis*¹⁹ and Servius²⁰ also defines it in accordance with this thought when recounting Iuno’s functions in his commentary.²¹ The antique grammarians also tried to explain

⁹ Seneca: *Epistulae* 115, 4.

¹⁰ Latte, K.: *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft V. 4. München, 1967. 41.

¹¹ 646 R. b. Non. 173, 27. *nomen et numen Iovis*; 692 R. *nomen vestrum numenque*.

¹² Cicero: *De divinatione* 1, 120. *numen dei*; 2, 63. *divum numina*; *Philippicae* 11, 28; *De finibus bonorum et malorum* 3, 64; *De natura deorum* 1, 3; 2, 95; 3, 92. *deorum immortalium numen*.

¹³ Cicero: *In Verrem* 5, 107.

¹⁴ Cicero: *Pro rege Deiotaro* 18; *Tusculanae disputationes* 2, 23.

¹⁵ Cicero: *De natura deorum* 1, 22; *Pro Milone* 83. *numen divinum*.

¹⁶ Cicero: *In Verrem* 2, 4, 111. *expiare*; *De divinatione* 2, 63; *De domo sua* 140; Caesar: *De bello Gallico* 6, 16, 3. *placare*; Vergilius: *Georgica* 1, 30 *colere*; Ovidius: *Tristia* 5, 3, 46. *flectere*; Horatius: *Epistulae* 17, 3; Vergilius: *Aeneis* 2, 141. *orare*; Vergilius: *Aeneis* 3, 437; Ovidius. *Tristia* 3, 8, 13. *adorare*.

¹⁷ Vergilius: *Aeneis* 2, 141. *conscium veri*; Ovidius: *Metamorphoses* 4, 452. *implacabile*; *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* VI 29944. *iratum*; Vergilius: *Aeneis* 4, 521. *memor*; 4, 382. *pium*; *Culex* 271. *placabile*; Statius: *Thebais* 10, 486. *providum*.

¹⁸ Pfister, Fr.: Numen. In: *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* XVII. 2. 1937. 1273.

¹⁹ Vergilius: *Aeneis* 1, 8. *quo numine laeso quidve dolens regina deum*.

²⁰ Servius: *Commentarius in Verg. Aen.* 1, 8. *Nam Iuno habet multa numina: est Curitis ... est Lucina ... est regina*.

²¹ Pötscher, W.: ‘Numen’ und ‘numen Augusti’. In: Pötscher, W.: *Hellas und Rom*. Hildesheim, 1988. 449.

this expression, e. g. Festus defines it as a divine nodding, and divine power,²² Varro defines it as *imperium*.²³ These interpretations lead to the basic meaning of the word, i. e. the (assenting divine) nodding.²⁴ Various authors—like Pfister,²⁵ Wagenvoort²⁶ and Rose²⁷—identify the expression with the *verbum* 'to move'. Interpreting a pregnant locus by Catullus,²⁸ Pfister also takes position vis-a-vis the orendistic, will-expressing meaning of the word *numen*,²⁹ which seems to be strongly corroborated not only by the expression *adnuit* in the text of Catullus, but also by other constructions with the verb **nuo*,³⁰ which reinforce the (personal) expression of the will, with the help of the emotionally charged gesture of the nodding.³¹ Opinions also differ concerning the age of the expression *numen* itself. Pfister ranks it into the most ancient layers of religious terms,³² Rose prefers not to take sides in this question.³³ Latte's opinion deserves special attention. On the one hand he states that the expression *numen* can be encountered neither in ancient religious texts nor in the works of Plautus, Ennius and Cato, its first occurrence in the works of Accius and Lucilius could be dated to the second half of the 2nd century BC., so he thinks it possible that it became part of the Latin language only because of the influence of Stoic philosophy, as a translation of the Greek *dynamis*,³⁴ on the

²² Festus 172. *numen quasi nutus dei ac potestas*.

²³ Varro: *De lingua Latina* 7, 85. *numen dicunt esse imperium*

²⁴ Pötscher: *op. cit.* 450.

²⁵ Pfister: *op. cit.* 1289.

²⁶ Wagenvoort: *Roman Dynamism...* *op. cit.* 74.

²⁷ Rose, H. J.: *Ancient Roman Religion*. London, 1948. 13.

²⁸ Catullus: 64, 204. sq. *Adnuit invicto caelestum numine rector, quo motu tellus atque horrida contremuerunt aequora concussitque micantia sidera mundus*.

²⁹ Pfister: *op. cit.* 1290. sq.

³⁰ *adnuere* (Pomponius: *Atellana*. 25. *saepe adnuit. invenibit saepe*; Plautus: *Asinaria* 784. *illa ... nutet, nictet, annuat; Bacchides* 186. *ego autem me venturum adnuo; Truculentus prol.* 4. *quid nunc? daturin estis an non? adnuont*; Varro: *De re rustica* 1, 2, 2. *si ita est, ut adnuis*; Ennius: *Annales* 133. V. *adnuit sese mecum decernere ferro*), *adnutare* (Naevius: *Comoediae* 1047. *alii adnutat, alii adnictat*; Plautus: *Mercator* 437. *mihi ... adnutat: addam sex minas*), *abnuere* (Plautus, *Truculentus prol.* 6. *abnuont ... adnuont; Mercator* 50. *abnuere negitare adeo me natum suom*), *abnutare* (Plautus: *Captivi* 611. *quid mi adnutas? tibi ego abnuto?*; Ennius: *Tragoediae* 306. V. *quid te adiri abnutas?*), *innuere* (Plautus: *Rudens* 731. *ubi ego innuere vobis*; Terentius: *Eunuchus* 735. *abiens mihi innuit*; Terentius: *Adelphoe* 171. *si innuerim*; 174. *non innueram*).

³¹ Pötscher: *op. cit.* 450.

³² Pfister: *op. cit.* 1290.

³³ Rose: *op. cit.* 1948. 114.

