

## CAUSATION AND THE AUTHORITY OF THE POET IN OVID'S *FASTI*

### I. *TEMPORA CUM CAUSIS*

The two central themes of *Fasti*<sup>1</sup> are twice (1.1, 4.11) linked in this way. The association, which at once gives the poem the appearance of having a literary ancestry in the aetiological tradition,<sup>2</sup> might have seemed inevitable: any verse narrative account of a festival is very likely to contain an αἴτιον of it. Callimachus' hymns illustrate this assertion, and there are clearly defined hymnic elements in *Fasti* to bear out the comparison, for example the listing of Venus' ἀπειραί and πρᾶξεις at 4.91ff.<sup>3</sup> and the instructions to the devotees of Pales at 4.731–48.<sup>4</sup> To state the obvious fact that the poem combines Roman antiquities with Alexandrian aetiology, a blending of which more straightforward examples are to be found in the fourth book of Propertius, is only a prelude to establishing what Ovid really achieves in *Fasti*. Traditional elements are, as I hope to show, cunningly exploited to create 'counter-effects' and to subject the material to the constantly varying and wide-ranging influences of the poet's literary background. Though the notion of *causa* is

<sup>1</sup> All references are to *Fasti*, in the Teubner edition of Alton, Wormell and Courtney (Leipzig, 1978), unless the context obviously suggests otherwise. I cite by editor's name only the editions of F. Bömer (2 vols, Heidelberg, 1957–8), J. G. Frazer (5 vols, London, 1929), C. Landi (rev. L. Castiglioni, Turin, 1960), H. Peter<sup>4</sup> (Leipzig, 1907). The following books and articles are referred to by the author's name only:

M. Beard, 'A Complex of Times: No More Sheep on Romulus' Birthday', *PCPS* 33 (1987), 1–15.

C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry* ii, *The 'Ars Poetica'* (Cambridge, 1971). *Horace on Poetry* iii, *Epistles Book II: the Letters to Augustus and Florus* (Cambridge, 1982).

E. Fantham, 'Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*: Sources and Motivation', *HSCP* 87 (1983), 185–216.

J.-M. Frécaut, *L'esprit et l'humour chez Ovide* (Grenoble, 1972).

S. Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-conscious Muse* (Cambridge, 1987).

J. C. McKeown, 'Fabula proposita nulla tegenda meo: Ovid's *Fasti* and Augustan politics' in A. J. Woodman and D. West (edd.), *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 169–187.

F. Peeters, *Les Fastes d'Ovide: histoire du texte* (Brussels, 1939).

D. Porte, *L'étiologie religieuse dans les Fastes d'Ovide* (Paris, 1985).

R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978).

A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus and the *Fasti*' in M. Whitby, P. Hardie and M. Whitby (edd.), *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol, 1987), pp. 221–30.

L. P. Wilkinson, *Ovid Recalled* (Cambridge, 1955).

W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (Wiesbaden, 1960).

I treat *Metamorphoses* throughout as in almost every respect an earlier poem than *Fasti*.

<sup>2</sup> 'The *Fasti* was modelled largely on Callimachus' *Aetia*' is the confident assertion of McKeown (p. 178). This is in one sense clearly true, but it will emerge that I see *Aetia* less as a model here and more as a kind of mine whose resources of narrative technique could be exploited by Ovid's own *ingenium*. For the more obvious aetiological background see Peeters, pp. 54ff.

<sup>3</sup> The relation of these to traditional hymns is stressed by Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.10 (p. 127).

<sup>4</sup> Such instructions are 'standard in cult-hymns', N. Hopkinson on Call. *h. Dem.* p. 78 with further examples.

central to *Fasti*, the poem is much more than an amalgam of such influences as the aetiological prose works of Varro and (possibly) Verrius Flaccus with the aetiological poetics of Propertius 4.<sup>5</sup> These sources combined to provide material for the foundation of the finished structure, which was to be the creative manipulation of these antiquarian and literary stimuli directed at providing a vehicle for the regular themes of the Ovidian *persona*.

Recent critical writing on *Fasti* has revealed a fundamental lack of consensus about the essential qualities of the poem. What have traditionally been regarded as the most comical episodes have had their established *grivoiserie* called into question,<sup>6</sup> and forcefully re-asserted.<sup>7</sup> The view that Ovid indulges in anti-Augustan satire has been advanced,<sup>8</sup> subsequently denied in favour of a broader picture of literary influence,<sup>9</sup> and most recently totally reversed to suggest that the poem is, in a more subtle and sophisticated way than was previously realised, a supportive poetical comment on Augustan religious reform.<sup>10</sup> I shall not take on any of these problems directly. My attention is devoted to the ways in which Ovid's poetic *ingenium* selects, orders and presents its themes, and to what this can tell us of the particular emphasis and expressive tone it wishes to convey. I shall not be concerned with the most *risqué* episodes; my view of their kind of comedy should be reasonably obvious in the light of my treatment of episodes which are less usually placed among the poem's comic highlights, as should my view of the thesis<sup>11</sup> that the poem goes into terminal decline in the later books. I do not attempt a complete picture of Ovid's relations with Augustus. This is too large a topic, even within the confines of *Fasti*, to be adequately discussed here, but two points may help to clarify my approach. I have not allowed any pre-conceived theory about their relations to restrict what the poem itself can be reasonably read as suggesting, aware that this may result in concluding that the poem has no *coherent* view of Augustus at all. Next, I do not accept that to be humorous on Augustan themes, even at Augustus' expense, is necessarily to be 'anti-Augustan'. A poetic presentation of the *princeps* and his achievement need not necessarily be a one-dimensional, uniform hymn of praise. The Ovidian *ingenium* may turn out to be more subtle than that.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>5</sup> On Verrius Flaccus and the *Fasti* see now Wallace-Hadrill, pp. 225ff., arguing for a less rigid distinction between poetry and politics than McKeown's. The recent material he assembles supports the positions of H. Winther, *De Fastis Verri Flacci ab Ovidio adhibitis* (Berlin, 1885) and Peeters, pp. 23 and 54 against the scepticism of Bömer i.22–3. On the Varronian background see McKeown, pp. 170f. (persuasive here), Bömer i.23–4 and Peeters, pp. 49–51 who uses Ch. Hülsen, *Varronianae doctrinae quoniam in Ovidii Fastis vestigia exstant* (Berlin, 1880), which I have not seen. On the influence of Propertius' aetiological poems see Bömer i.25–6 and the excellent discussion in M. Hubbard, *Propertius* (London, 1974), pp. 121–34.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the objections of D. Porte 'Les Fastes d'Ovide et le sourcil latin', *Latomus* 37 (1978), 851–73, with literature on earlier views. This ponderous approach, now amplified at great length (see 'Porte' in n. 1), seems to miss the point that aetiology is a functional device for giving narrative a new dimension of sophistication, and one which Ovid uses wittily and inventively.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Fantham's attempt (pp. 194ff.) to relate the comedy to Priapean humour. Fantham ignores Porte's article.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. A. W. J. Holleman, 'Ovid and the Lupercalia', *Historia* 22 (1973), 260–8.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. McKeown, pp. 177ff.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Beard, pp. 7f. Wallace-Hadrill (p. 228) largely goes along with Beard, but sees the problems arising from Ovid's undeniably comic tone in treating some 'moral' issues.

<sup>11</sup> Most sympathetically presented by W. R. Johnson, 'The Desolation of the *Fasti*', *CJ* 74 (1979–80), 7–18; cf. Fantham, pp. 210–15 ('the material was drying up', p. 215).

<sup>12</sup> As is illustrated by, for example, U. Blank-Sangmeister (see n. 42 below) and S. D'Elia's appreciation of the poem's ironies (see n. 94 below).

II. *TEMPORA*: THE CALENDAR ORDER

The pattern of *tempora* was to a large extent established in the external ordering of the revised Julian Fasti,<sup>13</sup> leaving Ovid to decide on the appropriate scale of treatment in each case. Use of the calendar arrangement enables Ovid to develop what really does interest him, ironic contrasts and shifts of tone suggested by the potential incongruity of the juxtapositions of festivals in the calendar, responsibility for which cannot of course be laid at the poet's door.<sup>14</sup>

I give one example of the kind of effect achieved in this way. The celebration on February 11th of the voting of the title *pater patriae* to Augustus (2.119–44) begins with a mock-heroic raising of the poetic tension which invokes Homeric (119–20) and Pindaric (121–2) prototypes.<sup>15</sup> The expectations thus created are answered with a *comparatio* between Romulus, addressed as instigator of the rape of the Sabines, and Augustus, the promoter of moral legislation:

tu rapis, hic castas duce se iubet esse maritas. (139)

The phrase 'duce se' carries implications for the standing of Augustus, whose reputation as 'sanctus pater patriae' (127) has just been compared with that of Jupiter himself, the parallel lord of the heavens (131–2). Distinguished from the sexually violent Romulus (139–44), the law-abiding and peace-loving Augustus shares a *nomen* with Jupiter (131–2), the sense of *nomen* here easily extending from the 'name' *pater* to a shared 'reputation'.<sup>16</sup> Fresh light is then thrown on Jupiter's *nomen* by two chronologically related episodes which immediately follow this *comparatio*. The taking-up into heaven of Romulus by Jupiter and of Julius Caesar by Augustus (144) is succeeded by the emergence of Ganymede (145–8), whose elevation to the celestial spheres took place in circumstances different from either. Ovid's introduction of the *puer Idaeus* on the 5th is made possible only by two loose connections, one mythological, the other astronomical. Mythology did not consistently identify Ganymede with Aquarius,<sup>17</sup> though it is of course only this equation which can justify Ganymede's introduction here. Astronomically, the placing of the rising of Aquarius at this point on the 5th February, mid-way between its 'true' morning rising on 22nd January and its 'apparent' morning rising on 22nd February, is an arbitrary

<sup>13</sup> Wallace-Hadrill, pp. 224ff. His advocacy of the *Fasti Praenestini* needs to be qualified by the point made by Porte, whom he entirely ignores: 'Les Fastes de Préneste ne sont pour lui qu'un point de départ, un répertoire de sujets qu'on peut modeler ensuite à son gré' (p. 42. Cf. her whole discussion of 'Le choix d'Ovide', pp. 39–124, and Bömer i.22–3).

<sup>14</sup> Wilkinson (pp. 266–9) sets out some examples of what he claims to be the loss to narrative integrity of Ovid's following the calendar arrangement, but he altogether misses the point I touch on in this paragraph and hope to explain more fully elsewhere, that a satisfactorily integrated narrative was sacrificed for ingenious and subtly ironic effects which could be obtained by exploiting the calendar order. This point is well put by M. Beard (p. 8), developing her claims for 'paradigmatic meaning': 'It was precisely the Roman calendar's reliance on building up associations and images on a paradigmatic model outside any determining narrative that gave the individual festival a fluid meaning in relation to the others in the sequence.' I shall be exploiting the idea of 'paradigmatic' allusion later.

