

## OVID AND THE FABII: *FASTI* 2.193–474

### 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

The occasional role played in Ovidian poetry by noble Roman families and their contemporary representatives has naturally received much less attention than the recurring and often ambivalent presence of Augustus.<sup>2</sup> A case of special interest is that of the Fabii, whose antiquity and military prowess are accorded special attention in the *Fasti*, while the penultimate consul the *gens* produced was a correspondent of Ovid's from Pontus. I propose to examine the ways in which the fortunes of this house become a complex theme in *Fasti* 2, partly to justify a sophisticated reading of the poem and partly to encourage a similar approach to the theme of the *princeps* himself.

A link with Augustus is easy to establish, since the latter, acting out his neo-Romulean part,<sup>3</sup> restored the rites of the Lupercalia.<sup>4</sup> As legendary followers of Remus, the Fabii received their family name from the joint founder of this festival,

<sup>1</sup> A section of this paper was read to the Laurence Seminar on the *Fasti* held at the Cambridge Classics Faculty in May 1990. I am grateful to Professor M. D. Reeve for the invitation to attend and to the participants for their interest and suggestions. It is a special pleasure to acknowledge the criticisms offered by A. Barchiesi, I. Du Quesnay, E. Fantham, P. Hardie, C. Newlands, S. Oakley and N. Wright. None of these scholars should be assumed to be endorsing this final version in any way. References are to *Fasti* 2 unless the context obviously suggests otherwise. I cite the *Fasti* from the Teubner edition of Alton, Wormell and Courtney (Leipzig, 1978), and use the editor's name only in citing the commentaries of F. Bömer (Heidelberg, 1957–8), J. G. Frazer (London, 1929) and G. E. Gierig (Leipzig, 1812). The following books and articles are usually referred to by the author's name: E. Fantham, 'Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*: Sources and Motivation', *HSCP* 87 (1983), 185–216; E. Lefèvre, 'Die Schlacht am Cremera in Ovids *Fasten* 2, 195–242', *RhM* 123 (1980), 152–62; R. J. Littlewood, 'Ovid's Lupercalia (*Fasti* 2.267–452): a Study in the Artistry of the *Fasti*', *Latomus* 34 (1975), 1060–72; R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1–5* (Oxford, 1965); J.-Cl. Richard, 'Historiographie et Histoire: L'Expédition des *Fabii* à la Crémère', *Latomus* 47 (1988), 526–53 = Richard<sup>1</sup>; J.-Cl. Richard, 'Ovide et le *Dies Cremerensis*', *RPh* 62 (1988), 217–25 = Richard<sup>2</sup>; R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978) = Syme *HO*; R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford, 1986) = Syme *AA*; G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*<sup>2</sup> (Munich, 1912).

<sup>2</sup> The indispensable study remains Syme *HO*, but ch. VIII 'Paullus Fabius Maximus' can now be supplemented by ch. XXVIII of *AA*. Although these chapters range widely over Ovidian references to the Fabii, it is odd to find Syme ignoring entirely Ovid's celebration of the family's most famous heroic action and of their most distinguished religious privileges, both centrally located in *Fasti* 2.

<sup>3</sup> The literary typology fulfilled the emperor's own wishes. There has been a proposal in 27 to have Octavian entitled Romulus 'quasi et ipsum conditorem urbis' (Suet. *Aug.* 7.2, cf. 95 for the conveniently supportive omen), and Dio (53.16.7) attributes the move to the keen wish (ἐπεθύμει ἰσχυρώς) of Octavian himself. 'Augustus' was adopted instead in case the parallels with Romulus' kingship and fratricide were pressed too far, a scruple which failed to inhibit contemporary poets (see G. Binder, *Aeneas und Augustus: Interpretationen zum 8 Buch der Aeneis* [Meisenheim, 1971], pp. 150ff. and now F. Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic* [Cambridge, 1989], p. 97 with bibliography in note 41). When Ovid later contrasted the 'achievements' of Romulus and Augustus (*Fast.* 2.133–44), we should remember that he was exposing the ironies implicit in a comparison once endorsed by the emperor himself.

<sup>4</sup> Suet. *Aug.* 31.4, *Res G.* 10.4. A. W. J. Holleman ('Ovid and the Lupercalia', *Historia* 22 [1973], 260–8) develops an 'anti-Augustan' thesis out of interpreting Ovidian burlesque as an attack on Augustus' ritual restoration. Fantham (in her notes 27 and 79) is right to criticize this approach.

as the Quinctilii did from Romulus, and the twins gave these two *gentes* joint authority over the sacred rites,<sup>5</sup> though in more recent times other families were also represented.<sup>6</sup> Ovid's account of the Lupercalia (*Fast.* 2.267–474) highlights the early involvement of the Fabii as its centre-piece (365–80) and gives a privileged place to their first victory (377–8) over the rival *gens*. This central story seems at first to be the only section of Ovid's narrative explicitly linking the festival with the Fabii, but I shall show that the fortunes of this *gens* are alluded to less directly – for the implications of the allusions are none too favourable – in the stories of Faunus and of the exposure of the twins, which fall on either side of the Fabian centre-piece. Moreover, the significance of the Lupercalia as a celebration of the antiquity and distinction of the Fabii is enhanced by the account which Ovid places two days earlier of the family's most famous collective action.<sup>7</sup> The Cremera narrative on the Ides (193–242), commemorating the day on which virtually the whole male membership of the Fabian *gens* died fighting for Rome, does more than merely anticipate the celebration of this family which we find at the focal point of the much longer Lupercalia section which follows it. I shall argue that the Cremera narrative is far from being straightforwardly simple in its treatment of its subject, and that the conflicts and uncertainties we find there add a new dimension to our reading of the ensuing stories of the Lupercalia.

## 2. *The Cremera: Ovid's date*

The argument that the Cremera and Lupercalia narratives are mutually supportive and form a Fabian sequence must first come to terms with a long-standing problem. The circumstances in which Ovid's account of the Cremera has come to be placed two days before the Lupercalia have never been satisfactorily explained. In the *Fasti* Ovid generally follows traditional commemorative dates for events as accepted and recorded in the calendars (his astronomy is, of course, quite a different matter),<sup>8</sup> and that he should have behaved whimsically in the case of the most celebrated event in the history of a major and ancient *gens*, with whose chief contemporary representative he enjoyed a long-standing relationship, has always been a bit of a puzzle. A fresh look at this problem will clarify the structure of the second book.