³⁴ Latte: *op. cit.* 57.

other hand he notes that it is impossible to explain why this particular word was used to translate the concept of *dynamis theou*.³⁵ Concerning the first part of Latte's idea, it cannot be disregarded that both Ennius's and Cato's texts are considerably incomplete, thus the lack of the word *numen* does not provide sufficient reason for drawing conclusions, Plautus's comedies cannot contain the expression because of their very nature, while in the religious texts the expression *numen* signifies a concept pertaining to the sphere of the religious experience rather than to the ritual.³⁶ In connection with Cicero's relevant locus,³⁷ Latte seems to forget about the important sacred functions of the *senatus*, like the ordering of the *triumphus*, the consecration of a certain plot of land to the gods and later the initiation of the emperor to the divine status. Pötcher also states that through the functions the *senatus* assumed certain competences belonging to the divine sphere.³⁸ When Lucretius connects the concept of the *numen* to the human mind,³⁹ he presumably speaks only about the familiar mechanism through which religious concepts *mutatis mutandis* gain philosophical significance.

The question concerning the *numen*'s main operational principle, which at the same time means the manifestation of the divine will, is of utmost importance. Pötcher considers the **nuere*, the manifestation of the divine will, an ancient component of Roman religion, which avoided epiphany, carefully guarded the *pax deorum*, and interpreted the slightest deviation from the order of daily routine as a sign (more precisely as a *symptom*, according to Köves-Zulauf⁴⁰) without attempting to draw any conclusion with regard to the age of the expression *numen*.⁴¹ Similarities of the expression with Greek terms are striking, the word *numen* can be connected with *neyma*, the meaning of *nutus* can be connected to *neysis*, the common characteristic feature of these latter two is the dynamism inherent in them,⁴² but the closest parallel can be drawn

³⁵ *Ibid.* 57.

³⁶ Pötcher: *op. cit.* 451.

³⁷ Cicero: *Philippicae* 3, 32. *magna vis est, magnum numen ... idem sentientis senatus.*

³⁸ Pötcher: *op. cit.* 452.

³⁹ Lucretius: *De rerum natura* 3, 144. sq. *Cetera pars animae per totum dissita corpus paret et ad numen mentis momenque movetur.* 4, 179. *in quem quaeque locum diverso numine tendunt.*

⁴⁰ Köves-Zulauf: *Bevezetés a római vallás... op. cit.* 61.

⁴¹ Pötcher: *op. cit.* 452.

⁴² Cicero: *Tusculanae disputationes* 1, 40. *terrena et humida suo pte nutu et suo pondere ad partes angulos terram et in mare ferantur;* Vergilius: *Aeneis* 9, 106; 10, 115. *adnuat et totum nutu tremefecit Olympum.*

between *neyo*⁴³ and **nuo*, known in its constructions.⁴⁴ The concept of divine warning, consent or disapproval appearing in the form of natural phenomena can be encountered both in Greek and Roman authors.⁴⁵ However, the different *omina* cannot be strictly paralleled with the divinity expressing his will with a nod (*nutus*), because in most cases only the Romans' conviction about a certain event's being proper or not can be inferred without the possibility of establishing whether or not the given warning was connected to the will of a personal god.⁴⁶ In numerous cases it is not possible to separate the personal energy-component and the one manifesting only in the course of operation, or it is not possible to define their precise amount and proportion, these phenomena being outside the logical sphere. At the same time certain *omina*—e.g. the *augurium* connected to the founding of Rome—were traditionally related to particular gods.⁴⁷ Presumably here belong both the local, less important divinities mainly manifesting in the form of natural phenomena, conceived as operating natural forces, and the more important ones, invested with a certain cult and precisely defined personal characteristics, almost a personality—this coincides with the concept of *Person-Bereichenheit*, the concept of the unity of person and sphere of authority which for the antique man meant the unity and the simultaneity of the material component and the divinity of the given phenomenon.⁴⁸ As Kerényi also notes: „*Apollo—and every other Greek god—is a primordial type that was recognised by the Greeks as the metaphysical form of experienced spiritual and plastically contemplated natural realities.*”⁴⁹ According to the conviction of ancient Romans the lack of a precise denomination does not mean that the *augurium* would have been the work of chance, and not the manifestation of a particular (personal) will.

⁴³ *Ilias* 3, 337; 13, 133; 9, 223; *Odyseia* 16, 283; 18, 237.

⁴⁴ Pötscher: *op. cit.* 453.

⁴⁵ Cf. Nielsson, M. P.: *Geschichte der griechischen Religion I-II*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft V. 2. München, 1955; Cook, A. B.: *Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion*. Cambridge, 1914; Jakobsthal, P.: *Der Blitz in der orientalischen und griechischen Kunst. Ein formgeschichtlicher Versuch*. Berlin, 1906.

⁴⁶ Pötscher: *op. cit.* 455.

⁴⁷ Livius: 1, 6, 4. *Quoniam gemini essent nec aetatis verecundia discrimen facere posset, ut dii quorum tutelae ea loca essent auguriis legerent qui nomen novae urbi daret, qui conditam imperio regeret, Palatium Romulus, Remus Aventinum ad inaugurandum templa capiunt.*

⁴⁸ Cf. Pötscher, W.: Das Person-Bereichdenken. *Wiener Studien* 72. 1959. 24. sqq.; Spengler: *op. cit.* 518. sq.

⁴⁹ Kerényi, K.: Halhatatlanság és Apollon-vallás (Immortality and Apollo-religion). In: *Az örök Antigone* (The eternal Antigone). Budapest, 2003. 157.

The concept of divinities invested with a concretely defined personality is not excluded by the fact that they are not called by a precise name, it is enough to think of the text and the ritual of *evocatio*,⁵⁰ belonging to the sphere of the *ius sacrum*, known from Macrobius,⁵¹ which, without mentioning names, appeals to personal gods and not impersonal forces.⁵² The image of Zeus, shaking the skies and the earth with a little movement of his head, as well as the image of Iuppiter can be frequently encountered.⁵³

It seems to be worth returning to the two oldest occurrences of the term in the constructions *nomen et numen Iovis* and *nomen vestrum numenque* in Accius. In both cases the expression *numen* is connected with the word *nomen*. Two widely differing opinions collide here. Wagenvoort thinks that this construction might help to grasp the historic moment when the concept of the personal God comes to existence as a development of the impersonal, magical force, just as the primary expression of *numen* is later associated with the secondary term *nomen* as the result of a kind of evolution.⁵⁴ Conversely, Pötscher argues that the expressions *numen* and *nomen* are two different aspects of the same phenomenon without either of them being secondary to the other with regard to both their meaning and their chronology.⁵⁵ This view is corroborated by the analogy taken from the functions of the Roman military leader, i. e. the *ductus*, the *imperium* and the *auspicium* are concepts appearing

⁵⁰ Cf. Basanoff, V.: *Evocatio*. Paris, 1947.