<sup>15</sup> The background to the 'Homeric' lines 119f. is fully presented by Austin on *Aen.* 6.625ff., and to the 'Pindaric' lines 123–4 by Kiessling-Heinze on *Hor. Carm.* 4.2.33 and Bömer on *Met.* 10.148–50.

<sup>16</sup> OLD s.v. *nomen* 12.

<sup>17</sup> 'Allerdings ist die Gleichsetzung Ganymedes-Aquarius nicht allgemein anerkannt' concludes Bömer on 2.145, adjusting the rather misleading impression conveyed by Frazer's view (ii.315) that the equation was a 'popular fancy' and by Hyg. *Astr.* 2.29. A full range of possibilities is covered in Röscher's *Lexicon* 6.974–7.

compromise which cannot be traced back further than Ovid.<sup>18</sup> I believe that the reason why Ovid placed the rising of Aquarius here and pressed the equation with Ganymede emerges when we remember that Ovid also (not surprisingly) adopted the pederastic version of the Ganymede story, which was the most discreditable to Jupiter. At *Met.* 10.155–61 the seizure (*abripit* 160) of Ganymede by Jupiter is attributed to the god's amorous infatuation with the boy ('Ganymedis amore/arsit' 155f.),<sup>19</sup> a passion which upsets marital harmony ('invita...Iunone' 161). The *comparatio* of the *nomen* of Augustus with that of Jupiter at *Fast.* 2.131ff. is to be seen in the light of the appearance of Ganymede, whom Ovid contrives to introduce immediately after the *comparatio* (145ff.), and whose appearance adds a new dimension to Jupiter's *nomen* by recalling a translation to the heavens rather different from that of Romulus (144).

Those readers who miss the point about Ganymede are alerted to the real reputation Jupiter has by what follows almost immediately on the 11th February, in the next scene Ovid has chosen to treat in detail (2.153–90), the story of the rape of Callisto by 'summus Iuppiter' (182). There is no doubt of the god's culpability ('de Iove crimen habet' 162, cf. 182) or of the violent nature of the rape ('invito est pectore passa Iovem' 178). The mysterious *lucus* (165f.) which Callisto desecrates by her presence recalls the Capitoline asylum (*lucus* 140) which Romulus defiles by the admission of *nefas*. What matches Augustus' moral requirements here ('castas...iubet esse maritas' 139) is the moral inflexibility not of Jupiter, now exposed as a rapist, but of Diana (cf. 'nec castas pollue...aquas' 174). As with Ganymede, Juno's anger is provoked (177f.) by her husband's impassioned involvement with another interloping *paelex* (179), behaviour which clearly corresponds more with the example of Romulean *vis* than with Augustan *leges* (cf. 141). It is difficult to believe that a reader's response to the Augustus/Jupiter parallel is not set up in 119–44 only to be put into a new perspective by the evocation of Ganymede in 145–8 and by the explicit account of the rape of Callisto in 153–88. The expectations elaborately blown up by the heroic pomposity of the prelude (119–26) and by the claim that Augustus is superior to Romulus, with whom he is regularly associated in the typology of Augustan verse,<sup>20</sup> are deflated in the immediate sequel.

### III. CAUSAE

When we come to the *causae* themselves, such effects are more problematic to determine, for Ovid here had greater scope for manoeuvre and the exercise of selection. His usual practice is to select and present one narrative αἴτιον for a festival,

<sup>18</sup> On this point Bömer on 2.145 has nothing to add to Frazer's account (ii.315ff.) and both derive their information (with acknowledgement) from J. L. Ideler, 'Über den astronomischen Theil der Fasti des Ovid', *Abhandl. der histor.-philol. Klasse der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin aus den Jahren 1822 und 1823* (Berlin, 1825), pp. 160f. That Columella (11.2.14) follows Ovid in recording the rise of Aquarius at its mid-point is at least as likely as that both use some (unknown) independent source. Columella's 'mediae partes Aquarii oriuntur' is simply a prose version of *Fast.* 2.145.

<sup>19</sup> So also at *Priapea* 3.5–6 Buecheler, attributed to Ovid by the elder Seneca (*Con.* 1.2.22). The variants in the Greek version of the Ganymede story are documented by Gerber on Pindar, *Ol.* 1.45 s.v. *χρῆος*. See also Frazer on Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.2, Bömer on *Met.* 10.155ff. and Röscher's *Lexicon* cited in n. 17 above.

<sup>20</sup> On the comparison see G. Binder *Aeneas und Augustus: Interpretationen zum 8 Buch der Aeneis* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1971), pp. 150ff., K. Gransden (ed.), *Virgil, Aeneid VIII* (Cambridge, 1976), p. 16, R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), pp. 306 and 313. There is a full bibliography on the comparison in Brink iii.39–42 (on Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.5).

with the rejected possibilities and the criterion of selection duly suppressed in deference to the authority, often divine, invoked to authenticate the chosen version. I shall presently discuss the few cases where Ovid does *not* follow this usual practice but gives multiple explanations for a single event. For the present I want to highlight the (perhaps unexpected) paucity of those instances by examining the abundantly varied examples of Ovid's more usual procedure.

The poetic *persona* used as a basis for *variatio* in *Fasti* is that of one or other form of the didactic *vates*, for the 'poetic' sense here derives much of its character from the earlier 'prophetic' sense.<sup>21</sup> The sources of his inspiration vary from the gods and goddesses of the Greco-Roman pantheon to local Roman divinities and nymphs, the Muses and ancestral tradition. The usual procedure is for the poet to invoke the aid of an appropriate addressee in expounding the particular *causa* of the day's festival, the idea clearly being to ensure that special credence is given to the authority emanating from the superior source. Despite the occasional reference to the idea of 'pure' research by Ovid,<sup>22</sup> the impression is misleading; these references merely support the appeal to antiquity as an authenticating source. The impression usually conveyed here through the vatic *persona* is not that of the student who carefully sifts his sources and balances his judgement but rather of a suppliant priest who prays for a divinely sent revelation of the 'true' *lóγος* and faithfully reproduces it. Thus, when Minerva is asked directly to supply details of the *Quinquatrus minores* on the Ides of June (6.653–4) and complies immediately, the account which follows might easily be the goddess's own and is clearly not to be questioned. When Mercury is summoned, appropriately as *caducifer*, to inspire knowledge of the name of the Lemuria on 9th May (5.445–50), the source of the poet's account of the *origo nominis* which follows (451–92) is confirmed by a special and indisputable authority:

'accipe causam  
nominis: ex ipso est cognita causa deo.' (449–50)<sup>23</sup>

On a different scale, the full treatment accorded to Janus (1.65–289) is accounted for by his importance as a model with which all subsequent invocations and responses can be compared or contrasted. First praised in a hymn (65–70), he is invoked and asked to explain his nature (91–2). He responds with an epiphany which imparts poetic inspiration in a physical experience (93–100), and his speech is preceded by an authoritative instruction that it is to be believed by the poet (and, of course, by the reader):

<sup>21</sup> As in Horace (see Brink ii.391), though Ovid's manipulation of the potential ambivalence is naturally more self-consciously mocking than Horace's, e.g. at 6.249ff.

<sup>22</sup> E.g. 'annalibus eruta priscis' 1.7, 4.11, a phrase in which the associative, scholarly emphasis occurs in *eruta* 'unearthed by investigation', see *TLL* 5.2.845.33ff. as well as 844.77ff. given by Bömer. The *Fasti* usages should be included with those listed by Brink (iii.337) to illustrate the parallel Horatian use of *eruere* in connection with the poet-researcher. For other examples of supposed scholarly work by Ovid cf. 3.844 and the reflections on the origin of the name *Agonalia* at 1.317–32 which may at least in part derive from the alternatives in the *Fasti Praenestini* (Wallace-Hadrill, p. 229). Bömer (i.22ff. and ii on 1.7) takes this 'antiquarian-researcher' pose far too seriously, as does Frazer (i.xi–xiii) who has Ovid gathering his material with the earnestness of the author of *The Golden Bough*! Wilkinson (pp. 264–8) is rightly more sceptical about the degree of serious dedication to scholarship involved. Callimachean research is, by contrast, precise about its sources (cf. fr. 75.53–6, 92.2–3 Pf.).

<sup>23</sup> We shall presently see that this example has a more complex side to it (see section V iii and nn. 61 and 62 below). Wilkinson (p. 250) quoting these and other examples fails to see that Ovid uses the invocation-technique not to 'enliven his poem' but as a literary device for defining the status both of the *causa* and of the poet who expounds it. Porte (pp. 30ff.) is equally innocent of the function of the technique.

'disce...

quod petis et voces percipe mente meas'.

(102, cf. 115, 133)

Each request for further information is satisfied and the response, duly accepted, invites a further request.<sup>24</sup> Janus is finally thanked with a prayer for his continuing favour on city and poet (287–8). This opening section of *Fasti* 1 has not had justice done to it. This is, I believe, the first occasion on which the earlier Greek, and especially Hellenistic, device of a poet's invoking divine inspiration has been answered by a personal visitation and instruction from an exclusively Roman deity.<sup>25</sup> The combination of the Callimachean epiphany-description<sup>26</sup> with the Roman Janus<sup>27</sup> establishes the tone which dominates *Fasti* and which arises from the interaction of Greek and Roman material.

The basic pattern of Janus is followed only approximately in subsequent invocations, and never on such a scale. There is a common feature: the fact that the source of inspiration is also invariably the source of information confirms the view that the vatic *persona*'s function is to 'guarantee' by this means the authenticity of the story told. The extraordinary case of Vesta (6.249–56) shows how the information need not even be imparted verbally, but by the simple presence of the invoked deity, who thus identifies the telling of a whole range of *causae* for June 9th (256–460) even more intimately with the sensation of poetic inspiration (cf. 251–6). In due course we shall see how variations in this common feature will yield some of Ovid's most piquant ironies, especially in the cases of Romulus, the Muses and some of the major Greco-Roman deities.

First, more localised addressees. It is not surprising to find that several Ovidian *aïria* are related to those in *Aeneid* 8. Following a hint in Virgil,<sup>28</sup> Ovid has the prophetess Carmentis inspire him (1.465–8) to tell how she directed her son Evander to his settlement in Italy; Numa's wife, Egeria, another water-deity, reveals the background to the rites of the Salii (3.259–392), and his inspired exposition adds weight to the revealed authority of the poet's final admonitory flourish (393–8): the river Tiber, in an episode modelled in all probability on Tiberinus,<sup>29</sup> rises to explain in response to a request ('Thy bri, doce verum' 5.635) the origin of the casting of dummy bodies of straw into the river (5.621–62). Questioned on now familiar lines ('ipsa doce quae sis' 5.191), Flora reveals her identity (193–272) and offers to answer further questions (276), which she then proceeds to do (277–376) on a variety of subjects. The addressee's favour is won by the poet's adapting his work to suit and

<sup>24</sup> Cf. 145–8, 161–2, 165–6, 171–2, 175–6, 183–4, 189–90, 227–30, 255–8, 277–8.