It has long been recognized that Ovid's narrative at 195–242 is in the main compatible with Livy's (2.48–50) and that Livy must be the source from which a number of Ovid's details are derived. Recent studies have again confirmed that the additional information and alternative versions in Dionysius of Halicarnassus have next to no bearing on the Ovidian account.<sup>9</sup> Livy's narrative, by contrast, offers easily

<sup>5</sup> They were established as two colleges for the purpose. For the story cf. *Fast.* 2.365–80 (a concise version) and Wissowa 559. The ancient evidence is assembled (with much else) by Frazer (ii.328–41) and more briefly by Bömer on *Fast.* 2.375.

<sup>6</sup> The short-lived addition of a third college, the Iulii, in the mid-1st century (Suet. *Iul.* 76.1) may be connected with a crisis in the fortunes of the Fabii at that time which I discuss below. Certainly, the two original colleges survived to be recorded by Ps.-Aurelius *OGR* 22.1 ('utrumque nomen etiamnunc in sacris manet').

<sup>7</sup> Lack of a persuasive explanation of this connection is a weakness in the recent studies of Lefèvre and Richard<sup>2</sup>. See pp. 220–1 of the latter.

<sup>8</sup> An instance is the intervening fable of the Raven, Bowl and Snake at 243–6. Inaccurate though its astronomical position may be, it is not entirely irrelevant here, as I shall explain below. Ovid was as little concerned with precision in such matters as Lucan was, and for the same reason: our confidence in the poet's range and skill is enhanced by the inclusion of narratologically apposite myths from the wider cosmic framework.

<sup>9</sup> See most recently Richard<sup>1</sup>, 531 ('Il nous semble plus important que le récit d'Ovide doive beaucoup à celui de Tite-Live') with a summary of the Livian parallels familiar since Niebuhr

the best background for assessing Ovid's,<sup>10</sup> telling how in 479 three hundred and six men of the Fabian *gens* left Rome with attendants and an auxiliary force to set up a garrison on a small tributary of the Tiber called the Cremera, the intention being to fend off attacks from Veii. They held out for nearly two years, until the Veientes ambushed them and killed the lot. They died leaving only a single male heir at Rome, a small boy who ensured the continuation of the line. The consensus of ancient evidence is that this ambush took place on 18 July, a date which nearly a century later would also become the cursed *dies Alliensis*.<sup>11</sup> That Ovid alone unequivocally places the ambush on 13 February, contradicting the ancient local calendars, the chronology traditionally ascribed to Livy, and the unqualified testimony of Tacitus, has left his interpreters at a loss for persuasive explanations, especially as it has been held that Ovid follows Livy closely in other respects. Among the suggestions which have commended themselves to others have been that Ovid followed a private family calendar of the Fabii (otherwise unknown)<sup>12</sup> or that he placed the date of the ambush on the date of the original departure from Rome.<sup>13</sup> Now, to concern oneself with the precise date of an event of which nearly every other transmitted detail is very likely to be an elaborate fiction might seem a mindless exercise.<sup>14</sup> Much of the fictional detail, clearly reinforcing the propaganda value of the myth for the Fabian house, is derived – as has often been pointed out – from a self-evident comparison with the almost contemporary heroism of Thermopylae and the Roman reading of Herodotus,<sup>15</sup> and one must in any case expect discrepancies when writers of historical fiction try to consolidate early mythical family traditions in a unified national chronology. But Ovid is so emphatic about his chosen date – ‘*haec fuit illa dies*’ (195), and it will not do to follow Peter<sup>16</sup> who thought lines 195–242 a sketch for inclusion in a seventh book, later to be inserted in the second by that familiar ghost, the post-

and Mommsen. Richard provides a thorough analysis of the different versions in the historians, but admits that Ovid's version ‘*fasse figure de corps étranger dans l'ensemble de nos sources*’ (542).

<sup>10</sup> This brief summary gives preference for the moment to Livy's version in the case of disputed details. I shall presently discuss the discrepancies in Ovid. A full list of testimonia is given in Richard<sup>2</sup> 217 n. 1.

<sup>11</sup> So Livy explicitly at 6.1.11, though a summer date has also been assumed for the Book 2 narrative from 2.52.3 and also Tac. *Hist.* 2.91, Plut. *Camillus* 19.1–3 and the *Fasti Antiates CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 248, 322. On the parallel with the Allia see Richard<sup>2</sup> 217–18, 223–4.

<sup>12</sup> So Bömer (p. 96 on 195), whose Fabian ‘*Familientradition*’ would juxtapose the Cremera and the Lupercalia. This view is derived from Mommsen's later thesis (*Römische Forschungen* ii [Berlin, 1879], 255) and is now discredited if Richard<sup>1</sup> is right (541–2) in holding that one tradition of the Fabian *gens* was in fact precisely the opposite – that the Cremera and the Allia were synchronous and that the association between the two was transmitted to the family archives from the annalist Q. Fabius Pictor. See further Richard<sup>2</sup> 220–1.

<sup>13</sup> Mommsen's earlier thesis, which Frazer (ii.323) follows. For fuller background and references to earlier literature see Lefèvre 153–4, Richard<sup>1</sup> 542–3 and Richard<sup>2</sup> 219–20. Lefèvre himself argues for an exilic dating of the Cremera narrative (pp. 156–60) and thinks Ovid placed it in February simply to put it next to the Lupercalia. But if there were no basis for such a juxtaposition the point would lose much of its effect. See Richard<sup>2</sup> 222 for a critical assessment. The solution offered in Richard<sup>2</sup> 223–5 develops the connection between the Cremera and the Gallic attack of 390, but in a way which is unnecessarily speculative in view of what I believe can be made of the material in *Fasti* 2.

<sup>14</sup> See Ogilvie 359, echoing Dionysius' judgement *μύθοις γὰρ δὴ ταῦτά γε καὶ πλάσμασιν ἔοικε θεατρικοῖς* (*AR* 9.22.3). Richard is also judiciously sober here, unlike J. Heurgon, *The Rise of Rome to 264 B.C.* (London, 1973), 181.

<sup>15</sup> The two battles are already linked in Gellius (17.21.12–13). See Ogilvie 359–60 and Richard<sup>1</sup> 533–4.

<sup>16</sup> 3rd ed. (Leipzig, 1889), pt II, p. 28 on 195. See Richard<sup>2</sup> 219, n. 8.

Ovidian editor of revamped *Fasti. Hibernis* in 206 knocks that idea out immediately, and 206 is a line left intact by those critics between Gierig and Housman who excised or rearranged up to half a dozen lines in this section, for a revealing reason which I shall return to later.