⁵¹ Macrobius: *Saturnalia* 3, 9, 7–8. *Si deus, si dea est, cui populus civitasque Carthaginensis est in tutela, teque maxime, ille qui urbis huius populique tutelam recepit, precor veneroque veniamque vobis peto ut vos populum civitatemque Carthaginensem deseratis, loca templa sacra urbemque eorum relinquatis, absque his abeat is eique populo civitati metum formidinem oblivionem iniciatis, proditi que Romam ad me meosque veniatis, nostraque vobis loca templa sacra urbs acceptior probatiorque sit, mihi que populoque Romano militibusque meis praepositi sitis ut sciamus intellegamusque. Si ita feceritis, voveo vobis templa ludosque facturum.*

⁵² Pötscher: *op. cit.* 456. sq. (Cf. Vergilius, *Aeneis* 8, 347. sqq. *Iam tum religio pavidos terreat agrestis / dira loci, iam tum silvam saxumque tremebant. / 'Hoc nemus, hunc' inquit 'frondoso vertice collem /—quis deus, incertum est—habitat deus: Arcades ipsum / credunt se vidisse Iovem, cum saepe nigrantem / aegida concuteret dextra nimbosque cieret.)*

⁵³ Vergilius: *Aeneis* 4, 268. sq. *ipse deum tibi me caelo demittit Olympo / regnator, caelum et terras qui numine torquet*; Horatius: *carmina* 3, 1, 5. sqq. *Regum timendorum in proprios greges / reges in ipsos imperium est Iovis / clari Giganteo triumpho / cuncta supercilio moventis*. Ovidius: *Metamorphoses* 1, 179. sqq. *Ergo ubi marmoreo superi sedere recessu, / celsior ipse loco sceptroque innixus eburno / terrificam capitis concussit terque quaterque / caesariem, cum qua terram, mare, sidera movit.*

⁵⁴ Wagenvoort: *Roman Dynamism... op. cit.* 78.

⁵⁵ Pötscher: *op. cit.* 460.

together, in juxtaposition, overlapping with one another but not altogether synonymous.⁵⁶ These concepts express different aspects of the same office and it is highly unlikely that they would be only synonyms heaped together—the *imperium* primarily signifies the effective power of the commander but is also related to the religious sphere, in the case of *auspicium* the sacred element is dominant, at the same time it carries within itself the executive competence needed for its fulfillment.⁵⁷ According to Wagenvoort, in Roman thinking, certain persons disposed of a special *mana* of their own, e. g. the *imperator*—if the origin of the word is considered—has a creative fertilising power,⁵⁸ and when, as a general, he ordered his soldiers to occupy an enemy camp, he conjured up the force necessary to carry out the order with the help of his magic words; hence it can be inferred that the *imperium* is nothing other than a form of transmitting a mysterious force.⁵⁹ It cannot be disregarded that according to antique views, the name is never arbitrary but it always, thus in the case of gods as well, constitutes an integral part of personality; it was not by chance that they proceeded with such caution in the precise naming of the gods or in keeping their names in secret if it was necessary.⁶⁰

III. Payne thinks that it is not possible to understand Roman thinking without understanding the *triumphus*.⁶¹ Although tradition knows about *triumphus* already held by Romulus, the ceremony of the *triumphus* is connected to the introduction of the cult of Iuppiter Capitolinus in the year 509 BC.⁶² The last *triumphus* corresponding to all religious prescriptions were held at the end of

⁵⁶ Plautus: *Amphitruo* 196. *ductu, imperio, auspicio suo*; 192. *imperio atque auspicio eri*; 657. *eos auspicio meo atque ductu vicimus*; Livius 27, 44, 4. *sine imperio, sine auspicio*; 28, 27, 4. *qui imperium auspiciūque*; Valerius Maximus 2, 8, 2. *de imperio et auspicio*

⁵⁷ Pötscher: *op. cit.* 462.

⁵⁸ Walde, A.–Hofmann, J. B.: *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1938. I. 683.

⁵⁹ Wagenvoort, H.: Wesenszüge altrömischer Religion. In: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. I. 2. Hildesheim–New York, 1972. 371. sq. *Imperium ist also eine Form der Übertragung geheimnisvoller Kraft*.

⁶⁰ Cf. Brelich, A.: *Die geheime Schutzgottheit von Rom*. Zürich, 1949.

⁶¹ Payne, R.: *The Roman Triumph*. London, 1962. 10.

⁶² Lemosse, M.: Les éléments techniques de l'ancien triomphe romain et le problème de son origine. In: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* I. 2. Hildesheim–New York, 1972. 443.

the 3rd century AD,⁶³ the *triumphus* organised later—the custom well survived the fall of the empire—cannot be considered the continuation of the religious tradition.⁶⁴ Although the political importance of the *triumphus* can hardly be overestimated, and countless examples can be found for its *abusus* for profane purposes in Roman history, it must be kept in mind that the *triumphus* is originally a religious act⁶⁵—both in the magic and the sacred sense of the word⁶⁶—because, as it was mentioned in the introduction, in the course of this, the *numen* of the Iuppiter Capitolinus is incarnated in the *triumphator*.⁶⁷ In ancient times, the archaic *triumphus*, presumably taken over from the Etruscans, started from the Alban mountains, and according to the classic rite that had been formed through historical development, it proceeded according to the following itinerary: The procession started from the Campus Martius, got into the city through the Porta Triumphalis, there they presented the prescribed sacrifice, then headed towards the Porta Carmentalis—after the building of Circus Flaminius had been finished, the procession naturally touched it as well—originally they went across the Velabrum towards the Capitolium, later they went round the Palatinus along the Via Sacra to reach the same place.⁶⁸ In the procession, the looted treasures, the weapons seized from the enemy, the sacrificial gifts, the group of captives, among whom the captive generals, rulers and their courts were followed by the *triumphator* himself, escorted by his officers and the soldiers of his army.⁶⁹ The *triumphator* was standing on a two-wheeled, horse-drawn *quadriga*, holding an ivory sceptre with Iuppiter's bird the eagle in one hand and a laurel twig in the other, a slave standing behind him on the *quadriga* was holding a golden wreath above his head, he was wearing a laurel wreath on his head and festive clothes on his body, which

⁶³ Picard, Ch. G.: *Les Triompées Romains. Contribution à l'histoire de la religion et de l'art triomphal de Rome*. Paris, 1957. 428.