<sup>25</sup> A list of earlier appearances to poets is given by Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 2, p. 315, all involving Greek or Greco-Roman deities. The instruction given by the (Etrurian?) Vertumnus in Propertius 4.2 is not, of course, an epiphany, while Romulus' intervention at Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.32ff. is not in answer to any invocation of him in the poet's *Graeci versiculi*.

<sup>26</sup> Bömer on 1.93 notes the parallel with *Aetia* fr. 1.21f., but cf. also the approaching epiphany of Apollo in the second hymn.

<sup>27</sup> So emphasised by Ovid in 90 to make the combination as dramatic as it is unexpected: 'nam tibi par nullum Graecia numen habet'. What concerns us is that Ovid *believed* Janus to be exclusively Roman; the wider possibilities now canvassed are given by Bömer on 1.89.

<sup>28</sup> *Aen.* 8.335–41. Virgil already has Carmentis as a prophetess ('vatis fatidicae' 340), so naturally Ovid gives her something to say which must command acceptance. Cf. Eden on *Aen.* 8.336ff. for the etymological link between her name and *carmen* ('prophecy') and Bömer on 1.462.

<sup>29</sup> *Aen.* 8.31–65; see Bömer on 5.635 and E. S. Rutledge, 'Vergil and Ovid on the Tiber', *CJ* 75 (1980), 301–4. The application of 'Greek' poetic invocation to the figures of early Roman mythology continues the technique used in the case of Janus and found again in that of Flora.

flatter the particular features of the addressee invoked, and so Flora has the poet's final prayer for success adapted from its more usual ship-metaphor format<sup>30</sup> to match her characteristics (377–8).

In the same way Ovid accommodates himself to Pales' requirements (4.721–30) to earn the favour which depends on the poet's devotion to the deity. The repeated asseverations (*certe* 725/7) therefore emphasise the lengths to which Ovid will go to obtain that favour ('Look how devout I am!') and reveal what the particular requirements of Pales are. The account need hardly be taken literally.<sup>31</sup> Ovid aims to win Pales' approval with a display of his *officium* (724), not to immortalise details of country lore for future generations unfamiliar with that kind of thing. His aim is attained (729), and as with the earlier appeal to Venus which opens the fourth book his success is confirmed by the recurrence of the ship-metaphor (729–30, cf. 4.18). Accepted by Pales as her authorised spokesman, Ovid is now in a position to give instructions to the shepherd on how the goddess is to be placated (747–77). Though Pales herself does not speak here, we are clearly to take Ovid's instructions as though they were the *ipsissima verba* of the goddess herself.

Ovid's Minerva, Mercury, Janus, Vesta, Carmentis, Egeria, Flora and Pales all illustrate in their different ways how the invoked patron can be presented as determining the content of what the poet transmits to the reader and even, in the case of Vesta, as formulating its expression. The extent of the patron's control over the content and direction of the transmitted story can be vividly seen in the case of Romulus (4.807–62).

Invoked (808) to assist the telling of Rome's foundation, Romulus selects an unusual version of the traditional story,<sup>32</sup> one which exculpates him from the charge of fratricide (841–4). He weeps ostentatiously over his brother Remus' body (849–52), aptly quoting Catullus' pathetic farewell to his brother in Bithynia,<sup>33</sup> and his famous quip about Remus jumping the walls and so becoming an enemy is put down to the need to keep a 'stiff upper lip' in public (847–8).<sup>34</sup> The emphasis here is very different

<sup>30</sup> This metaphor is found as early as 1.4 and is used as a sphragis at 2.863–4 and 3.789–90 (see Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* [Leipzig, 1890] s.v. *linter*). Examples listed by Bömer on 1.4, to which could be added *Georgics* 2.41ff. and 4.116f., bear out the significance of the ship-motif equally for the didacticism of *Fasti* and *Ars amatoria*.

<sup>31</sup> As it is by Beard, p. 2 and Porte, p. 17, following Frazer i.xiii–xiv. Wilkinson (pp. 266–8) and Bömer (i.29–30) more sensibly recall Wissowa's view that Ovid's knowledge of the details of rituals is extremely sketchy and often wrong in elementary ways. *Fasti* is a literary, not a liturgical, text and it is worth noting here A. W. Bulloch's comment in his demonstration that Callimachus' fifth hymn was not used for practical liturgical purposes: '... the careful insertion of references to ceremonial particulars [has] to do not with realism, but verisimilitude. Indeed the very presence of such details betrays precisely the literary nature of our text.' (*Callimachus: the fifth hymn* [Cambridge, 1985], p. 5; my italics).

<sup>32</sup> On the version followed here, in which Remus is killed by Celer, see Bömer i.26–8, 45 and ii. on 2.809. In his detailed analysis of the traditions Ogilvie (*A Commentary on Livy 1–5* [Oxford, 1965], p. 54) rightly observes that Virgil suppresses the story of Remus' murder by Romulus, as used in Ennius, Horace and Livy, to make Augustus' Romulean pretensions more commendable. Cf. H. Wagenvoort, 'The Crime of Fratricide: the Figure of Romulus-Quirinus in the Political Struggle of the First Century B.C.', *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion* (Leiden, 1956), pp. 161–83. As I explain, Ovid's purpose is in my view quite different.

<sup>33</sup> 4.852 'invito frater adempte, vale' combines Catullus 68.20, 92 '... misero frater adempte mihi' with 101.10 '... frater, ave atque vale'. Bömer strangely misses this.

<sup>34</sup> In Livy (1.7.2–3) Remus acts deliberately ('ludibrio fratris' 7.2 – contrast Ovid's 'ignorans' in 841), and is killed by Romulus who speaks his famous taunt 'increpitans'.

from the usual one of fratricidal jealousy and vengeance, and the emphasis is, I suggest, incredible for the same reason it is expected. The incompatibility of this version with, for example, that at 2.143 where Romulus' guilt is alluded to, can be explained (though it usually isn't) by the fact that the whole account from 4.809 to 862 is directed by the presence of Romulus himself ('ades factis, magne Quirine, tuis' 808). It is therefore no mere whimsical hyperbole of Ovid's which makes Romulus' lament, with its lyricism and personal tenderness, seem embarrassingly overdone, or which glorifies Rome's imperial dominion. By virtually allowing Romulus to explain himself through his *vates*, Ovid has succeeded in making him utterly unbelievable and untrustworthy.<sup>35</sup> The shaking of our faith in the objectivity of the source (and hence of the account 'inspired' by the source) arouses scepticism which also undermines the effectiveness of Romulus' triumphant concluding verses (857-62) on the universal jurisdiction of Rome and the Augustan house. Called into doubt as a biased historian of his house, Romulus will scarcely be trusted as a prophet of its fate!

#### IV. THE MUSES

Ovid both addresses the Muses (e.g. 4.189ff.) and is addressed by them (e.g. 1.657-62) with information on the causes of festivals and names. Invoking the Muses can be a simple device in constructing and interweaving narratives, as it very likely appears to have been in Callimachus' *Aetia*.<sup>36</sup> At *Fast.* 2.359-60 *mea Musa* is invoked to supply a Roman *causa* for the nudity of the Lupercal, with the chariot motif of 360 (which recurs in the poem, as does the equally familiar ship motif) lending a suitably vatic emphasis to the invocation and thus helping to confirm the authority of the only Roman *causa* given by combining it with a Callimachean poetic reference.<sup>37</sup> The 'Roman' Muse is here being invoked to complement the *Pierides* of 269ff. who have supplied (Greek) *αἴτια* for the same event. The two aetiological accounts of the ceremony are in fact neither contradictory nor mutually exclusive; but even if they were to be, the effect is obviously intended to be cumulative, as *adde* (359) suggests, to enable Ovid to avoid the position of having to choose and of valuing one Muse above the others. In this case, combining the Greek invocation of the Muses (269) with the Latin one (359) serves to bind the two narratives into a single sequence and to give the Roman myth an authoritative standing equal to that of its more venerable counterpart. We are not dealing here with incompatible contradictions, but have another example of the collaborative and mutually supportive way in which Greek influence and Roman self-consciousness are balanced against each other throughout the poem.

<sup>35</sup> Frécaut's attempt (p. 229) to show that the Ovidian Romulus here is a humorous cross-reference to Livy's Aemilius Paullus fails for want of persuasive evidence. The Romulus-Augustus association is more likely to have been in Ovid's mind.

<sup>36</sup> In fr. 86 Pf. explicitly, but a growing weight of evidence supports the view that in the first two books of *Aetia* the Muses in turn answered Callimachus' questions. It is now possible to trace the intervention of Erato (*SH* 238.8 with editors' note *ad loc.*) as well as of Clio, who provides an accurate genealogy of the Graces when Callimachus had been depending on written sources (Schol. Flor. Pf. i, p. 13.30ff., cf. fr. 43.56 Pf.) and of Calliope (fr. 7.22 Pf. and Pfeiffer's note on fr. 759). There is however no evidence that Callimachus' Muses disagree among themselves.

<sup>37</sup> For the extent of the metaphor in Ovid see Bömer on 4.10. The Callimachean reference is of course to the poetic carriage and journey of *Aetia* fr. 1.25-8 (Wimmel, pp. 105-9). Propertius had already used this motif at 3.11.9-11 and especially 2.10.1-2 where H.-P. Stahl has recently argued for a greater independence from Callimachus (*Propertius: Love and War; Individual and State under Augustus* [Berkeley, 1985], pp. 156ff.).