A way out of the difficulty is suggested by Ogilvie's demonstration<sup>17</sup> that Livy's account of the battles at the Cremera draws on two sources which date the ambushing of the Fabii to different parts of the year 477. What Ogilvie showed was that while Livy in one place (6.1.11) explicitly dates the Cremera to 18 July and his actual narrative of the battle (2.49–50) is substantially as consistent with that date as with a winter one, he must nevertheless have used in 51.1–3 another source in which the preferred date of the battle will have been in about February.<sup>18</sup> It is not impossible that this source was Licinius Macer.<sup>19</sup> If this argument of Ogilvie's is right, then behind Ovid there lies an independent tradition which dated the battle to a different date from that followed in the parallel tradition, which happens to be the one we know better because it was Livy's declared preference. It therefore follows that there is conscious selectivity at work here, and that one element in the design which shapes the whole arrangement is that the reader should be alert to the significance attached to the Ovidian choice of date from at least two available options.

The decision to adopt the Cremera narrative as a prelude to the Lupercalia – each is introduced by the rites of Faunus (193–4, 267–8) – will further support a view I have argued for elsewhere,<sup>20</sup> that episodes in the *Fasti* are selected to be given emphasis, slanted treatment and position within their respective books in such a way that juxtaposed stories interact to stimulate and complicate the reader's response as no individual story might do if taken out of context. One way in which a reading of *Fasti* is enlarged by setting an interpretation of an individual episode in the context of its neighbours is what I want to illustrate here.

### 3. *Ovid and Livy*

If Ovid draws so many of his details of the Cremera from Livy, why does he not adopt Livy's preferred date? The debt to Livy is obvious enough and has been often documented,<sup>21</sup> except in one important respect. Certainly, the degree of factual

<sup>17</sup> See pp. 360–1. Ogilvie's insight is noted briefly by Richard<sup>1</sup> 543 and Richard<sup>2</sup> 220–1 but its significance is missed, so that Richard ends up having to argue for a prior tradition by a less convincing route.

<sup>18</sup> The discrepancies seem of a minor kind, as one would expect in a skilful stitching together of different sources, but Ogilvie's explanation of them seems quite convincing. The decisive evidence occurs in chapters 51–2. In 51.1 T. Menenius, consul for 477, is 'confestim missus' against the Etruscans who ambushed the Fabii. This suggests (says Ogilvie) that there was no consular army already prepared in the field, but that a 'scratch force' had to be contrived on an *ad hoc* basis. And the Etruscan advance into Latium after the Cremera 'precipitates a corn shortage' (51.2) 'because the Romans were prevented from harvesting their crops... [which] would have been harvested well before 18 July'. Livy is therefore here following a tradition which located the Cremera in the winter (the consular year of office began on 1 August), presumably on 13 February. At 52.3, however, Menenius already has his *stativa* in the field at the time of the Cremera, presumably now on the summer date of 18 July, and he remains consul until 31 July. Ogilvie therefore divides the two narrative sources at 51.4, the beginning of the next consular year.

<sup>19</sup> An idea 'hazarded' by Ogilvie (p. 361) with good supporting evidence. Cf. Richard<sup>1</sup> 541–2. We are elsewhere (Richard<sup>2</sup> 218, n. 5) promised a paper on Licinius and the Cremera, which I have not seen.

<sup>20</sup> 'Causation and the Authority of the Poet in Ovid's *Fasti*', *CQ* 38 (1989), 164–85.

<sup>21</sup> The basic details are in E. Sofer, *Livius als Quelle von Ovids Fasten* (Vienna, 1905–6), and see most recently Richard<sup>1</sup> 531.

reminiscence is remarkable considering the brevity of the passage, and includes the fatal omen attached to the right arch of the gate through which the Fabii marched out of Rome, the fact that any one of them was fit to be a general, and the survival of the one male child.<sup>22</sup> At least three of Ovid's lines seem to quote Livy directly,<sup>23</sup> while both narratives hurtle along at fever pitch, with phrases recalling epic, or at least epyllion, usage. Yet, as one might expect, Ovid is not consistent in this: from 199 to 207 it is the hexameters which carry the weight of this quasi-epic narrative, while the intervening pentameters introduce a discordant effect – the mock-religious tone of the interjection admonishing the reader at 202,<sup>24</sup> the quirky notion 'porta vacat culpa'<sup>25</sup> and the very Ovidian homoeoteleuton 'omen habet' in 202 and 204.<sup>26</sup> The apparent incongruity of the pentameters is a factor which contributed to the nineteenth century vogue for wholesale excision and rearrangement here to preserve stylistic unity and restore closer fidelity to Livy.<sup>27</sup> Yet the problem is one of generic disorientation; Ovid is repeatedly dismantling with one hand the elaborate and quasi-epic effects which his other hand is trying to construct. Then there is the curiously inflated description of the Cremera itself in 205–6, which is not drawn from Livy; an inept description, perhaps, for an insignificant little stream, until one notices the attention to detail here: there is the emphatic *rapacem* (205) associating the river with the Fabii in two ways. In the sense of 'swiftly dashing along with destructive potential'<sup>28</sup> it matches the speed of the Fabii's advance *celeri passu* (in the same line) and prepares for the simile of the destructive *torrens* in 219–22, while in the grim sense which associates *rapax* with death<sup>29</sup> the adjective anticipates the appalling slaughter of a whole *gens* on the river-bank. Also, the pentameter in part surely evokes the poetic symbolism of the Callimachean ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος with its πολλὰ | λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ... συρφετόν,<sup>30</sup> perhaps suggesting that Ovid's intermittently elevated tone here

<sup>22</sup> The familiar parallels are respectively:

Livy	Ovid, <i>Fasti</i>
2.49.8	2.201–4
2.49.4	2.199–200

(reading *exercitus* with Bentley),

2.50.11	2.239–42
---------	----------

In the first of these parallels Ovid and Livy are making the same point, and the objections of A. Elter, *Cremera und Porta Carmentalis* (Bonn, 1910) and the latest Teubner editors (p. xx) are unfounded.

<sup>23</sup> They are quoted by Frazer, ii.322 n. 2.

<sup>24</sup> For *quisquis* used in quasi-religious admonitions in verse see *Ibis* 98–9 with the parallels (especially Tibullus 2.1.1 and 2.2.2) given in La Penna's note *ad loc.*, but the usage is sometimes extended in even more solemn addresses to the gods themselves (Pease on *Aen.* 4.577). Ovidian practice and formulaic religious language can be followed up in Bömer's note on *Fast.* 6.731.