⁶⁴ Köves-Zulauf: *Bevezetés a római vallás... op. cit.* 154.

⁶⁵ Wissowa, G.: *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. München, 1912. 126; Livius: 28, 9, 7. *Ut et dis immortalibus haberetur honos et ipsis triumphantibus urbem inire liceret*. 45, 39, 10. *Dis quoque enim, non solum hominibus debetur triumphus*.

⁶⁶ Köves-Zulauf: *Bevezetés a római vallás... op. cit.* 156.

⁶⁷ Wissowa: *op. cit.* 127.; Taeger, F.: *Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes II*. Stuttgart, 1960. 13; Picard: *op. cit.* 139.

⁶⁸ Altheim, F.: *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. Leipzig, 1932. II. 24. sq.

⁶⁹ Cf. Ehlers, W.: *Triumphus*. In: *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Alterums-wissenschaft XIII*. 493. sqq.

he put down when he reached the Capitolium⁷⁰ and he sacrificed a white bull to Iuppiter there.⁷¹

The characteristics likening the general to Iuppiter, more precisely incarnating Iuppiter in him were the following: the *triumphator*'s face was painted vermilion,⁷² the colour of the face of the Iuppiter Capitolinus's clay statue. The red painting on the face did not only serve his identification with Iuppiter, but it also symbolised blood thus investing the general with the magic power dwelling in blood,⁷³ his clothes did not merely resemble the clothes of Iuppiter's statue but they were identical, as they took off the statue's clothes (this on the one hand meant the *toga palmata*, on the other hand the *toga picta* decorated with golden stars that was worn over it) to dress the *triumphator* in them.⁷⁴ The *triumphator* was driving a *quadriga* like the one standing on the top of the temple of the Capitolium, where the above mentioned statue of Iuppiter was standing too.⁷⁵ Many scholars, like Fowler⁷⁶ and Deubner⁷⁷ attempted to deny that the *triumphator* represented Iuppiter and he was regarded as being Iuppiter for that period, but they could not shake the identifying view, counting as *communis opinio* in the literature on the subject.⁷⁸ It is true that it is hard to interpret the duplicity according to which the *triumphator* who—by virtue of the above identification—is none other than Iuppiter during this period, is heading towards Iuppiter's Temple on his *quadriga* in order to present sacrifice to the god there, thus Iuppiter's presence is somehow redoubled for this period. However, it must be taken into account that the contradiction that is rationally perceived in the *triumphus* but not disturbing the experience on the religious level cannot be reconciled according to the rules of linear logic,⁷⁹ it must also be observed that the divine character of the *triumphator* was gradually waning in the course of the ceremony until it completely ceased when he put down his wreath and his clothes at the statue.⁸⁰ (The sacrifice

⁷⁰ Plinius: *Naturalis historia* 15, 133; Silius: *Punica* 15, 118. sqq.

⁷¹ Servius: *Commentarius in Verg. Georg.* 2, 146; Ehlers: *op. cit.* 493. sqq; Wissowa: *op. cit.* 126. sq; Köves-Zulauf: *Bevezetés a római vallás... op. cit.* 156.

⁷² Plinius: *Naturalis historia* 33, 111; Servius: *Commentarius in Verg. ecl.* 6, 22. 10, 27.

⁷³ Köves-Zulauf: *Bevezetés a római vallás... op. cit.* 156.

⁷⁴ Livius: 10, 7, 10; Suetonius: *Augustus* 94; Iuvenalis: *Saturae* 10, 38.

⁷⁵ Dionysius Halicarnassensis 9, 71, 4; Ovidius: *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2, 1, 58.

⁷⁶ Fowler, W. W.: *Iuppiter and the Triumphator*. *Classical Review* 30. 1916. 153. sqq.

⁷⁷ Deubner, L.: *Die Tracht des römischen Triumphators*. *Hermes* 69. 1934. 316. sqq.

⁷⁸ About the controversial theses cf. Köves-Zulauf, Th.: *Reden und Schweigen. Römische Religion bei Plinius Maior*. München, 1972. 136.

⁷⁹ Payne: *op. cit.* 57. sq.

⁸⁰ Köves-Zulauf: *Reden und Schweigen. op. cit.* 136.

presented on the Capitolium was followed by the *ludi magni*, which probably constituted an integral part of the *triumphus*; this seems to be corroborated by the fact that though the independent *ludi magni* separated from the *triumphus* itself appeared only later, the *magistratus* organising the games still appeared in the clothes resembling those of the *triumphator*, the date of the games were connected to the founding ceremony of the Capitoline Temple celebrated on the 13th of September.⁸¹⁾

At the same time, the special position acquired by the *triumphator* through his temporary deification was carrying numerous dangers. The rational core of these dangers was the envy manifested towards the *triumphator* which embodied in the *malocchio* from the magical aspect, and in the ire of Nemesis and Fortuna from the religious aspect, against which they tried to defend the *triumphator* with the help of various preventive means well-known from antique magic, e. g. amulets put round his neck, bells fastened onto the *quadriga* that were meant to keep demons away, obscene accessories,⁸² as well as by singing satirical songs in order to belittle the glory of the triumphant general, thus diminishing the danger of divine envy.⁸³

However, more important than all these is the rite according to which the slave holding a golden wreath above the *triumphator*'s head was shouting into his ears reminding him of his being human, as it is mentioned in a locus of *Naturalis Historia* by Plinius Maior.⁸⁴ Köves-Zulauf thoroughly examined both the Plinian and the parallel loci⁸⁵—with special attention to the *hoti antrópoi eisin* in Arrianos's text and the *Hominem te memento!* phrases in Tertullianus's and Hieronymus's works—therefore we took over the *recipere* version in the Plinian text recommended by him instead of the *respicere* version, proposed by Ernout.⁸⁶ A particular mixture can be traced in Fortuna's character: the

⁸¹ Altheim: *op. cit.* II. 25.