The major appearance of the Muses (5.1–110) makes a different impression. The Muses are invoked (7f.) by a hesitant poet (3–6) to explain the origin of the name of the month of May. There are three responses, from Polyhymnia (11–52), supported by Clio and Thalia, Urania (57–78) and Calliope (81–106).<sup>38</sup> The stories they tell again bring together elements of Greek and Roman origin,<sup>39</sup> but the open disagreement among the Muses ('dissensere deae' 9) leaves the *vates* they are instructing with something of a problem ('quid faciam?' 108). The competitive nature of the contest, as each of the three tries to win Ovid's support, prevents any one of the three *αἴτια* having the special authoritative stamp which the Muses' support would normally confer. The *vates*, who cannot afford to make enemies in such quarters, withholds his judgement (109–10), so there is no decisive verdict on the month's name to match the treatment of February (2.19f.) or the obvious cases of January and March. Our sense of the embarrassment of the poet's position is intensified by an awareness that in the contest between the Muses and *Pierides* at *Met.* 5.294ff. Calliope's story of Ceres and Proserpina won outright victory with nymphs as judges (*Met.* 5.663ff.), while Polyhymnia's story of the Gigantomachy in *Fast.* 5 was there told by the defeated daughter of Pierus (*Met.* 5.318ff.). Ovid's situation as judge of the Muses in *Fast.* 5 becomes all the more unenviable when we recall the earlier contest. If the purpose of the divine invocation and the responding instruction is to confer an authoritative stamp on the *causa* which the poet relates, the device fails when we are confronted by three *causae*, each presented in an authoritative guise which effectively removes the poet's power to select. The function of the invocation-device here must clearly be different from what it has been in earlier examples, and deliberately so, for in *Fast.* 1.41 Ovid, following Varro,<sup>40</sup> had already given as undisputed fact what turns out to be Urania's position in the contest in the fifth book (*Maius* from *maiores*, i.e. *seniores*), and the same derivation is repeated without qualification at 5.427 and 6.88. Why the poet's hesitation in the *iudicium* which opens the fifth book?

The *iudicium* between the personifications of Elegy and Tragedy in *Amores* 3.1 does not, I think, offer a sufficiently strong parallel.<sup>41</sup> We have in *Fast.* 5 the clear impression that Ovid is here reversing the topos employed more conventionally at, for example, 2.359ff., in which the Muse inspires the poet in true Hesiodic fashion to proclaim whatever she reveals. This impression is confirmed at the beginning of the sixth book. Here the *causa nominis* again raises a difficulty and we have a succession of three possible explanations, in turn from Juno, Juventas and Concordia, for the month's name. The confident 'vatic' role is laid aside (6.13–14), but Ovid also has to distance himself (15–16) from the ominously parallel role of Paris suggested by the *iudicium* of the three goddesses at the beginning of the sixth book and of the three Muses at the beginning of the fifth. The Trojan background is introduced only for Ovid to reject the challenge to choose which he is offered in this playful posturing,

<sup>38</sup> The two latter are also supported by two sisters each (108). Clio and Calliope appear in a similar capacity in *Aetia* (see n. 36).

<sup>39</sup> Polyhymnia combines Roman *Maiestas* (see Bömer on 5.9; Porte, p. 217) with the gigantomachy; Urania tells a Romulean story (see Bömer on 5.55; Porte, p. 203) and Calliope the Greco-Roman story of Arcadian Evander (see Bömer on 5.80).

<sup>40</sup> *L.* 6.33. Calliope's *Maia* is treated as an alternative at 6.35 and also by Festus (p. 120.8ff. Lindsay), and is preferred by Censorinus, *De die natali* 22.12 (p. 56.4 Sallmann) and Servius, *in Georg.* 1.43. Polyhymnia's *Maiestas* seems to be a suggestion unique to Ovid.

<sup>41</sup> That by choosing *Elegia* in preference to *Tragoedia* in *Amores* 3.1 Ovid might be supposed to be giving offence is suggested by his supplication to *Tragoedia* to avert her anger (67–8), which evidently proves successful ('mota dedit veniam' 69).

advised by the warning of the parallel case of Paris (6.98–100).<sup>42</sup> The strong Augustan associations of Concordia<sup>43</sup> not only fail to inspire conviction but also increase the risk of giving offence when the Trojan parallel makes clear the consequences of jealous rivalry and of making decisions in such circumstances. To avoid offence there is no repetition of Paris' mistake, no judgement. But if there is to be no judgement, what is achieved by invoking the goddesses in the first place? Elsewhere the Muses and (as we shall see) gods and goddesses authoritatively confirm the *causa* of a given festival. In the introduction to books 5 and 6 they make such a decision impossible for the poet to take. The *vates'* very source of inspiration and of the confidence he inspires in others effectively nullifies his vatic role and reduces him to judicial impotence. The *iudicium* which begins books 5 and 6 is, then, in each case a reversal of the instructive, confirmatory role of a Muse's interpretation as we find it working in, for example, 1.657–62, 2.359–60 and 4.189ff. I believe that these two *iudicia* exploit the Trojan parallel of Paris to play a ludic reversal on the standard function of the invocation topos.<sup>44</sup> By introducing the example of Paris and distancing himself from it, Ovid effectively undermines his own role as judicial *vates*.

The cases in which the Muses are invoked show how it is a feature of Ovid's art both to use them as a device for authenticating *causae* and to vary that device by using them for disorientating and comic effect.<sup>45</sup> Invocation of divine, quasi-divine and traditional authorities is in fact the prelude to most of the major narratives of *Fasti*, as we shall see. Finding a way to vary the presentation of such an accumulation of *causae*, each having to be presented with convincing vatic authority, proved to be the kind of challenge which suited Ovid's powers uniquely among (extant) Roman poets. His seemingly inexhaustible capacity for *variatio* constitutes more of a unifying thread for the narratives of *Fasti* than the calendar sequence itself.

<sup>42</sup> The comical function of the *iudicium* which opens *Fasti* 6 is analysed differently by U. Blank-Sangmeister, 'Ovid und die Aitiologie des Juni in *Fast.* VI.1–100', *Latomus* 42 (1983), 332–49, though she too makes the comparison with Paris (pp. 333ff.) and has her own penetrating discussion of the comic tone of the passage (pp. 348f.).

<sup>43</sup> Cf. 6.91–2. I take the 'placidus dux' here to be Augustus, but it does not affect my argument substantially if it refers to Tiberius, as 'dux venerande' must do in the account of the reconstruction of Concordia's temple at 1.637–50 (Bömer on 1.646). If Tiberius is the 'dux' here, Frazer must be right (ii.239–41) in taking the reference to be to Tiberius' rebuilding in A.D. 10, when the temple was re-dedicated to *Concordia Augusta* in honour of the reigning emperor (Suetonius, *Tib.* 20; cf. Syme, p. 29). All the more reason why Ovid might be expected to pay special attention to what Concordia has to say, but in the end she fails to convince.

<sup>44</sup> Porte (p. 65) also connects the *iudicia* which open books five and six, but her view that Ovid's apparent perplexity at 5.108–10 'sert ici à dissimuler un réel embarras scientifique' is hard to reconcile with the fact that Ovid has already formed his conclusion at 1.41 and repeats it at 5.427 and 6.88. As elsewhere, Porte here has much too limiting a view of the potential of Ovidian humour.

<sup>45</sup> That Ovid should play so freely with a *variatio* on a solemn invocatory topos like the Muses distances him from the earlier tradition, including Callimachus and the epigrammatists. For the Alexandrian treatment of the topos, largely followed by Horace, see Nisbet–Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.26.1 s.vv. *Musis amicus* and cf. the note on 1.24.3. The early significance of the Muses in Roman poetry is explained by Skutsch on Ennius, *Ann.* fr. 1 (pp. 144–7). The topos remains equally functional in Propertius (3.2.15–16; 3.3.37–8; cf. Camps on 4.6.12) and in Ovid's amatory poems (e.g. *Am.* 1.1.30; 3.8.23). As I argue above, Ovid's refusal to award the palm to Calliope in *Fasti* 5 gains in piquancy if we recall Calliope's outright victory over the daughter of Pierus in *Met.* 5.662ff.

## V. GODS AND GODDESSES

From what we have seen in connection with the Muses we would expect the major deities of the Greco-Roman pantheon to play a dominant role in inspiring and authenticating the poet's account of their festivals. They indeed do so, though with some surprising omissions, and, given the nature of Ovid's poetic *ingenium*, literary allusion adds another dimension to interpreting these invocations.

## (i) Venus: 4.1–132

Venus is invoked to supply the *causae dierum* (17) in April. The *gravitas* of the theme, which is to embrace the origins of the Caesarean-Augustan house, would at first appear to be the reason for the *recusatio* of love poetry in 9–10: *lusimus* (9) refers to the sophisticated playfulness of the style of *Amores*, *Ars* and *Remedia*,<sup>46</sup> which Ovid has now (we are to understand) abandoned, though Venus will continue to remain the theme in her capacity as mother of the Caesarean house. A familiar feature of the 'ludic' style is the witty manipulation of literary allusion, so the *recusatio* of 'ludic' love elegy which opens the fourth book of *Fasti* is hardly consolidated by a reference to *Amores* 3.15.1 in the opening line, or by the self-mocking reference to Virgil, *Ecl.* 4.1 in the third line.<sup>47</sup> As in the prelude to *Fast.* 2, the *recusatio* of ludic verse is here being undermined by the use of allusive technique in what follows.<sup>48</sup> Venus' reaction to the opening appeal follows on naturally enough (1–8) from the 'rejection' of Venus in *Amores* 3.15.1–2. Following the Trojan interlude (19–84), the great hymn to Venus (91–132) draws its themes and examples partly from the *amor omnibus idem* motif of *Georgic* 3,<sup>49</sup> but rather more from the hymn to Venus in Lucretius, *DRN* 1.1–49.<sup>50</sup> The

<sup>46</sup> Cf. *Fast.* 2.6 with Bömer's note *ad loc.*, Luck on *Trist.* 3.2.5 and Fordyce on Catullus 50.2. Other Ovidian examples occur at *Am.* 3.1.27, *Trist.* 2.538 and 5.1.43.

<sup>47</sup> Even the normally unsmiling Frazer recognises the tone here as 'playful' (iii.164).

<sup>48</sup> *Fast.* 2 begins with a parallel literary manifesto in which the 'ludic' approach of the amatory poems is set aside for something *allegedly* very different (cf. 8: 'ecquis ad haec illinc crederet esse viam?'). As with *Fast.* 4 the *recusatio* turns out to be deceptive: the declaration of the gulf between the two styles (8) is immediately (9) followed by a fresh application of the *militia* metaphor, allusively imported from amatory elegy (see Bömer on 2.9) to remind us that Ovid's ludic technique is still very much alive (cf. also 4.7 for a repetition of the device). The prelude to the fourth book contains a wider *area* (cf. 10) of allusion and is more obviously self-referential. Otherwise the overall effect is very much the same as in the prelude to the second book.

<sup>49</sup> Ovid's picturesque account of the bull and heifer (100–4) is a much reduced adaptation of *Georg.* 3.209ff., in which the bull *uses* its *feritas* instead of laying it aside (103).

<sup>50</sup> The reference to *DRN* is emphasised by the Lucretian 'blanda voluptas' at 99 (see Bömer *ad loc.*), but can be seen particularly in the following:

<i>Fasti</i>	4	: <i>DRN</i> 1
	93–4	: 4–5
	96	: 7–8
	99	: 18–20
	100–4	: 15–20
	105–6	: 14 (Martin <sup>5</sup> ).