<sup>25</sup> The dilemma posed by the contrasts in this couplet was succinctly expressed by Gierig (p. 73): 'Parum mihi placet; neque tamen abesse potest, ne manca sit oratio.' In fact, the apparent oddness of 204 is explained by the line's reference to the *fama* of the fateful arch of the Carmentine Gate, contradicting its title 'Porta Scelerata' (Florus 1.6.2). Festus groups together several examples of the transference of this epithet in Roman place-names, 'Sceleratus Campus' and 'Sceleratus Vicus' along with the 'Scelerata Porta' (495–7, pp. 449–51 Lindsay).

<sup>26</sup> For repeated phrases of this kind cf. 'una dies' in 235–6 below and the far from exhaustive list given by Bömer on 202–4.

<sup>27</sup> A catalogue of such acts of editorial rashness in dealing with lines 196–204, as inconclusive as they were inappropriate, is given in Frazer's critical note on 203 (i.66–7). When we recognize that these lines exploit stylistic incongruity and are not merely a bland versification of Livy, the critical problems disappear.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. *OLD* s.v. 1b and *Ars am.* 1.388 (*ventus*), *DRN* 1.17 (*fluvios*), 3.650 (*falces*).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. *OLD* s.v. 2a and Tib. 1.3.65, Hor. *Carm.* 2.18.30. The theme of destruction in the swollen rivers of winter will return in connection with the Tiber (389–90) and will be discussed in a later section.

<sup>30</sup> *Hymn* 2.108–9.

matches its 'epic' subject-matter.<sup>31</sup> And Ovid telescopes the action in 195–240, events which in the historians are spread over about two years,<sup>32</sup> moulding the story to serve the dramatic unities of time (with the Lucretian 'una dies' 235–6) and place ('campus erat...' 215–16) and eliminating the attendants who in other versions accompany the Fabii.<sup>33</sup> Ovid is close to Livy in so many small details that these points of divergence are significant in alerting us to the special quality of Ovid's treatment.

The most interesting feature of Ovid's response to Livy, as yet unnoticed by commentators among the more superficial comparisons of phrase and detail, deserves special consideration since it will be seen to have special relevance to the placing of the Cremera narrative on the Ides of February. It has been widely accepted that both Livy and Ovid reproduce a tradition which is wholly enthusiastic about the Fabii and their achievement at the Cremera.<sup>34</sup> It is easy to see how this impression has gained currency. The military distinction of Quintus Fabius and the *eximia virtus* of the whole *gens* in earlier fighting against Veii is a theme of Livy's narrative from chapter 43 onwards; there is the virtuous self-denial of Marcus Fabius in 47, refusing a triumph because of the death of his fellow-consul, while in 48 Caeso Fabius tries to restore *concordia* with the plebs after the Coriolanus incident. He then offers to lift the burden of the Veientine war on to the shoulders of his own *gens*, inevitably to universal acclaim ('Fabios ad caelum laudibus ferunt' 49.1), though today we surely read as ironical, if not downright cynical, Livy's observation that with two families like this Rome's foreign and military problems would all be solved (49.2). The full irony of this comment becomes apparent in 50; it is usual to see the trapping and slaughter of the Fabii in both Livy and Ovid as the triumph of guile and *fraus* over simple native virtue.<sup>35</sup> But a reading of Livy which resists the pressure to be swept along in the current of uncritical adulation of the Fabian house yields another approach: the success of the Fabii after two years of fighting at the Cremera leads them to dangerous over-confidence, which the Veientes are only too pleased to spot: 'gaudere etiam multo successu Fabiis audaciam crescere' (50.3), and 'Fabii adeo contempserant hostem ut sua invicta arma neque loco neque tempore ullo crederent sustineri posse' (50.5). The Fabii fall into the Veientine trap *improvidi* (50.6) and the folly of this incautious headlong dash is admonished in Ovid's interjection 'quo ruitis?' (225), which ironically echoes the form of Virgil's dramatic address to the Fabii at *Aeneid* 6.845.<sup>36</sup> Their impetuosity is to be contrasted with the opposite

<sup>31</sup> The tension in the Cremera passage between the 'epic' subject and the elegiac medium is discussed briefly by A. Barchiesi, 'Voci e istanze narrative nelle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio', *Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi dei Testi Classici* 23 (1989), 55–97, p. 62.

<sup>32</sup> The fuller Greek tradition represented to us by Dionysius has a succession of battles spread over an even longer period (Richard<sup>1</sup> 527–30), while Ovid's compression skilfully heightens the tension.

<sup>33</sup> Ovid suppresses reference to the larger force in order to concentrate attention on the central role of the Fabii. That the 306 were not alone is clear from Livy 2.49.5, Diod. 11.53.6, Gellius 17.21.13 and Servius on *Aen.* 6.845, while the number of their *clientes* is given as 4000 in Dion. 9.15.3 and 5000 in Festus 496 (p. 450 Lindsay). (For discussion see Richard<sup>1</sup> 545ff.). Ovid cannot be trying to conceal anything. As we shall see, he has his reasons for making this an exclusive venture of the Fabii.

<sup>34</sup> Lefèvre supplies the most recent evidence for this attitude, believing that Ovid's version is a barely concealed eulogy of the Fabii designed to impress Paullus Fabius Maximus from exile.

<sup>35</sup> This view has some textual support; cf. Livy 2.50.3 in which the trap is a 'consilium... insidiis ferocem hostem captandi' with *Fast.* 2.213–14 and especially 226–7 'fraude perit virtus'. But it is only one side of the coin.