⁸² Köves-Zulauf: *Reden und Schweigen. op. cit.* 160.

⁸³ Suetonius: *Divus Iulius* 51.

⁸⁴ Plinius: *Naturalis historia* 28, 39. ... *illos religione (muta) tutatur et Fascinus, imperatorum quoque, non solum infantium, custos, qui deus inter sacra Romana a Vestalibus colitur, et currus triumphantium, sub his pendens, defendit medicus invidiae, iubetque eosdem recipere similis medicina linguae, et sit exorata a tergo Fortuna gloriae carnifex.*

⁸⁵ Arrianus: *Epicteti dissertationes* 3, 24, 85; Tertullianus: *Apologia*, 33, 4; Hieronymus: *Epistulae* 39, 2, 8; Isidorus: *Origines* 18, 2, 6; Zonaras 7, 21, 9; Tzetzes: *Epsiulae* 97, 86; *Historiarum variarum chiliades* 13, 51–53.

⁸⁶ Ernout, A.–Beaujeu, J.–Saint-Denis, E. de–Pépin, R.–André, J.–Bonniec, H. Le–Gaullet de Santerre, H.: *Pline l'Ancient, Histoire Naturelle*. Paris, 1947; Köves-Zulauf: *Reden und Schweigen. op. cit.* 123. sqq.

Romans regarded Fortuna as being an aspect of Nemesis⁸⁷ thus she entered the Roman pantheon as the enemy of human intemperance and conceit; in this function she is rightly conferred the *appositio* of *carnifex gloriae*—thus being not only the enemy but the executioner of glory—which *mutatis mutandis* should be taken not only for Fortuna but also for the *servus publicus*, i.e. the *triumphator*—in order to defend him from *hybris* and in order to diminish his glory the way the satirical songs were meant to do—containing some kind of concealed threat as well. The goddess's place in Plinius's text is exactly where the other sources localise the *servus publicus*, this also alludes to their symbolic identifiability, as well as to Envy watching from his back, ready to pounce on him.⁸⁸ It is a question whether Fortuna and Nemesis had any concrete function in the liturgy of the *triumphus*, or the Plinian locus has got into the text as an element of the author's personal style of composition and message. Although there is no knowledge of any cultic prayer or ritual act addressed to Fortuna in the course of the *triumphus*, fear of the power of Fortuna and Nemesis probably occurred in the thoughts of the *triumphator*,⁸⁹ as certain references seem to prove this. Plinius's wording testifies to the fact that perceiving Fortuna's power not only on the real but also on the religious level was at least not strange from the atmosphere of the *triumphus*.⁹⁰ The restraining, moderative character of the *recipere* could be taken *stricto sensu* for the speed of the *quadriga*, i. e. the *triumphator* should proceed more slowly in his carriage (which—taking into account the ceremonial clothes, the sceptre and the laurel stick—was probably not driven by himself⁹¹) because in this way it could have moved away too much from his soldiers, making them rightly feel offended, as the *triumphus* was meant to recognise not only the *triumphator's* merits but their merits as well;⁹² at the same time, considering the magical religious atmosphere of the *triumphus*, it could carry a more abstract, spiritual meaning, fitting into the line of the rites of prevention. It can be legitimately asked what is the substantial difference between the textual variant *recipere* and that of *respice*. It is perhaps not necessary to treat more amply the literary historical and textual arguments proposed by Köves-Zulauf, which make his

⁸⁷ *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* III. 1125. *Deae Nemesi sive Fortunae*; Historia Augusta, *Maxim. et Balb.* 8, 6. *Nemesis id est vis quaedam Fortunae*.

⁸⁸ Köves-Zulauf: *Reden und Schweigen. op. cit.* 131. sqq.

⁸⁹ Livius: 5, 21, 15. sk; Plutarchus: *Camillus* 5. 7. 12; Livius: 45, 40, 6-9; 45, 41, 8. sqq.

⁹⁰ Wagenvoort: *Roman Dynamism .. op. cit.* 69.; Köves-Zulauf: *Reden und Schweigen. op. cit.* 132.

⁹¹ Ehlers: *op. cit.* 507.

⁹² Livius: 26, 21, 4; 39, 7, 3; 45, 36, 5; 45, 37, 3; 45, 41, 3; 45, 43, 8.

version more plausible, it seems more important to give an overview of his conclusions drawn from the immanent structure of the *triumphus*.⁹³

The inadequacy of looking back is substantiated by other sources as well,⁹⁴ emphasizing the rigid, statue-like posture of the *triumphator* modelling Iuppiter Capitolinus, meant to evoke the feeling of *tremendum maiestatis*, which completely harmonizes with the description of the Persian ruler's posture, probably influencing the formation of the rite of the *triumphus* relatively early.⁹⁵ It is possible to ponder on the fact that the prohibition of looking back is well-known from mythology in cases when a given person is standing at the limit, the meeting point of two spheres, one negative, harmful, demonic,⁹⁶ from the past, the other positive, fulfilling, pointing to the future. The story of Deucalion throwing stones behind his back is an example of the threat of the demonic sphere,⁹⁷ or the ceremony of the magic digging out of the plant,⁹⁸ looking back appears as the threat of losing the mission-fulfilling, positive future in numerous texts from both the Old and New Testaments.⁹⁹ The equally strong presence of the two spheres is exemplified by the story of Orpheus looking back¹⁰⁰ and by the story of Lot's wife.¹⁰¹ Several circumstances prohibiting looking back meet in the ceremony of the *triumphus*: The *triumphator* is preparing to perform a religious act, the sacrifice dedicated to Iuppiter Capitolinus, in the most important moment of his life, he is returning from the scene of his triumph to the most sacred place of his motherland, in his back the power of Nemesis, the harmful force of the *malocchio* is watching.¹⁰² At the same time the prohibition of looking back seems to be corroborated by the circumstance that the triumphator, who will take off the divine insignia when reaching the sanctuary of Iuppiter Capitolinus, thus ending his temporary identification with the deity, would

⁹³ Köves-Zulauf: *Reden und Schweigen. op. cit.* 137. sqq.