In view of these associations it is difficult to believe that the invocatory adjective *alma* in 4.1 does not echo 'alma Venus' at *DRN* 1.2 as Porte (art. cit. n. 6 above, pp. 867ff.) already suggests, though Bömer *ad loc.* shows that *alma* is used in *Fasti* of other deities as well. For further associations between *Fasti* 4 and *DRN* cf. the Cybele passage at *Fast.* 4.179–372 with its equivalent at *DRN* 2.600–60. Bailey's commentary on the latter passage records the parallels in detail. P. Ferrarino's account of the relation ('*Laus Veneris: Fasti* IV. 91–114' in N. I. Herescu (ed.), *Ovidiana: recherches sur Ovide* [Paris, 1958], pp. 301–16) lacks the support of detailed analysis.

introduction of a *paraclausithyron* (109–12) into this hymn sets another Lucretian motif, now of course associated with amatory elegy, into a context where the influence of Ovidian amatory elegy and of *DRN* is already dominant.<sup>51</sup> Though Ovid may have claimed initially to exclude his earlier elegiac style from the invocation of Venus (9–10), the hymn of 91–132 shows how the allusive technique is re-introduced in relation to more than one source. The general intention is clear: the *area maior* (10) of the invocation, which lays claim to a theme and style elevated beyond that of earlier elegy, is seen to be established by a chain of literary allusion. The genealogy of the Caesarean family (23–60) is connected with that in *Met.* 14.609ff.;<sup>52</sup> the derivation of the name Falisci from Halesus (73–4) has already appeared in *Amores* 3.13<sup>53</sup> and surfaces again in *Fast.* 4 next to mention of Ovid's own birthplace; finally, the hymn to Venus exploits amatory material mainly from *DRN* but also from *Georgic* 3. The claimed elevation of style and content, designed to celebrate the divine ancestry of the Julian house, is in fact an extension of the allusive *lusus* employed in the amatory poems.

Superficially, then, the invocation of Venus serves the same instrumental function of explaining and confirming the *causae dierum* as does the invocation of the Muses, and this function is in fact fulfilled when the poet authoritatively selects the correct *causa* for the month's name at 4.61–2 with the prophetic assertion *auguror*. But a new dimension is added by the range of literary allusion here to give a sharper definition to the kind of poetic *opus* (16) our Roman *vates* is fashioning: a eulogy for the *gens Iulia* which celebrated the family's (and a nation's) foundation by exiles, and which identifies the divine fountain-head of Augustus' family with the original inspiration for the amatory topoi of Ovid's own earlier poems. Never was an opening *recusatio* of a poem's actual content more needed, or less convincing, than at the opening of *Fasti* 4.

(ii) Mars: 3.167–258

The device used basically for authenticating a *causa* can be exploited in other ways too. In the case of Mars I suggest that a comic dimension is added not, as in that of Venus, by literary but by paradigmatic allusion.<sup>54</sup> Mars appears in order to explain why his feast is kept by *matronae*, and the authoritative tone in which the instruction is imparted may be sensed in 3.177–8. The explanation which follows culminates in Mars recommending war to his son as a means of ensuring the numerical increase of the Roman people (198). The solution of going to war gives practical effect to the god's statement in the previous line that he has given Romulus '*patriam ... mentem*'.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Bömer on 5.339 for full references to the *paraclausithyron* in amatory elegy.

<sup>52</sup> The parallels with *Fast.* 4.23–60 are given in the Korn–Ehwald–von Albrecht edition *ad loc.* (ii.402). This point obviously depends on my declared preference for the priority of *Met.*

<sup>53</sup> *Am.* 3.13.31–6. From the first line of this poem we learn that Falisci was the birthplace of Ovid's wife. The appearance of Falisci in *Fast.* 4 (73–4) is quickly followed (79–80) by mention of Ovid's own birthplace, Sulmo (cf. *Am.* 2.16), and its derivation. That the two birthplaces should be so closely linked in a celebration of Venus may seem appropriate enough, though commentators seem to have missed it. It should be noted that the exilic *querella* for Sulmo, which was inserted at 81–4, is not a mere appendage to the mention of Ovid's birthplace but is especially ironic in view of the fact that both Sulmo and Falisci were themselves founded by exiles who fled in the opposite direction (73, 79), and gains added piquancy from a wider context which includes such prominent exiles as Evander (65), Ulysses (69), Antenor (75) and Aeneas (78).

<sup>54</sup> I here adapt Beard's idea that the Roman *Fasti* showed 'reliance on building up associations and images on a paradigmatic model outside any determining narrative' (p. 8).

Mars is here quoting Livy, who has the consul of 460, P. Valerius, beg Romulus to give his Roman descendants something of his own determination and firmness of purpose in the face of an enemy.<sup>55</sup> So, in *Fasti* 3, the warlike determination of Mars is passed on to his son with the instruction 'quod petis arma dabunt' (198). But is 'firmness of purpose' the only characteristic of this 'patria mens'? Ovid is, I think, combining the Livian sense of *mens* with the sense of 'inclination',<sup>56</sup> thus adding what is, as we shall see, a new dimension to the god's bequest to his son.

At the beginning of the book we have already seen Mars' *mens* in a different light. The rape of the Vestal virgin Silvia (11–42) was a case of *force majeure* not carried out on any socio-economic pretext like Romulus' but simply to satisfy the sexual impulse: 'Mars videt hanc visamque cupit potiturque cupita' (21).<sup>57</sup> War was in fact ruled out of the earlier situation (Mars was *inermis* 9) to emphasise the exclusively lustful motive for the rape, which offended the most sacred shrine of Roman religion (45–6). Since this other aspect of Mars' *mens* has been revealed at the opening of the book, we may well fear the worst when he refers at 197 to his son having inherited the 'patria mens'. For what Mars directs his son's mind to in search of a solution for Rome's problems is not in the first place war, but the father's example of trickery, betrayal and rape. It is *these* which constitute the 'Martial arts' of *Fasti* 3, exemplified in both father and son. There is really no need for Romulus' putting-into-action of the 'patria mens' to be related in any detail:<sup>58</sup> the paradigmatic story of Romulus' conception at the beginning of the book supplies sufficient parallel for the reader with 'memor pectus' (178). We may surmise that Mars is not anxious for us to make this association which hardly reflects well on either himself or his son. He represents himself as recommending war, not rape, as the only alternative to a debilitating peace (198); he suppresses details of the rape and refers at 233 to his own intercourse with Silvia in a way (n.b. *feliciter*<sup>59</sup>) which dishonestly covers over its real nature. Ovid, of course, has *already* supplied us with a more 'sincere' and 'objective' account of the event, which enables us to judge Mars' speech here against his 'real' actions as portrayed in the earlier account. Interestingly, this earlier account of the rape of Silvia is authenticated not, like the ensuing account of the Sabines, by its being dictated by Mars (who presumably has his pride) in response to an invocation, but simply by his being invited (1–10) to present himself (*ades* 2) while Ovid tells the tale Mars cannot

<sup>55</sup> Livy 3.17.6 'Romule pater, tu mentem tuam ... da stirpi tuae' (Bömer's reference). Cf. also *Aen.* 8.400. For examples of *mens* as 'determination', 'firmness of mind' see *OLD* s.v. 7, where the definitions hardly meet the requirements of some of the examples given.

<sup>56</sup> *OLD* s.v. 9, especially *Georg.* 3.267 'mentem Venus ipsa dedit', where *mens* refers to the strong sexual impulse of mares.

<sup>57</sup> A suitable parallel for the quick succession of events here occurs in the rape of Proserpina (*Met.* 5.395). See Bömer on 3.21.

<sup>58</sup> At 199–200 the story is put off until the treatment of the *Consualia* in August or December. Ovid may well have seen special possibilities in treating it there, since my view is that a narrative of the rape in *Fast.* 3 will add nothing to what we already know of Romulus' 'patria mens'.

<sup>59</sup> An unusual word for Ovid to have used in such a context, according to Bömer *ad loc.*, who refers to *TLL* 6.454.23ff. But the adverb arises quite naturally from the frequent use of *felix* in the sense of *fecundus*, *prole auctus* (*TLL* 6.436.56–437.15), and Mars may well be using *feliciter* to point to Silvia's fecundity as the mother of twins. So, Hypsipyle informs Jason that she has now given birth to twins: 'nunc etiam peperit ... / *felix* in numero quoque sum, prolemque gemellam / ... dedi' (*heroid.* 6.119, 121–2). There may also be an undercurrent here suggesting that Silvia was naively duped by Mars: Stahl (op. cit. n. 37 above, p. 181) reminds us that *felix* in Propertius can carry the undertone of 'naive', 'simple', and I note possible examples of this undertone also in *Fast.* 1.540; *Am.* 1.8.27, 2.11.30 and *Trist.* 5.1.30 where it adds a new dimension to the accepted sense.

deny. When the full invocatory device is finally employed (167–71) and responded to (171–8), we already know enough to realise that on *this* occasion the device may *not* bring to light the full account of the *causa dierum*. The irregular anticipating at the opening of the book of Mars' later invocation has comically undermined our faith in the capacity of the familiar device, when it eventually comes at 167–71, to produce a fully 'true' account on this occasion. No device in Ovid is used repeatedly without variation or exploitation of its comic effects.

(iii) Mercury: 5.663–92

Like Mars, Mercury suffers by paradigmatic comparison. In his case too we can see how an initial example, uncomplicated in itself, can be given a new dimension and ambivalence when set alongside a subsequent or preceding narrative. The first invocation of Mercury has already been presented as a 'typical' example of the technique:<sup>60</sup> in response to the poet's invocation (5.447), Mercury reveals the *causa* of the name of the Lemuria. Authority, especially divine authority, can induce belief in otherwise quite unconvincing positions. The emphatic conclusion 'hic sensus verbi, vis ea vocis erat' (5.484) rounds off an explanation, in itself utterly improbable,<sup>61</sup> which involves the name 'Lemuria' being a more easily pronounced substitute for 'Remuria',<sup>62</sup> but who can doubt the truth of it when 'ex ipso est cognita causa deo' (450)? Six days later, on the Ides of May (5.663–92), the embers of our lingering, irreverent doubts over the mock-etymology are fanned by the explicit presentation of Mercury as the god of perjury and deception on the occasion of the dedication of his temple.<sup>63</sup> Mercury is invoked on his name-day in an elaborate hymn (663–72) and summoned to hear the prayers of fraudulent salesmen, prayers from mouths accustomed to deceive (680). Asking the god for forgiveness for past theft and lying (681–6) is only a prelude to asking forgiveness for theft and deception yet to come (687–8):

'da modo lucra mihi, da facto gaudia lucro,  
et fac ut emptori verba dedisse iuuet.' (689–90)

What makes such irreverence appropriate for Mercury's feast-day? Mercury himself recalls (cf. *memor* 692) that he is himself a famed practitioner of fraud and deception because of the theft of Apollo's cattle,<sup>64</sup> and is thus a suitable recipient of the devotion of the thieves and liars who throng his temple – his knowing smile (691) is the

<sup>60</sup> See section III above on 5.445–92.