<sup>36</sup> 'Quo fessum rapitis, Fabii?' Like Ovid, Virgil also is about to introduce the character of Fabius Cunctator. I shall develop this parallel later.

strategy of the eventual successor to the only surviving heir of the Fabii, Quintus Fabius Maximus, in 241–2: it is rather by prudent cautious circumspection (*cunctando* 242) that Rome's enemies will be defeated.<sup>37</sup>

#### 4. *Ovid and the Fabian Myth*

Ovid, I believe, echoes implicitly the criticism of the incautious and fatal *audacia* of the Fabii which is more directly noted in Livy. But Ovidian comment is all the more effective for the allusive way it is delivered. The fighting Fabii are portrayed in three similes, of which the first comes at 209–10. Similes involving savage, wounded and roaring lions are not uncommon; Bömer lists a number of them,<sup>38</sup> but misses the closest parallel to the Ovidian simile here, Virgil's simile at *Aeneid* 9.339–42 of the 'impastus leo' which attacks the flocks in search of food.<sup>39</sup> Virgil is applying the simile to the slaughter of the Rutulians by Euryalus, and the comparison with the Fabii extends, of course, in both cases to the tragic outcome of the initial courageous enterprise: in the end no amount of heroism will save either the Fabii or Euryalus from falling victim to their enemies. The inescapable foreboding which hangs over Ovid's narrative following the ill-omened exit of the Fabii from the city (202, 204) is therefore intensified by the lion simile. For in recalling here the initial impact of Euryalus on the Rutulians, the lion simile applied to the first confident assault of the Fabii on their Etruscan enemies itself serves the function of a further omen of the catastrophic reversal to come. A repeated detail from the simile neatly highlights the reversal: in 210 the 'sparsi ... greges' are the unsuspecting Veientes about to be attacked by the bloodthirsty Fabii; but the 'rara armenta' of 217 have become the bait which will ensnare the Fabii in the fatal ambush.

The next simile is an omen with greater urgency (219–22): the gushing *torrens* flooding the cornfields, to which the Fabii are compared as they dash into the valley where the Etruscans already wait in ambush for them, is an allusion to the 'rapidus ... torrens' which 'sternit agros, sternit sata laeta boumque labores' at *Aeneid* 2.304–8.<sup>40</sup> Virgil evokes the first sounds of disaster heard from afar, and compares with the shepherd's alert perception of these sounds Aeneas' catching from the rooftop of his father's house the approaching sound of fighting which exposes the successful deception of the Trojans. Ovid effects another neat reversal here: while Virgil uses the *torrens* as a simile for the irresistible onrush of the conquering Greeks, Ovid uses the same simile for the onrush of the Fabii to their destruction. And the reversal extends to the consequences of the similes for the actors in the drama in each case: for Aeneas the 'rapidus ... torrens' does, as it were, reveal all – 'tum vero manifesta fides, Danaumque patescunt/insidiae' (2.309f.), but the Fabii are not anything like as alert to the dangers of their situation ('nec metus alter inest' 224). The parallel with Euryalus here is clear enough, a wild courage which throws caution to the winds and ignores all the warnings, while it is the reader who resembles Virgil's shepherd/Aeneas, accurately interpreting the distant literary echo in the Ovidian simile as an omen of disaster. In 225–6 Ovid offers the Fabii a blunt interpretation of

<sup>37</sup> Livy (2.50.11) does not have to specify Fabius' policy here, but '*saepe ... maximum futurum auxilium*' suggests a higher level of success than their ancestors at the Cremera enjoyed.

<sup>38</sup> There is a fuller list from Roman verse in *TLL* 7.2.1168.45ff.

<sup>39</sup> The most important feature of the parallel is the destruction of the flocks. Virgil intensifies the already sharp impact of a simile from the Homeric Doloneia (*Il.* 10.485–6; cf. also Sarpedon at 12.299–301 and the less dramatically forceful version at *Od.* 6.130–4).

<sup>40</sup> Bömer's list of parallels is here indiscriminating; the essential point had already been made (with other pertinent remarks) by Gierig (p. 74 n. 219).

the simile, explaining how, as in *Aeneid* 2, it is a warning of impending doom and of deception unmasked. 'Fraude perit virtus' follows inevitably in 227, as the forebodings which the reader senses from an alert perception of the Virgilian parallel are fulfilled.

The allusion in the third simile (231-4) to yet another simile in the *Aeneid* is fully recognized in modern commentaries. The Laurentine boar is the doomed Mezentius of *Aeneid* 10.707-18, still striking terror into his pursuers, though cornered and about to be fatally wounded. A similar fatalism characterizes the possible original of this simile in the *Iliad* (12.41-8), in which Hector is compared to a cornered boar or lion at which the still frightened hunters aim their spears. It is Hector's continuing courage, like the boar's, which will bring about his death:

τοῦ δ' οὐ ποτε κυδάλιμον κῆρ  
ταρβεί οὐδὲ φοβείται, ἀγνοροίη δέ μιν ἔκτα. (45-6)

One relevant point which has not been noticed in this connection is the significance for the Ovidian narrative of the death of Mezentius' son Lausus, killed by Aeneas just before the death of the father (815ff.). Here again Ovid adapts the Virgilian narrative to his purpose. With Mezentius' death his house dies with him,<sup>41</sup> as a single day would also carry the whole Fabian gens to its destruction (236) were it not for the extraordinarily fine thread by which it secures its survival.

The unrestrained *furor* of Euryalus, the irresistible advance of the Greek treachery at Troy, the savage instincts of the cornered Mezentius – the cumulative force of Ovid's allusion to the similes of the *Aeneid* suggests some considerable qualification of what has been seen as the unrestrained enthusiasm shown in the *Fasti* for the Fabii and their heroism at the Cremera. It is Ovid's way of suggesting the same incautious lack of self-restraint to which, as we have seen, Livy draws attention as a contributory factor to the house's almost total ruin. And Ovid ends his account of the battle on a note of tragic pathos. The complete destruction of the gens is emphasized both in the unusual number of words repeated in the couplet 235-6 and perhaps even more in the three words ('Fabios omnes perdidit') which occur only once. The repeated 'una dies' which encloses the couplet is a familiar motif used elsewhere in contexts of sudden and total destruction and is derived most obviously from Lucretius,<sup>42</sup> though consideration should be given to Ogilvie's suggestion that Livy's source for the motif in his account of the destruction of Alba Longa ('unaque hora...excidio ac ruinis dedit' 1.29.6) is Ennius' version of the same event in the second book of the *Annales*.<sup>43</sup> That the shadow of Ennius' epic hangs over the latter part of Ovid's Cremera narrative will be confirmed by the climactic reference in 242, but it is quite possibly already present in 235-6.

<sup>41</sup> For the significance of the relationship between Mezentius and his son in both life and death see R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*<sup>4</sup> (Stuttgart, 1957), pp. 213-15.

<sup>42</sup> See McKeown on *Am.* 1.15.24 (ii.408-9) for references and parallels, to which *Ex P.* 1.2.4 (referring to *Fast.* 2.235-6) and Prop. 3.11.70 (the destruction of Antony's forces at Actium) should be added.