⁹⁴ Ammianus Marcellinus: 16, 10, 9–10. ...*talem se tamquam immobilem ostendens. Nam ... velut collo munito rectam aciem luminum tendens nec dextra vultum nec laeva flectebat tamquam figmentum hominis.*

⁹⁵ Payne: *op. cit.* 14; 202. sqq.

⁹⁶ Servius: *Commentarius in Verg. ecl.* 8, 102. *Nec respexeris: nolunt enim se videri numina.*

⁹⁷ Ovidius: *Metamorphoses* 1, 397. sqq.

⁹⁸ Plinius: *Naturalis historia* 24, 176.

⁹⁹ *Reges* 1, 19, 19–21; *Lucas* 9, 62.

¹⁰⁰ Ovidius: *Metamorphoses* 10, 56. sqq.

¹⁰¹ *Genesis* 19, 17. 26.

¹⁰² Köves-Zulauf: *Reden und Schweigen. op. cit.* 144. sq.; Köves-Zulauf: *Bevezetés a római vallás... op. cit.* 167. sq.

hinder his own rehumanisation aimed at in fact by the entire ceremony, thus provoking Nemesis even more.

IV. First let us take a brief overview—following mainly Taeger¹⁰³ and Pötscher¹⁰⁴—of the literature of the *numen Augusti* problem. Toutain, somewhat simplifying the question, regards Augustus's *numen* and person as being basically the same, substantiating his views by stating that—especially for the provincial usage—the conceptual separation is too nuanced, almost hair-splitting.¹⁰⁵ In his opinion he seems to forget the characteristic Roman religious tendency prone to atomizing and separation, which instead of synthesizing, connected clearly separable divine forces, so-called *Sondergottheiten* to numerous phenomena of everyday life, like the different phases of the life of corn.¹⁰⁶ Pippidi identifies the concepts of *numen Augusti* and *genius Augusti* with each other,¹⁰⁷ his view being challenged by Taeger, who, highlighting the fundamental differences between the cult of the *numen* and that of the *genius* categorically rejects the attempt at identifying *numen Augusti* and *genius Augusti*.¹⁰⁸ In his opinion this cult was dedicated to Augustus's *numen*, i.e. the numinous force present in the emperor as Augustus, to obtain a general cultic figure, not one connected to some particular function,¹⁰⁹ the *numen* being a concept less strictly cultic than the *genius*, rather connected to experiencing of a given phenomenon as a religious experience.¹¹⁰ With regard to the problem of *genius* and *numen* Fishwick states that the *numen Augusti* phrase was frequently used instead of the construction *genius Augusti* but this does not mean at all that the term *numen* would have meant the same as the term *genius*.¹¹¹ According to Latte the *genius* is the life-giving, personal creative power that dwells in man, never becoming abstract;¹¹² this, naturally does not mean that a given god, a human,

¹⁰³ Taeger: *op. cit.* 145. sqq.

¹⁰⁴ Pötscher: *op. cit.* 471–483.

¹⁰⁵ Toutain, J.: *Les cultes païens dans l'Empire romain*. Paris, 1907. 53. *Pour nous, le culte du numen impérial équivaut pleinement au culte de l'empereur vivant.*

¹⁰⁶ Latte: *op. cit.* 50. sqq.; Pötscher: *op. cit.* 472.

¹⁰⁷ Pippidi, D. M.: Le 'Numen Augusti'. Observations sur une forme occidentale du culte impériale. *Revue des Études Latines* 9. 1931. 83. sqq.; 106. sqq.

¹⁰⁸ Taeger: *op. cit.* 145.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 146.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.* 379.

¹¹¹ Fishwick, D.: Genius and Numen. *Harvard Theological Review* 62. 1969. 358. sqq. (Quoted by Pötscher: *op. cit.* 473. sq.)

¹¹² Latte: *op. cit.* 103.

or a corporation could not have possessed *numen* on the one hand and *genius* on the other in Roman thinking.¹¹³ The *numen* is rather a given momentary operation, a (divine) manifestation, involving a kind of extra energy.¹¹⁴ The divinity possesses *genius*, though it is not itself *genius*, at the same time, it possesses *numen* and—especially according to the Augustan and the subsequent terminology—is itself *numen*. This, however, does not solve the *numen Augusti–genius Augusti* problem, because the term *numen genii* would be possible *de iure*, but it does not *de facto* appear in textual tradition, on the contrary, the construction *genius numinis* is somewhat problematic, especially with respect to the living *princeps*, considering the fact that—at least the emperors of the Augustan age—were not regarded *stricto sensu*, i.e. religiously revered gods in their lifetime.¹¹⁵

Thus the emperor possessing numinosity, remained human throughout his life, even on the highest level of his exaltation, although, as it will be demonstrated, a human representing divine substance.¹¹⁶ In Roman thinking, the entry to the pantheon of certain abstract notions (e. g. Concordia, Pax, Salus) might have served as an analogy with the *consecratio* following the emperor's death.¹¹⁷ The veneration of the living and the deceased emperor are two more or less clearly separable mechanisms, because the deceased emperor became *de iure* god by the act of *consecratio*,¹¹⁸ hence he was entitled to the *divus* attributum—which, though it contained a kind of distinction between the eternally venerated gods and the people who became, or were declared divine after their death, as it is pointed out by Servius,¹¹⁹ this distinction was bearing grammatical rather than cultic relevance.¹²⁰ The *numen* attributed to the ruler—because it is an independent concept—cannot be considered identical with the ruler's *genius* although, considering its origins, it incorporates some of its aspects.¹²¹ At the same time, to a certain extent, it can be related to the hellenistic, *eyergetes* image of the ruler, which can be regarded as being one of

¹¹³ Pfister: *op. cit.* 1286.

¹¹⁴ Porphyrio: *Commentarius in Hor. Carm.* 1, 35, 2. *Praesentia dicuntur numina deorum, quae se potentiamque suam manifeste tendunt*

¹¹⁵ Pötscher: *op. cit.* 475.

¹¹⁶ Taeger: *op. cit.* 467.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.* 242.