<sup>61</sup> 'Die Ableitung ist nicht haltbar' is Bömer's judgement (on 5.479). Porte (pp. 237f.), who also sees that this nonsense is Ovid's own invention, tries to make out a case for his 'ingéniosité' in inventing 'cette dérivation subtile'. Neither asks *why* Ovid should present a derivation which is so transparently false, or invent one when others were ready to hand. There are, of course, Hellenistic precedents for altering names in this way (cf. Dieg. IX, 12–14 to Call. *Iamb.* fr. 201 Pf.), but I know of none which exploits the topos as wittily as Ovid does here.

<sup>62</sup> Porphyrio (on Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.209) has a similar derivation, doubtless copied from *Fast.* 5. No Varronian or Verrian etymology survives (the Varronian fragment from *de vita populi Romani* at Nonius, p. 197.1ff. Lindsay offers none).

<sup>63</sup> Mercury's shady reputation in Roman literature goes back to Plautus (Fantham, p. 187), and Ovid may well be exploiting a motif from earlier comedy. For the 'invention' of the temple-dedication to him recorded in Livy 2.27.5–7 and Val. Max. 9.3.6 see Ogilvie (op. cit. n. 32 above), p. 303.

<sup>64</sup> Ovid records the *furtum*, as well as the *infamia* Mercury gained by punishing the innocent Battus, at *Met.* 2.680–707. That Battus is there punished for his 'periura pectora' (2.705) is ironic in view of Mercury's own performance before his father (*h. Hom.* 4.368–86). Cf. Frazer on Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10§2, Nisbet–Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.10.7, N. O. Brown, *Hermes the Thief* (London, 1947), Röscher, *Lexicon* i.2342ff.

knowing response of one deceiver to another.<sup>65</sup> The authoritative instructor of the origin of the name 'Lemuria' at 445ff. now seems rather less trustworthy, despite his imposing appearance and tone. The inherent improbability of the explanation he offers for the name is hardly going to win supporters for his case when he is exposed as the appropriate addressee of the prayers of liars and cheats, and as one who responds to such prayers with a knowing smile. The transparently false etymology which the god delivers (cf. 450) is now easier to understand.

How justified are we in making a comparison of this kind? After all, a god like Hermes/Mercury has a wide range of roles acquired by syncretism and association. Why should any two such roles, by convention distinct, be taken together by the reader to produce an ironic effect? An answer comes in part from what is indisputably Ovid's own practice. In *Fast.* 5.663–92 he combines the cult of 'Ερμῆς ἑμπολαῖος (669–90) with that of 'Ερμῆς δόλιος (691–2) to give us a Mercury whose reputation as a thief and trickster has flowed over into his patronage of business and trade. The association here is Ovid's,<sup>66</sup> and the reader is surely justified in extending what is revealed by it to throw light on Mercury's other recent appearance as ψυχαγωγός and ἑρμηνεύς, especially as Ovid now immediately proceeds (693ff.) from his presentation of Mercury as ἑμπολαῖος and δόλιος to call upon his aid once again as *interpres causarum*, though the god has been exposed only in the preceding couplet as one who smiles knowingly on liars and deceivers. What is more, Mercury is here, uniquely in *Fasti*,<sup>67</sup> invited to deliver his account of the καταστερισμός of Castor and Pollux 'directly', not as reported by his *vates*. Such an unusual invitation might be taken as a tribute to Mercury's verbal skill (cf. 'facundo...ore' 698), but I think it more likely that it allows the poet to shift the weight of responsibility for what is said even more obviously on to the shoulders of the 'speaker' than is usually the case. The reader has been sufficiently warned.

The fullest and least inhibited account of Hermes as liar and thief is found in the fourth Homeric hymn.<sup>68</sup> When Hermes, still a baby, mounted an extraordinary and wholly deceitful defence of himself before his father against the charge of stealing Apollo's cattle (*h. Hom.* 4.366–90), his undertaking to tell his father the truth – καὶ οὐκ οἶδα ψεύδεσθαι (369), and his denial of the charge on a solemn oath (383–6) secured his future as patron both of liars and of clever verbal manipulators. It is, of course, his success on that occasion which he has just recalled at *Fast.* 5.691–2, before he launches into another speech (699–720), where there is admittedly nothing much at stake, except his reputation.

This speech is preceded by a brief invocatory prelude (693–6) which links Mercury with the Dioscuri (the subject of the speech) and Hercules, just as the account of the same story in Pindar, *Nem.* 10.101–66 is preceded at 91–100 by a short prefatory

<sup>65</sup> There is more here than the humour which Frécaut (p. 287) sees. Jupiter smiles at the false oaths of lovers (*Ars am.* 1.633) because he has deceived so many of his lovers himself. Cf. also *Fast.* 5. 686 with *Ars am.* 1.634. Mercury's 'knowing smile' (*Fast.* 5.691) imitates that of his father, for which see *h. Hom.* 4.389.

<sup>66</sup> I cannot trace an earlier instance where the association is exploited in this way. At Aristophanes, *Plutus* 1155–8 these two attributes of Hermes are juxtaposed as part of a longer list, which is not quite the same thing.

<sup>67</sup> This was pointed out by R. Heinze, 'Ovids elegische Erzählung' (*Bericht über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Leipzig, 1919), p. 96.1. See Bömer on 5.694.

<sup>68</sup> For a comparison with the fuller version of the deception in Sophocles' *Ichneutae* see L. Radermacher (ed.), *Der homerische Hermeshymnus* (Vienna, 1931), pp. 183ff. and (more concisely) D. L. Page, *Literary Papyri: Poetry* (Loeb Class. Lib., London, 1962), p. 28.

section which includes Hermes and Heracles with Castor and Polydeuces as patrons of the Peloponnesian games. Ovid's account combines Pindar's versions of the wounding of Castor (though at the hands of Lynceus, not Idas) and the deaths of Lynceus and of Idas<sup>69</sup> with a background related to that in the hymn for Castor in Theocritus 22.137–215,<sup>70</sup> though all versions of the story apparently descend ultimately from the *Cypria*.<sup>71</sup> Like Theocritus, Ovid begins with the abduction of the daughters of Leucippus. The many differences between the Ovidian and Theocritean narratives<sup>72</sup> can mostly be related to a basic generic difference between the hymn-form used by Theocritus, triumphant and heroic, and the *αἵτιον* narrative in Ovid, which is drastically abbreviated, remains uncommitted on the rights and wrongs of the dispute, and until the invocation of Jupiter by Pollux at the very end (716–18) treats the combatants as equals in every way.<sup>73</sup> Theocritus' Castor, a dashing hero whose success has to justify the unequivocal conclusion of the hymn,<sup>74</sup> hardly compares with his Ovidian equivalent, who is quickly caught off his guard by Lynceus and killed.<sup>75</sup> Ovid's contribution to this narrative is largely one of selection and conflation: there is surprisingly little original detail which cannot be traced in these earlier stories.<sup>76</sup> Mercury's speech would seem to be answering the invocation of 693–4 with a recycling of the literary sources for the story, heavily abridged and emotionally detached in the Alexandrian manner, but stopping short of outright deception on the detail of the narrative.

Or does it stop short? There is just one point in his speech at which Mercury departs from the earlier literary tradition in a way which flatly contradicts it.<sup>77</sup> At 708 he transfers the scene of the incident from Laconia to Aphidna in Attica. Mercury's own interpreters, Frazer and Bömer, are bewildered by this change of location,<sup>78</sup> since they rightly see that the god is confusing the place where Castor and Pollux fought the sons of Aphareus with the town in Attica from which they rescued their sister Helen.<sup>79</sup> The change is inexplicable except as an Ovidian aberration. How, though,

<sup>69</sup> For Castor cf. *Nem.* 10.112f. with *Fast.* 5.709–10 (and cf. *Cypria* fr. VI Allen); for Lynceus cf. *Nem.* 10.128–31 with *Fast.* 5.711–12; for Idas cf. *Nem.* 10.132 with *Fast.* 5.713.

<sup>70</sup> This hymn contains at 167–8 an example of the motif of the winds carrying off and rendering void the prayers of men, which Ovid has just used at 686. Theoc. 22.167f. should be added to the parallels collected there by Bömer.

<sup>71</sup> Fr. VI-XI Allen. See Gow, *Theocritus*<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge, 1952), ii.383.

<sup>72</sup> These are summarised by Bömer on 5.694, where he rightly sees that the differences show 'Ovids Technik in eigentümlichem Licht'.

<sup>73</sup> Ovid's narrative here is thus firmly in the Hellenistic tradition. See Bulloch on Call. *h.* 5, p. 163, for 'studied detachment' in narrative and p. 177 for 'confining of dramatic action to a minimum'.

<sup>74</sup> 212: οὕτω Τυνδαρίδαις πολέμιζέμεν οὐκ ἐν ἐλαφρώ.

<sup>75</sup> On the significance of 'non exspectato volnere' (710) see Bömer ii.334.

<sup>76</sup> One odd detail of the kind is that the location was free of trees (707). This seems to contradict directly *Nem.* 10.114–16 δρυὸς ἐν στέλεχει ἡμένους, where the scholiast traces the same detail to the *Cypria* (= fr. XI Allen). For such descriptive detail in narrative elegy see B. Otis, *Ovid as an Epic Poet*<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge, 1970), p. 52.

<sup>77</sup> I disregard such Ovidian features as Castor's death at the hands of Lynceus (709–10), which simply reverses the situation in Theoc. 22.201ff., or the odd detail recorded in the previous note, which can be seen as an oblique reference to *Nem.* 10.

<sup>78</sup> Frazer iv.120: 'Ovid is clearly mistaken in giving the name Aphidna to the scene of the combat... for Aphidna was in Attica', with supporting evidence for the Laconian location for the fight in n. 4; Bömer ii.334: 'Gründe für die Verlegung [sc. des Kampfes] sind nicht bekannt.'

<sup>79</sup> This seems the best explanation (Frazer iv.119–20; Bömer ii.334, with supporting testimony for the 'Helenaraub'). A Laconian Aphidna, for which the only evidence is Steph. Byz. 149.16 Meineke, is rightly ruled out by Bömer, loc. cit. Hyginus, *Astron.* 2.22 has a version



could a poet who had carefully studied and selected his details from established literary sources not only make an elementary error (which even Hyginus can manage to avoid<sup>80</sup>) regarding the location of the whole incident, an error found in no earlier source, but also explicitly advertise his confusion to the world, which he does at 708, when there was no need to do so? I suggest that the confusion here is not Ovid's but Mercury's, and that it is an attempt by the master-interpreter to deceive the reader (and the poet) by confusing two quite distinct stories in the god's narrative. Mercury is confirming in this small detail the reputation for untrustworthiness he has only momentarily before been shown to have, and is playing a narrative 'trick' on the reader which the latter in turn will find satisfaction in exposing.