<sup>43</sup> See Ogilvie 120. The suggestion is ignored in O. Skutsch's discussion of the possible parallels between Ennius and the Livy passage (*The Annals of Q. Ennius* [Oxford, 1985], pp. 279-80), though it is clear from *Ann.* fr. 258 Sk ('multa dies in bello conficit unus') that Ennius used the motif elsewhere. Gierig (p. 74, note on 235) thought that Livy's account of the destruction of Alba was very likely Ovid's source for the motif in *Fast.* 2.235-6, though it is equally possible that if Ennius was the source he was used directly. Skutsch's point (p. 279, note 9) '[Livy] probably knew [the *Annales*] by heart from his school days' would of course apply to Ovid too.



The story of the survival of one male child who ensured a posterity for the Fabian *gens* was thought by Dionysius (and no doubt many others) to be quite incredible,<sup>44</sup> and in introducing the story with 'credibile est' (238) Ovid shows something of that deferential irony with which the enlightened sceptic views the cherished traditions of the believer.<sup>45</sup> The explanation of divine interference in this case is apparently supplied by the reference to Hercules as the remote ancestor of the family (237), but, as we shall see, Ovid is here establishing another point which will connect the family's most glorious hour with their festival on the Ides. Historians and commentators are united in judging that no explanation can turn 237–42 into a credible sequence of events, and we are left asking why this suppositious incident, which Livy treated as a minor concluding detail, should have been accorded such significance in the Ovidian narrative.

Ovid's interest in the history of the Fabii should be viewed in the context of his continuing relationship with the *gens*. This relationship was eventually to produce the two intricate poetic epistles addressed to Paullus Fabius Maximus from Pontus (*Ex P.* 1.2, 3.3), which are introduced with a further reference to the Cremera and to the continuation of the *gens* by the narrowest of threads (1.2.3–4). The single survivor who, at *Fasti* 2.241, makes possible the birth of Q. Fabius Maximus and the frustrating of Hannibal by *cunctatio*, will also make possible at *Ex P.* 1.2.3 the birth of another Fabius Maximus, consul in 11 B.C. and a patron of Ovid's.<sup>46</sup> It is precisely this continuing interest in the fortune of the *gens* which confirms the continuing admonitory role of the poet at *Fasti* 2.237–42, where we find more than simply a 'happy outcome' to the tragic consequences of the family's recklessness at the Cremera; while the Cunctator's policy suggests that they profited from the lesson of their earlier defeat, something of the poet's previous scepticism regarding the capacity of the Fabii to give priority to securing their future and saving the *gens* from extinction also underlies the treatment of Fabius Maximus' birth. For Ovid and his aristocratic patron would have seen the story's relevance to a crisis which had twice overtaken the *gens* in the century and a half before the composition of the *Fasti*. At two periods during this time it appears that the Fabii faced virtual extinction, and survived the first crisis by a marital expedient and the second by what seems to have been a very slender thread indeed.

On both occasions the *gens* evidently failed to produce enough male members to maintain its status by competing for public office and military commands. On the first occasion the expedient of adoption was resorted to. In the middle of the second century a young member of the Aemilii, the son of the victor of Pydna and himself a veteran of the battle, was adopted into the Fabii as Q. Fabius Maximus Aemilianus, becoming consul in 145.<sup>47</sup> Help was also sought from the Servilii at about the same time. The son of Cn. Servilius Caepio, a consul of 169, was adopted as Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus, himself winning a consulship for 142.<sup>48</sup> Both adoptions were

<sup>44</sup> πράγμα οὐ μόνον ἀπίθανον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀδύνατον (*AR* 9.22.1). His supporting arguments seem irrefutable (*ibid.* 2–6), but there is of course no trace of such scepticism in Livy (2.50.11), unless 'satis convenit' may suggest a reluctance to endorse a received opinion which the author reports.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. the ironic eulogy of the astrologers in *Fasti* 1.295–310: 'credibile est illos pariter vitisque locisque | altius humanis exseruisse caput.' The expression 'credibile est' is noticeably Ovidian (see McKeown on *Am.* 1.11.11–12).

<sup>46</sup> For the parallel see Lefèvre 157, though my reading differs from his.

<sup>47</sup> *Kl. Pauly* s.v. 'Fabius' I, 33, Syme *HO* 136, *AA* 16, 104, 419.

<sup>48</sup> *Kl. Pauly* s.v. 39, Syme *HO* 136, *AA* 16, 419.

effected probably by Q. Fabius Maximus, praetor in 181 and grandson of the Cunctator, with a view to securing the future of the *gens* when extinction threatened.<sup>49</sup>

The policy was a temporary expedient and only a partial success, for the crisis which threatened the family in the following century seems to have been even worse. It looked as if the line of distinguished servants of the Republic would die with Q. Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus, consul in 121 and son of the adopted Aemilianus. 'The line of the great Cunctator was in danger of lapsing', writes Syme,<sup>50</sup> noting elsewhere the extraordinary fact that 'the Fabii are absent from the war against confederate Italy and from the ensuing civil dissensions... The next generation did not find it easy to recapture their "dignitas"'.<sup>51</sup> The problem arose partly because the line continued only through Allobrogicus' son, who was notoriously immoral, wasteful and dishonourable. Cicero described him as 'vita omnium perditorum ita similis ut esset facile deterimus' (*Tusc. Disp.* 1.81), and Valerius Maximus (3.5.2) attributed his wasting of the money 'quae Fabiae gentis splendori servire debebat' to 'nimia patris indulgentia' and records that the urban praetor had to intervene to save what was left of the family wealth by forbidding Allobrogicus the use of it.<sup>52</sup> The financial recklessness of the junior Allobrogicus must have compounded the family's problems, since it greatly impaired their eligibility for social alliances and public office, and they managed to revive their fortunes only by the slenderest of threads, staging a temporary recovery when Q. Fabius Maximus, great-grandson of the senior Allobrogicus, overcame the disgrace of his grandfather's reckless insolvency and attained the consulship in 45 after joining the Caesarians.<sup>53</sup>

Other ancient *gentes* suffered similar crises from time to time, but Ovid's personal relationship with Paullus Fabius Maximus, son of the consul of 45 and himself consul in 11, provided him with a special motive for taking an interest in a difficulty which had twice already nearly put an end to the Fabii's long record of distinguished political service. If it is preferable to suggest a literary source for Ovid's knowledge, we need look no further than the historical genealogy of the Fabii which T. Pomponius Atticus had compiled at the request of Paullus' father, noting 'quis a quo ortus quos honores quibusque temporibus cepisset'.<sup>54</sup> But personal intimacy between Ovid and Paullus makes such a hypothesis unnecessary. The essential point is that Ovid's familiarity with the more recent history of the Fabii enables us to see *Fasti* 2. 237–42 in a different perspective, since the emphasis given there to the survival of the *gens* by the slenderest of threads can now be seen to be establishing a pattern for future generations, when a new birth would again have to carry the family's hopes of recovery from disaster. Preservation of the seed of Hercules (237) was the motive which inspired the policy of adoption in the mid-second century; lines 239–40 could be applied as well to the consul of 45 in his childhood as to the infant ancestor of the Cunctator, while 241 could be as appropriately addressed to the senior Allobrogicus