¹¹⁸ Wissowa: *op. cit.* 243. sqq.

¹¹⁹ Servius: *Commentarius in Verg. Aen.* 5, 45. *Quamquam sit discretio, ut deos perpetuos dicamus, divos ex hominibus factos, quasi qui diem obierint; unde divos etiam imperatores vocamus.*

¹²⁰ Pötscher: *op. cit.* 479.

¹²¹ Latte: *op. cit.* 103.

the sources of the Roman cult of the emperor. Nevertheless, the most important point remains that mentioning the *numen* of the ruler they invariably meant a special supernatural force and reality and if,—as Cicero mentions it as well¹²²—the unified, consenting Senate can possess *numen*, than the living princeps can possess *numen* as well. The fact that it possesses *numen*, a numinous force, does not necessarily mean—at the same time not so much by virtue of the *consecratio* but rather the as a result of the unconscious associations evoked by the rites surrounding his person—that he would become a *numen*, i.e. a divinity. By the fact that the *numen Augusti* was cultically venerated already during the life of the *princeps*, it was not primarily Augustus's person that partook of religious homage, but the numinous, manaistic force, the *numen praesens*, manifested for his subjects through his person.¹²³ At the same time, establishing the precise borderline causes difficulty because although it is true that Augustus did not become *divus* in his lifetime, he accepted the title *Divi filius* after Caesar, who became *Divus Iulius* in the year 42 BC.¹²⁴ It is in perfect accordance with the above that Augustus was first given the right to wear the wreath of the *triumphator* during all his public appearances,¹²⁵ then, in the year 19 he obtained the privilege to wear the vestments of the *triumphator* in addition to the wreath, on the first day of each year,¹²⁶ thus he could appear among his subjects as the image of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus of the Capitolium. According to Suetonius, the future greatness of the later Augustus was predicted to his father by a dyonisian augury in a dream when he saw his son invested with the ornaments of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus.¹²⁷ (It is worth noting that representing Augustus as Iuppiter was part of the private cult, but Servius knows of a statue of Augustus which represented the ruler in complete Appolonian vestments.¹²⁸)

Thus it can be legitimately inferred that religious and dynamistic ideas played a role in Octavianus's becoming Augustus in the year 27 BC., because preceding him this *epiteton* had not been used for persons but only for sanctified things and cultic accessories, the word *augus*¹²⁹ originally meaning nothing else than *the one that has been augmented*.¹³⁰ The construction *augustum augurium* first

¹²² Cicero: *Philippicae* 3, 32. *magna vis est, magnum numen ... idem sentientis senatus.*

¹²³ Pötscher: *op. cit.* 482.

¹²⁴ Altheim: *op. cit.* III. 56.

¹²⁵ Dio Cassius: 51, 20, 1.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.* 53, 26, 5.

¹²⁷ Suetonius: *Augustus* 94, 5. sq.; Cf. Altheim: *op. cit.* III. 58. sqq.

¹²⁸ Altheim: *op. cit.* III. 63; Servius: *Commentarius in Verg. ecl.* 4, 10.

¹²⁹ Walde–Hofmann: *op. cit.* I. 83.

¹³⁰ Wagenvoort: *Wesenszüge altrömischer Religion. op. cit.* 367.

occurs in the *Annales* by Ennius,¹³¹ on the textile made by Athene, described in Ovidius's *Metamorphoses*, twelve Olympian gods can be seen who are sitting on their thrones with *augusta gravitate*, i.e. in human form but with an authority in their personality that exceeds human measure.¹³² This expression can be encountered twice in connection with Hercules, who is recognised by Euander in Livius because of his supernatural character, his emanation, *habitum formanque*,¹³³ and who appears in a corresponding shape with the occasion of his rising to heaven in Ovidius as well.¹³⁴ The poet explains the expression in accordance with the dynamistic connotations: "*Sancta vocant augusta patres, augusta vocantur templa sacerdotum rite dicata manu. Huius et augurium dependet origine verbi et quodcumque sua Iuppiter auget ope.*"¹³⁵ This denomination thus immanently carries within itself the substance standing beyond the human sphere, growing into the divine sphere, and, though this is not being defined each time the word is uttered,¹³⁶ it exerts its influence going deeper and originating deeper than any definition by means of unconscious associations, it is not by chance that in order to illustrate this Altheim quotes Vitruvius's address to Augustus: *divina tua mens et numen, imperator Caesar.*¹³⁷ A reference to the same creative act can be found in Suetonius when he says that the glory of permanent fame, the gift of the immortal gods will be received by those who increased the power of the Roman people from the smallest to the greatest measure.¹³⁸ Thus the word *augustus* derives from the verb *augere*, and is cognate with the term *augurium*, synonymous with *sanctus*, and even more with the expression *sacer*,¹³⁹ which receives its character from the sanctification performed by the *sacerdos* (see also *sacer-dare*).¹⁴⁰ However, the sanctification could be carried out only by a person, the *augur*, who had the numinous ability, *the auctoritas* to increase the *mana*.¹⁴¹

¹³¹ Ennius: *Annales* 502 V.

¹³² Ovidius: *Metamorphoses* 6, 72. sq.

¹³³ Livius: 1, 7, 9. ... *aliquantum ampliorem augustioremque humana.*

¹³⁴ Ovidius: *Metamorphoses* 9, 269. *maior ... videri ... et augusta fieri gravitate verendus.*

¹³⁵ Ovidius: *Fasti* 1, 609. sqq.

¹³⁶ Dio Cassius: 53, 16, 8.

¹³⁷ Altheim: *op. cit.* III. 61.

¹³⁸ Suetonius: *Augustus* 31, 5. *Proximum a dis immortalibus honorem memoriae ductum praestitit, qui imperium populi Romani ex minimo maximum reddidissent.*

¹³⁹ Cicero: *De natura deorum* 2, 62. 79; Statius: *Thebais* 10, 757; Macrobius *Saturnalia* 1, 20, 7.

¹⁴⁰ Suetonius: *Augustus* 71. *loca quoque religiosa et in quibus augurato quid consecratur augusta dicuntur.*

¹⁴¹ Wagenvoort: *Roman Dynamism...* *op. cit.* 12. sq.