(iv) Bacchus: 3.459–516; 713–90

Bacchus is also found in contrasting situations within the same book. The *Liberalia* on March 17th (3.713–90) opens with an invocation to the god: 'fave vati, dum tua festa cano' (714). In what follows the god favours the telling of the *causa* of Bacchus' association with honey-cakes. The personal preference of the *vates*, introduced by 'ecce libet' (723), is laid aside to make way for the 'carminis opus' (724) under the influence of the god's favour. This will happen again in the Bacchus-inspired account of the baked cakes of Matuta (6.481–550). The decision at 3.725–6 to select the *origo* of a simple, domestic practice ('quare/ vitisator populos ad sua liba vocet') in preference to the grandiose themes of Bacchus' conquest of India (719–20) and escape from pirates (723–4) fits in with Hellenistic preference for such commonplace detail, and the *recusatio* device used in 715–24 is anyway a familiar method of furthering narrative while appearing to restrict its compass.<sup>81</sup> But the story of the troubled circumstances of Bacchus' birth and infancy is here excluded under the god's

(one of a pair) different from either known before, in which Castor is killed at Aphidna fighting against the Athenians. This is almost certainly copied by Avienus, *Phaen.* 372ff. and by the scholiast on Germanicus (p. 68 Breysig). In an excellent note in his edition of Avienus' *Phaen.* (Coll. Budé, [Paris, 1981], pp. 196–8), J. Soubiran sets out the difficulties and probable affinity of the various stories, though the complexities he points to are quite ignored in the relevant notes in A. Le Boeuffe's edition of Hyginus, *Astron.* (Coll. Budé [Paris, 1983], p. 170). Soubiran's observation that the first of Hyginus' two stories, which has Castor killed fighting the Athenians at Aphidna (2.22), is really a new version was not given adequate weight by Frazer or Bömer, who tend to identify it with the earlier versions. The story of Castor's death at the hands of Lynceus (or Idas), which is the second of Hyginus' alternatives and which he places in Sparta, is altogether different from the other account by which Castor is or is not killed at Aphidna fighting the Athenians to rescue Helen. Hyginus clearly distinguishes the two stories and locates the Lynceus/Idas version in the Peloponnese. Ovid's version is found nowhere outside *Fast.* 5 and is explicable only as a 'confused' conflation of the Lynceus/Idas version with the scene of Helen's rescue (whether or not Castor was killed at Aphidna). It seems to me impossible to credit Ovid with so crude a conflation, with its nonsensical result, when he has obviously taken such pains to pare down his sources and fashion his narrative to suit his poetic intention. Would Ovid make such a basic mistake when even Hyginus can get the distinction right? As I explain, I believe Ovid's 'error' to be Mercury's 'error', and to be an attempt by the god at 'narrative deception' of the reader. For a similar 'confusion' at *Fast.* 4.500 see S. Hinds, *LCM* 9 (1984), 79.

<sup>80</sup> The question of whether 'Hyginus' is the Palatine librarian C. Iulius Hyginus, Ovid's close friend (Suet. *Gram.* 20), has an obvious bearing on the relation between the *Fasti* and the *Astronomica*, but is still unresolved. Syme rejects the association (p. 217 n. 3), accepting the earlier judgements now summarised in Le Boeuffe's edition of *Astron.* p. xxxiii. Le Boeuffe himself is much more sympathetic to identifying the two (pp. xxxi–xxxviii). I continue to treat *Fasti* and *Astron.* as independently constructed sources for their common material.

<sup>81</sup> On the use of *recusatio* see Wimmel, pp. 162ff. and especially 187ff. in connection with Hor. *Carm.* 1.6, an important parallel example.

direction (715–18), mainly so that they may be recounted at length in the sixth book (481ff.), also under the god's direction (484 'dirige vatis opus'), where they have more relevance to the narrative of Ino, whom Ovid possibly identified with Matuta by mistake.<sup>82</sup> The poet's arrangement of the Bacchic narratives in the two books is itself subject to the god's favour and direction.

If then, as I think we can, we allow that the invoked god has some control over the selection and disposition of the narrative he is invoked to favour, the earlier Bacchus narrative in the third book (459–516) provides an instructive contrast with both 713–90 and 6.481–550. The abandoning of Ariadne by Bacchus is not prefaced by any invocation. The poet launches immediately into the narrative ('protinus aspicias...' 459) and seems to proceed *suo Marte*. The reason for the omission is not hard to find. Bacchus could scarcely be invoked to inspire and authenticate the massive verbal assault which Ariadne now launches (471–506) against his integrity and fidelity, and which Ovid introduces here as a variation on the more familiar lament over the loss of Theseus.<sup>83</sup> Nor is this latter comparison in Bacchus' favour:

'Thesea culpabas fallacemque ipse vocabas:  
iudicio peccas turpius ipse tuo.' (487–8)

The abuse she hurls at her forsaker evidently does not need the assurance of his divine favour to confirm the genuineness of her situation. The absence of such an invocation here contrasts not only with the later invocatory hymns to Bacchus at 713ff. and 6.481ff. but also with the immediate antecedent of the *Fasti* 3 story at *Ars amatoria* 1.527–64 in which Ovid serves as Bacchus' own *vates* (525). In a very real sense *Fasti* 3.459–516 is a direct continuation of the earlier *Ars* tale of Bacchus' rescue of Ariadne on Naxos, a version which lacks an extended lament by Ariadne in order to concentrate on her delivery by Bacchus.<sup>84</sup> But the connection between the two narratives does not extend to the invocation of divine favour. For the *Ars* 1 narrative, which presents Bacchus the deliverer in such a favourable light, is a natural consequence of the god's favour and inspiration to his own poet (525–6), while the *Fasti* 3 narrative of his desertion gains in point and intensity from the poet's dependence on no influence outside his own resources. To make the god himself a party to the narrative of his desertion would create an untypically clumsy situation, since Bacchus could hardly be assigned a plausible excuse and Ariadne's powerful invective would take on a bizarre dimension. The poet's silence is all the more effective.

(v) Ceres: 4.417–620

The case of Bacchus helps to show how the presence or absence of an invocation in a major scene may be a matter of considered poetic policy with possible implications for the interpretation of an episode. The invocation-device introduces a new dramatic component into a scene, where the presence (or telling absence) of quasi-divine inspiration can supply a controlling influence over the content, style and even the 'sincerity' of a section. An important test-case here would be the Ceres narrative

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Frazer on 6.481 and the references given by Bömer on 6.475.

<sup>83</sup> Catullus 64.132–201 is an obvious source for much of the venom which Ariadne is here of course pouring out for the second time. Like Virgil (*Aen.* 4.305–330), Ovid avoids direct competition with Catullus by varying the situation in which the Catullan speech is exploited. Even in *Heroides* 10 there is no extended speech for Ariadne on the shore of Naxos.

<sup>84</sup> This point is made by A. S. Hollis in his introductory note to the section (*Ars am.* 1 [Oxford, 1977], pp. 121–2).

(4.417–620), where the invocation-device is not used. This suppression is in itself odd, since one would have expected a major narrative episode to be preceded by an appropriate invocation and divine response of the kind we have seen exemplified elsewhere. The games of Ceres are, however, held to be self-explanatory ('non est opus indice causae' 393), and the details of the ensuing story are confirmed not by supernatural inspiration but by an appeal to the literate reader's memory:

'plura recognosces, pauca docendus eris'. (418)

As Merkel and Hinds<sup>85</sup> have seen, this line looks back to the version of the Persephone story in *Met.* 5.341–661 and recalls the earlier narrative here.<sup>86</sup> The two versions are related at a number of levels, and I suggest the reason for the suppression of the invocation-device in *Fasti* 4 to be that the parallel account in *Met.* 5 comes from the authoritative mouth of the Muse Calliope (337–40) and is victorious in the competition (663ff.). As we have seen, such sources expect to carry conviction, and to have a second invocation and a second quasi-divinely inspired narrative of the same episode in *Fasti* 4 might irreverently suggest that the authoritative utterances of the Muse had failed to convince!<sup>87</sup> The appeal to the reader's literary recollections at 418 ('plura recognosces') is, as I take it, an incidental tribute to Calliope's powers of persuasion, so any further invocation would be out of place. Hinds sees in Calliope's endorsement of the *Met.* 5 version an 'epic' significance which distinguishes the narrative technique of *Met.* from that of *Fasti*,<sup>88</sup> but I think it unnecessary to see a residual 'generic' distinction in the absence of an invoked inspiration for *Fasti* 4. The more interesting comparison, which Hinds nowhere makes, is between the treatment of Calliope's two competitive entries, in *Met.* 5 and in *Fasti* 5.79ff. where she reappears to sing of a subject of undoubted 'epic' significance, Evander's journey to Italy, but does not repeat her earlier success in *Met.* 5.<sup>89</sup>

## VI. CONCLUSION

The vatic *persona* is both a role which instructs and a mask which disguises. Appearing to transmit the authoritative instructions of the gods, the *vates* disguises behind the mask of obsequious submission to the power which inspires him the true extent of his personal involvement in the selection, organisation and manipulation of

<sup>85</sup> Hinds, p. 40, following Merkel's observation in the preface of his edition of *Fasti* (Berlin, 1841), p. cclvi. Porte (p. 165) also spots the link but makes little of it.

<sup>86</sup> Hinds sees *Fasti* and *Met.* as 'contemporaneous' poems (p. 40; cf. 10–11: 'They are in some sense what most Ovidian scholars have held them to be, simultaneous compositions'), and he must therefore take 4.418 as a 'cross-reference' (p. 40) to *Met.* and not as a backward glance. But *recognosces* would be an odd verb for a cross-reference. Ovid's three uses of the verb (cf. also *Met.* 11.61–2: 'quae loca viderat ante/ cuncta recognoscit' and *Fasti* 1.7: 'sacra recognosces annalibus eruta *prisca*') all refer to the recollection of what was known in the past (*OLD* s.v. 3). Nor is Hinds strictly consistent: on p. 127 there is a clear implication that the *Fasti* version is taken as having been composed *before* that in *Met.* 5.

<sup>87</sup> This verdict depends, of course, on the priority of the *Met.* 5 version.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. especially pp. 125ff. 'It is hard not to see some significance in the fact that *Met.* 5.341ff... is represented as being composed and sung by the Muse who, later to be confirmed more explicitly as the Muse of epic, is already something of a special patron of elevated poetry' (p. 126).