<sup>49</sup> For this danger see Syme *HO* 136 'The Fabii were saved from extinction by the device of adoption from families in alliance or at social parity', *AA* 419 and *Kl. Pauly* ii.489.22ff. 'Die Maximi starben in 2 Jh. aus, wurden aber durch Adoptionen aus den Familien der Aemilii und Servilii fortgeführt.' <sup>50</sup> *HO* 135. For Allobrogicus see *Kl. Pauly* s.v. 'Fabius' I, 34.

<sup>51</sup> *AA* 419–20.

<sup>52</sup> For this procedure see most recently J. G. F. Powell, *Cicero, De Senectute* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 151.

<sup>53</sup> *Kl. Pauly* s.v. 32; he had been aedile in 57 and was to die during his consulship (Syme *HO* 135, *AA* 420). The genealogical table of the Fabii in Pauly-Wissowa is reproduced by Syme as table XXVII at the end of *AA*.

<sup>54</sup> *Nep. Att.* 18.3 (where 'pari modo' extends this description to all the lives listed). One wonders what line Atticus took on the date of the Cremera.

or (more pertinently) to Paullus Fabius himself. What we have here in other words is a statement of much wider application than is required by the immediate context, drawing attention to the fragility of the wealth and status enjoyed by the ancient *gentes* and of the process of their transmission, and to the divine intervention (cf. 238) which has alone ensured that transmission in repeated times of crisis. And as we saw earlier that Ovid uses the similes of the *Aeneid* to suggest that the crisis following the Cremera was due partly to the recklessness of the Fabii themselves, so we note that the most recent crisis to afflict the family began earlier in the century with recklessness of a different kind, but equally fateful in its consequences, the depraved extravagance of the junior Allobrogicus. Ovid's point has its moral force as well as its historical relevance.

It is particularly attractive to extend the application of 'Maxime' at 241 to refer to Paullus Fabius Maximus, Ovid's contemporary, as well as to the Cunctator. Not only was Paullus thought to preserve something of the character of Hercules (*Ex P.* 3.3.100, cf. *Fast.* 2.237) and to have in the consul of 45 a father to whom alone it fell to restore the *dignitas* of the *gens* after the reckless folly of the junior Allobrogicus (cf. *Fast.* 2.240), but there is also, as Syme explains, a special sense in which Paullus reproduced in a different context the strategy which made the Cunctator famous (cf. *ibid.* 242). Paullus' brother and sister are shadowy figures,<sup>55</sup> and it was through Ovid's patron that the line of the Fabii could be expected to continue into the next generation with sons who would attain the offices held by their ancestors. The choice of a wife was crucial in this connection, especially at a time when marriage to a relative of the princeps might be expected to secure rich dividends in the granting of favours and privileges, and Paullus here played a careful waiting game. As Syme succinctly puts it:

Fabius was born in 46 or 45. For a *nobilis* to be thirty, or close on thirty, without having acquired a wife, is abnormal if not scandalous. A parallel in this age is not easy to discover. Some may be tempted to surmise a distaste for women as well as for matrimony. A milder and more decorous explanation avails. Fabius chose, or consented, to wait until the heiress of the Marcii became nubile.<sup>56</sup>

The Marcia whom Paullus married is known from Ovid and other sources to have been a cousin of Augustus.<sup>57</sup> He had not waited in vain, but apparently did have to wait until about 15 B.C. He had already received a poem from Horace (*Carm.* 4.1), but it is more interesting to note that Ovid, whose third wife had long been an intimate member of Marcia's family circle (*Ex P.* 1.2.136–40), composed a poem for the wedding (*ibid.* 131).<sup>58</sup> Concluding a match with the daughter of a 'matertera Caesaris' (139) may well have been celebrated as a worthy outcome of a modern application of the strategy with which the name of the Fabii was indissolubly connected. Paullus, like his famous ancestor, secured the future by *cunctatio* (*Fast.* 2.242), heeding the warning of his ancestor's recklessness.

As we have seen, Ovid's account of the Cremera contains a strong admonitory element which qualifies the enthusiasm of the eulogy. If my view of the extended application of lines 237–42 is right, it is ironic that Paullus' applauded strategy for

<sup>55</sup> For Africanus see Syme *HO* 136 ('The record is sparse indeed'), and for Fabia *AA* 417. It is not known whether Africanus married (*ibid.*).

<sup>56</sup> *HO* 144; cf. *AA* 403, but there is no basis for the speculation that Fabius was already a widower when he married Marcia. Hor. *Carm.* 4.1 tells against the idea.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. *Fast.* 6.801–10 and *Ex P.* 1.2.137–40. Sources on Marcia's family background are collected by Bömer on 6.801 (the story is neatly summarized by Syme *AA* 403–4), but the Cypriot inscription recorded in Syme *HO* 137 should be added to Bömer's list.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Syme *AA* 413.

continuing the *fortuna* of his *gens* should have proved to be ultimately frustrated by the 'cynical depravity'<sup>59</sup> of the only surviving son of Paullus and Marcia. Paullus Fabius Persicus was to be the last of the Fabii to hold a consulship (A.D. 34); the *dignitas* of the ancient line, which had again and again been revived when on the point of extinction, finally died with a man whom Seneca reviled as one 'cuius osculum etiam impudici devitabant'.<sup>60</sup> Persicus had been born in 'about 1 B.C.', fractionally before the approximate date for beginning the composition of the *Fasti*.<sup>61</sup> It is tempting to see the two events as not unconnected, with Ovid acclaiming in the birth of a son to Paullus and Marcia the ultimate success of his patron's marriage strategy. If so, it was the poem's earlier oblique warnings about the frustrating of expectations and effort through the irresponsibility of successive generations which should have made the stronger impression. The Fabian *gens* never fully mastered the lesson of their collective experience.