Considering the Roman concept of *religio* one must place great emphasis on the experience of numinosity to reflect its special relationships, as C. G. Jung (based on Otto Rudolf's views¹⁴²) defines religion as a dynamic (i.e. full of *dynamis*—see also the identifiability of the concept of *numen* with the Greek *dynamis*) existence or influence affecting the human subject from the outside, getting possession over him.¹⁴³ The main characteristic of the archetype can be found precisely in its numinosity because the archetypal situations and images generate an emotional and temperal overcharge, thus eliciting the feeling of *tremendum maiestatis* from the conscience. Jung defines the origin and gist of the *mana* as the archetype being present in the collective unconscious, which appears as a person possessing power and authority, e. g. the hero and the godman:¹⁴⁴ It is in complete harmony with this that the operation of the *numinosum* seizes and dominates the human subject, the subject being rather the victim of this operation than its originator, thus it is independent of the subject's will.¹⁴⁵

It is worth taking a quick glance at how the concept of *imperium* is related to the concept of *numen*, and the concept of *auctoritas* augmenting and expressing the capacity of numinosity by its creative function even on the level of historical reality. It could be seen that the religious and military leader (both functions being fulfilled in the beginning by the *rex* in Rome) possesses *mana*—as he activates the archetype of the divine leader and that of the hero on the level of the collective unconscious.¹⁴⁶ His *mana* enables him to increase the fertility of the land, as it can be seen from ethnological examples. According to this in Wagenvoort's interpretation *imperare* originally did not mean anything else but to call to life, to fertilise, as the general—who ordered (*imperabat*) his soldiers to attack an enemy camp—conjured up, created the force necessary to carry out the mission with the help of his magic words, thus he draws the conclusion that the *imperium* is nothing else than the ability of creating and transmitting a mysterious power.¹⁴⁷ Köves-Zulauf mentions as a specificity of

¹⁴² Otto, R.: *Das Heilige*. Breslau, 1917.

¹⁴³ Jung, C. G.: *Psychologie und Religion*. München, 1997. 10. sq.

¹⁴⁴ Jung, C. G.: *Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Ich und dem Unbewußten*. München, 1997. 113. 118. sq.

¹⁴⁵ Jung: *Psychologie...* *op. cit.* 11.

¹⁴⁶ Wagenvoort: *Wesenszüge altrömischer Religion*. *op. cit.* 371.

¹⁴⁷ Wagenvoort: *op. cit.* 371. sq. *Sehen wir richtig, so bedeutete das Zeitwort imperare ('befehlen', 'herrschen') ursprünglich 'zum Leben erwecken', 'befruchten'; der Feldherr, der seinen Soldaten befahl (imperabat), ein feindliches Lager zu berennen, erzeugte in ihnen durch sein magisches Wort die Kraft zur Erfüllung seines Auftrages. Imperium ist also eine Form der Übertragung geheimnisvoller Kraft.*

this: „*the particular interest of the issue, not to be discussed in great detail here, is that parere (to bear) is a typically feminine word, whereas imperium was exclusively possessed by men.*”¹⁴⁸

Without endeavouring to thoroughly explain this phenomenon let proceed again from C. G. Jung’s definition of the *Mana-Persönlichkeit*, according to which it is nothing else than the archetype of the power-possessing man figure dwelling in the collective unconscious which dominates the conscious personality and takes over the autonomous power and value of the *anima*, and later, the identification with this figure creates the idea of possessing the *mana* of the *anima*.¹⁴⁹ By this, although the conscious did not prevail over the unconscious, it integrated the power of its representative, the *anima* to such an extent that the possibility of a more direct connection between the *ego* and the unconscious was created, through which the *ego* acquired the identification with its ideal which exercises higher power, the one possessing the power of the *mana*, the *außergewöhnlich Wirkungsvoll*, thus becoming a *mana*-personality.¹⁵⁰ Thus one becomes a leader capable of evoking the archetype of the possessor of power, one who has the ability in the strictest sense of the word to create, to bear—this ability is designated by the typically feminine word *imperium*—certain ideas of power in others by virtue of his harmonious relationship with the *anima*. (The leader living in disharmony with the *anima* also evokes the archetype of the manaistic personality, in his subjects, but precisely due to this disharmony, by which the power of the *anima* prevails over him, he becomes destructive, he cannot appropriate the *imperium* that is creative—this creativity being also shown by the word’s etymology.)

Augustus achieved the stability of his legitimation by the superior handling of the associational points connected to the *auctoritas*, the *imperium* and the *numen*, with the help of transferring the formation called—to use Max Weber’s formula—charismatic legitimation into the construction called traditional legitimation. The *numen Augusti* compositum organically fits into the Roman religious system, as on the one hand it evokes in the subjects the concept of the *numen*, the divine presence and dynamistic operational mode, on the other hand it evokes the *augus*, the numinous experience of the charismatic leader, possessing the augmenting, creative ability, the *mana*. Köves-Zulauf’s characterisation constitutes a convenient parallel, giving a synthesis of the Roman religion’s relationship with language: „*Therefore, Roman religion is the religion of*

¹⁴⁸ Köves-Zulauf: *Bevezetés a római vallás... op. cit.* 31.

¹⁴⁹ Jung: *Die Beziehungen zwischen... op. cit.* 113.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 114. sqq.

discipline, of repression, of anxiety, not of liberated relief, as the Greek ... From here ensues the neurotic relationship of Roman religion with speech."¹⁵¹

As it could be seen it is not only the Romans' relationship with speech that is relatively neurotic, but also their general relationship with the numinous experiences of religion, as their relationship with the above analysed archetypal phenomena is basically negative, refusing. This should not necessarily be the case as „*the archetype is in itself neither positive nor negative but a morally neutral numen that becomes good or bad only as a result of its collision with the conscience.*”¹⁵² It is precisely this neurosis inherent in Roman religion, constituting its most basic part that is used by the reigning power—so as to ensure its unquestionability—with the elevation of the concept of authority to numinous regions, generating the feeling of *tremendum maiestatis*.

¹⁵¹ Köves-Zulauf: *Bevezetés a római vallás... op. cit.* 249.

¹⁵² Jung, C. G.: *Pszichológia és költészet (Psychologie und Dichtung)*. Budapest, 2003. 100.