<sup>89</sup> Cf. section IV above. Hinds' astonishing omission of reference to Calliope's speech in the *certamen Musarum* in *Fasti* 5 undermines his attempt to base a generic distinction on her presence in *Met.* 5. Hinds' distinction would, I think, rest more securely on developing the contrast between the Muse's victory in *Met.* 5 (663ff.) and her failure to repeat the success in *Fasti* 5 (cf. 107–10).

the material he transmits. The use of such a *persona* in *Fasti* produces some astonishingly piquant results. Not only does Ovid present, for example, Romulus, Mars, Mercury and Bacchus in a way which hardly promotes their *gloria* among discriminating readers, but these gods are themselves invoked to inspire, authenticate (and to that extent to be held responsible for) their presentation in this way!

Such manipulative skill in exploiting a common vatic motif is more readily appreciated because the poet's *persona* in *Fasti* regularly uses conventional devices of presentation from the aetiological and didactic traditions to support its credibility. There is, as one might expect, shared borrowing with *Georgics*:<sup>90</sup> the appeal to ancestral wisdom, which Virgil embodies in the figure of the old Cilician (*G.* 4. 125–46), is a device of which generalised and specific instances occur in Callimachus.<sup>91</sup> A. W. Bulloch explains how the device 'relieves the narrator of any supposed moral responsibility' and 'provides the source-credentials' for both the narrative and the narrator.<sup>92</sup> Ovid, as we have seen, cunningly uses the invocation device for these purposes with witty consequences, but also varies his practice by using examples which parallel Virgil's old Cilician to reinforce the credibility of some of his *causae*: 'old men' are the source of his story for the origin of the goddess Muta (*Fast.* 2.583–4)<sup>93</sup> – presumably the goddess herself is appropriately disabled from giving any practical help if invoked; a *flamen* helps with the origins of the *Robigo* cult (4.905), and similar circumstantial detail is provided for the meeting with the old woman who explains the origin of the Curtian Lake (6.395–416).<sup>94</sup> Even a general ancestral tradition can be used to provide 'source-credentials' in this way (2.304, 6.417) and, as with the invocation device, to lift the burden of responsibility from the shoulders of the poet-narrator.

Yet the ultimate effect even of such conventional devices can be given a novel turn when they are combined with Ovid's ludic technique. Two examples will illustrate this.

The first shows how an ambivalent tone can be introduced into simple instruction. At the end of his account of the *Salii* Ovid has some words of warning for would-be brides (3.393–8): because the *dies religiosi* of early March are given over to warlike celebrations,

'habent parvae commoda magna morae'; (394)

so the wedding should be put off, since

'pugna est aliena maritis'. (395)

<sup>90</sup> The account of Aristaeus, Cyrene and Proteus (*G.* 4.315–558) is used for *Fast.* 1.363–80, but some of the material may be older than either version (see Bömer *ad loc.*). For the comparison of both poems to a ship see n. 30 above.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Call. *h.* 5.55–6, where Bulloch's note provides more parallels and discussion of the generalised instances. Mr A. S. Hollis draws my attention to the specific instance of Callimachus' questioning of Theogenes (fr. 178 Pf., 20ff.). The device shows Ovid and Virgil writing expansively within a tradition and is not merely, as Frécaut has it, 'piquer la curiosité du lecteur' (p. 160 on *Fast.* 2.304).

<sup>92</sup> On Call. *h.* 5.55–6, comparing fr. 612 Pf. ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν αἰΐδω.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Bömer i.29; in his note on 2.584 he fails to see the common functions of these 'persönliche Erkundigungen' in Ovid and those which Bulloch lists in Hellenistic poetry. The formulaic element in such attributions is illustrated by Hollis on *Met.* 8.720–1.

<sup>94</sup> Wilkinson (pp. 247–9) takes these examples of the 'personal approach' very literally, as does Bömer on 4.905, though the same approach in his note on 6.396 gets him into serious topographical difficulties. Ovid's encounters need not be autobiographical in any historical sense, and would hardly be worth recording in a poem like *Fasti* if they were; it is naive to believe that Ovid actually went about researching *Fasti* in the way they suggest. They are rather evidence of his working within a literary tradition. S. D'Elia (*Ovidio* [Naples, 1959], pp. 360–70) more sensibly suggests a comparison with the colloquial tone of Horace's *Satires* and *Epistles* 1.

The advice recalls the subversive *vates* of *Ars amatoria*:

‘postque brevem rescribere moram: mora semper amantes  
incitat, exiguum si modo tempus habet’, (Ars am. 3.473–4)

where ‘parva mora’ is a ploy used in lovers’ games to intensify passion.<sup>95</sup> Similarly, the incompatibility suggested in *Fast.* 3.395 is really between fighting and sexual activity, as the parallel warning which Briseis delivers to Achilles reveals more explicitly:

‘pugna nocet, citharae noxque Venusque iuvant’. (Heroid. 3.116)<sup>96</sup>

These are hardly the contexts whose recollection in *Fast.* 3.393–8 will give confidence to the intending Roman bride, though the instruction seems to carry the weight of the didactic poet’s authority.

In the second example Ovid exaggerates the familiar didactic device of presenting multiple instances of causation in a succession of alternative clauses. It is well known that this device does not reflect a genuine scholarly predicament but is a traditional mark of the didactic poet’s pose as a seemingly open-minded and judicious investigator.<sup>97</sup> The poet’s *persona* in *Fasti* would naturally wish to exploit this association, and the poem in fact contains an above-average number of examples.<sup>98</sup> Even so, the use of the device at 4.783–806, where we are offered seven possible *causae* for the fire custom of the *Parilia*, goes beyond other examples in the number and range of the possibilities embraced by the various alternatives. Too much weight should not be attached to the individual *causae* here, except to the extent that their diversity suggests the range of the didactic poet’s intellectual mastery and reinforces his status. A significant supporting pointer in this direction is the ‘doubting’ expression ‘vix equidem credo’ at 793. T. C. W. Stinton<sup>99</sup> has shown how ‘such expressions serve to enhance the objective tone proper to this kind of [i.e. didactic] poetry’, notably in *Fasti* where ‘they occur more often... than in [Ovid’s] other poems’. The use of such an expression thus complements the effect of the context of multiple causation in which it is embedded. Yet, if the poet’s interest is concentrated not so much on the *causae* themselves as on enhancing the poet’s status by presenting them in this way, it can legitimately be asked why Ovid should expatiate at such length *here*. The answer must, I think, be the fact that the *Parilia* on 21st April coincides with the traditional day of Rome’s foundation.<sup>100</sup> The last of Ovid’s seven

<sup>95</sup> Cf. *Ars am.* 2.357 ‘sed mora tuta brevis’, 653–4, 3.752, *Rem.* 83, 92 and R. Pichon, *Index verborum amatoriorum* (Hildesheim, 1966), p. 207 s.v. *mora*. The ‘longa mora’ is by contrast a dangerous omen, cf. *Heroid.* 1.73–4.

<sup>96</sup> The rejection of *arma* by the amatory poet (*Am.* 1.1.1) is recalled here. It matters little to my argument if ‘voxque’ is read here with Burman, since ‘Venusque’ is sufficiently explicit. Palmer (1898, *ad loc.*) needlessly impugns the authenticity of the couplet.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. *DRN* 5.517–25 and 1241–9, *Georg.* 1.84–93, *Aetna* 102–17 and 282–305, all of which are considerably more elaborate than the hellenistic equivalent we find at Call. *h.* 1.6–7, or at Arat. *Phaen.* 98–9.

<sup>98</sup> E.g. *Fast.* 3.771–90, 839–48, 6.569–636. More examples can be found in Wilkinson, p. 265. If, as Wilkinson suggests, the reason is that ‘[Ovid] did not think deeply about what he read’, why should he bother to record multiple *causae* at all, when one would – as was the case in most instances – suffice? The parallels in other didactic poems suggest that Ovid knew clearly the effect he wanted to achieve, though he may also have been influenced by the appearance of simple alternative explanations for a festival (the *Agonalia*) in the *Fasti Praenestini* (see Wallace-Hadrill, pp. 225–6 and 229).

<sup>99</sup> ‘...Si credere dignum est’: Some Expressions of Disbelief in Euripides and Others’, *PCPS* 22 (1976), 60–89, especially pp. 63–5 which quote examples from *Fasti*. ‘Vix equidem credo’ occurs also at 2.203 (where cf. Bömer) and 551. See Frécaut, pp. 162–4.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Cic. *Div.* 2.98 with Pease *ad loc.* (p. 518); Plut. *Rom.* 12.1.

possible *causae* for the Parilian fire links the two events (801–6), and the expansion of the multiple-causation device is a sign that the poet's didactic powers will here be stretched to their fullest extent for that day.<sup>101</sup> The content of the *causae* themselves, which may or may not be of Ovidian invention, is of little consequence.<sup>102</sup> Ovid is manipulating a device of didactic exposition to authenticate and reinforce his status as *vates* at a critical moment in his narrative, just before he invokes Romulus to assist him (808) and sings the praises of Rome and the Augustan house (857–62). The multiple-causation device is thus an additional puff of air blown into the bubble of poetic self-projection which bursts with the comic *dénouement* of the Romulus invocation.<sup>103</sup>

The authority of the poet as instructor and narrator rests on two foundations. One of these is, as we have seen, the inspiration of a god, goddess, Muse or quasi-divinity such as Romulus or Egeria; the other is the literary tradition, in which the way the poet presents his material shows him to have a point of reference in his didactic predecessors. For a poet to establish his authority and credibility by these means is one thing; using them to achieve what we have seen to be unexpectedly paradoxical effects is another. The orderly, predictable sequence of the year's *tempora* turns out to be accompanied by *causae* whose treatment is anything but easily anticipated and predictable in its effects. Unlike the *tempora*, the accompanying *causae* are fully subject to the independent, disorientating intelligence of the '*vates operosus dierum*'.

Llanelli

BYRON HARRIES

<sup>101</sup> It is just possible that an alternative reading at 807 '*ipse locus causas vati facit*', which Frazer actually prints but which Landi-Castiglioni, Bömer and Alton-Wormell-Courtney all rightly reject in favour of '*ipse locum casus vati facit*', is in fact a witty scribal gloss on the section 783–806 and emphasises this stretching of the poet's didactic powers: 'the point reached in the month [i.e. the conjunction of the *Parilia* and Rome's birthday] itself provides [an abundance of] *causae* for the poet!'

<sup>102</sup> Beard seems to me to make too much of the content of individual *causae* here, e.g. on p. 10 where she misses the literary significance of the section for the poet's authoritative *persona* and so fails to see how, fortified by his special gifts and status, the poet may treat the topic of Rome's birthday from an unconventional angle. Porte (p. 30) is equally insensitive here.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. section III, p. 171 above.