

Schultz's reassessment of gendered participation in Roman religion enables a clearer understanding of its civic inclusivity and social/familial practices, in which females figured more prominently than mainstream scholarship has allowed (2006: 5). I propose to extend Schultz' methodology to the divine realm, since the Romans perceived analogies to their own human family in divine families. The purpose of this paper is two-fold: first, to add to the discussion of the familiar nature of divine pairs; and secondly, to suggest that scholars have tended to dismiss the feminine deities in these pairs, thereby overlooking their familial significance.

Several same-name pairs in Roman religion are known from literature, material culture, and art, the most familiar of which are probably Faunus/Fauna, and Liber/Libera; in the typology of pairs a feature of archaic religion is generally recognized. There were other pairs, such as Dius/Dia (in various configurations), and Maius/Maia in the environs of Rome, and no doubt still others beyond the borders of Latium, such as Oscan Florus and Umbrian Pomonus, whose sisters Flora and Pomona married and moved to Rome, as it were. All of these were probably part of a larger system of same-name deities in pre-Roman Italy, only fragments of which survive. By the historical period, such pairs were understood as familial: how they were perceived in the archaic period cannot be recovered with certainty, but given the Romans' interest in ancestor cult it seems reasonable to suggest that same-name pairs had always been seen as familial, whether father/daughter or brother/sister.

Modern scholarship has been slow in recognizing the significance of same-name divine pairs, e.g. Wissowa sees in Cacus/Caca "*ein altes Götterpaar*" that was later forgotten (*RKR*<sup>2</sup> 161), but he pairs Janus with Vesta (*ibid.* 103), omitting any mention of Jana. Dumézil leaves both Janus and Cacus sisterless (*ARR* I, 43, n. 10), admitting only Faunus/Fauna and Liber/Libera as archaic pairs (though not fraternal/sororal), on the basis of a common concern for sexuality. Sabbatucci omits Janus/Jana (1999: 171-177; 199-202; 350-351), as does Bayet (1969: 99-112ff). The Romans themselves, however, understood all these pairs as related, often brother and sister, e.g. Liber/Libera (*Cic.*, *de Nat. Deorum* 2.24.62, who puns on the names as *liberi*). Despite scholars' almost universal disregard of the Janus/Jana pair, the Romans also clearly conceived of them as brother-sister. We see their syncretism in the Greco-Roman world with Apollo and Artemis/Diana in their aspect as sun and moon (*Macr. Sat.* 1.9.5-9, cf. *Varr. RR* 1.37), an association that both perplexed and vexed Wissowa (*RKR*<sup>2</sup> 72, n.3). And it is certainly no accident that the Etruscans had same-name male-female counterparts for Janus/Jana, the door-gods Culsans and Culsu, both depicted and named in Etruscan art.

I will end by noting how familial aspects of the Roman pantheon shed additional light on religious concerns about mortal brother-sister pairs like Horatius/Horatia, specific religious festivals pertaining to family, and on the Romans' general perception of the gods as a *familia*.