If what emerges about the Fabii from Ovid's Cremera narrative is the suspicion that they lack the skills to ensure their long-term survival, a strongly contrasted idea is suggested by the line which forms a climax to that narrative, 'cui res cunctando restituenda foret' (242). This reference to the Cunctator recalls the manner of Virgil's address to the same family hero at *Aeneid* 6.845–6:

quo fessum rapitis, Fabii? tu Maximus ille es,  
unus qui nobis cunctando restituis rem.

Anchises' question in 845, a protest at being overwhelmed by the sheer scale and distinction of the family's achievements,<sup>62</sup> is ironically echoed in Ovid's question to the Fabii at *Fasti* 2.225 'quo ruitis, generosa domus?', where attention is centred on the reckless bravado of their latest exploit. The address to the Cunctator, 'tu Maximus...' (845), is reproduced in Ovid's 'tu, Maxime' in the same *sedes* at *Fasti* 2.241, but the most obvious echo is also the most significant: Ovid transforms into a pentameter (242) the sense, phraseology and (as far as metre allows) the spondaic rhythm of the hexameter which immortalizes the policy of the greatest of the Fabii.<sup>63</sup> Ennius' famous line, traceable through Macrobius to the twelfth book of the *Annales* (363 Sk.), was already proverbial<sup>64</sup> when Virgil used it so appropriately and with the minimum of alteration in the speech of a man who, though now dead, transmits through his spirit instruction and a vision of eternity to the living. The quotation thus relates Ennius to Virgil in the way in which the speech of which it forms a part relates Anchises to Aeneas.<sup>65</sup> And when Ovid in turn repeats the Ennian reference from its

<sup>59</sup> Syme *HO* 154.

<sup>60</sup> *Ben.* 4.30.2, quoted by Syme *ibid.* with other facts which I repeat in this paragraph; cf. *AA* 417. Adding to the irony is the apparent extinction of the Marcii with the generation of Paullus' wife (*HO* 145).

<sup>61</sup> The evidence for the date is fully analysed by F. Peeters, *Les Fastes d'Ovide: histoire du texte* (Brussels, 1939), pp. 19–31. Syme agrees, *HO* 146.

<sup>62</sup> Servius (ad loc.) paraphrases Anchises' question differently: 'cur me, o Fabii, fessum ad vestram trahitis narrationem?' Neither Norden nor Austin follows up this approach, in which Servius interprets the *narratio* as the long list of the 306 Fabii killed at the Cremera. The reference seems too particularized for the context, but it is tempting to think that Ovid may have seen the same possibility in Anchises' question when he echoed it in *Fasti* 2, and that it may have helped to cement the association in his mind between the Cremera and the Cunctator.

<sup>63</sup> He had already used Virgil's introductory *unus* to begin his previous pentameter (240).

<sup>64</sup> Evidently so from its occurrences in Cicero and Livy; see Otto *Sprichwörter*, s.v. *cunctari* (p. 101) and Skutsch ad loc. (pp. 529–31).

<sup>65</sup> For the wider influence of Ennius on Anchises' speech see P. R. Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 77–8 with further examples collected at the foot of p. 77.

new context in the *Aeneid* he demonstrates to the Fabii how the achievements of the poets enjoy a fame and continuity free from the accidents of erroneous judgement and interrupted family descent which regularly threaten the security of their line. Ennius and Virgil here provide the poetic means to elevate Ovid to a status which, in the *sphragis* of the *Metamorphoses*, forms the basis of his confident claim to an immortality transcending the ravages of war and time.<sup>66</sup> But at *Fasti* 2.242 Ovid manages to assert without explicit self-advertisement a claim to the same authority and destiny which his predecessors enjoy, securing a *fama* in which the Fabii will still share when their own efforts to preserve the family's *dignitas* finally fail.

### 5. *An astronomical fable (243–66)*

The Cremera narrative ends with the poet staking his claim to the future with a confidence which the Fabii, relying on a resurgence of ancestral *virtus* in each successive generation, could not rival. Between the Ides and the family festival of the Fabii on the Lupercalia comes an artfully contrived foil to them both, a fable in which the raven's lie is rewarded with a curse on its own posterity, so that as with the Fabii future generations will inherit characteristics determined by the behaviour of their ancestor.

The story of the unsuccessful deception practised on the raven by Apollo was familiar enough from the mythographers,<sup>67</sup> but the notion that the constellations of the Raven, Bowl and Snake all rise together, and all on 14 February, is another example of Ovidian astronomical fiction designed to justify locating the story at this point in the narrative.<sup>68</sup> Other characteristically subtle features also suggest authorial independence here. As sometimes in Hellenistic poetry, the brevity of Ovid's narrative (cf. 248) is at odds with the time-scale, in this case the 'tarda ... mora' (256) of the incidents treated, while the 'fatidicus ... deus' (262) speaks with an appropriate mastery of technique<sup>69</sup> which outclasses the raven's stumbling attempt at using 'ficta verba' (258) and reinforces the authority of the penalty he devises. Apollo's sentence, as on a previous occasion when he changed the raven's colour from white to black,<sup>70</sup> imposes a characteristic to be transmitted in perpetuity through the whole species. But this is a small matter when compared with the eternal record which the poet can offer and with which Ovid both begins (243–4) and ends (265–6) his story. For it is the poem which fixes the risings of these constellations on this date, and the poem which confirms their significance as 'antiqui monimenta perennia facti' (265).

<sup>66</sup> It has often been noted that a motif from Ennius (*Ep.* 18V) which Virgil takes up in the proem to the third *Georgic* (see R. Thomas on 3.9) makes its mark along with other influences on the epilogue to the *Metamorphoses* (see Bömer on 15.871ff.).

<sup>67</sup> To the identical list of mythographical sources in Frazer (ii.326 n. 7) and Bömer (on 243) add the version in the scholia on Aratus *Phaen.* 449 (p. 282 Martin).

<sup>68</sup> Ovid omits the Crab and the Lion, which Vitruvius (9.51) links to the three used in the fable. The correct risings (apparent and real) of these constellations are recorded by Frazer (ii. 327), but Ovid was as little concerned with precision in such matters. The intended effect is to make the poet's narrative strategy appear to receive support from an independent calendrical/celestial sequence, and astronomical accuracy is subordinated to literary advantage. It so happens that the next astronomical passage, the movement of the sun from Aquarius to Pisces (453–74), is accurate enough in its dating (Frazer, iii.390).

<sup>69</sup> Note, for example, the chiasmus in 250 and the contrasting word order in 264, and the double alliteration in 262.

<sup>70</sup> *Met.* 2.531–632, Call. *Hec.* fr. 74 Hollis, 15–20. On that first occasion, of course, the raven had tried telling Apollo the *truth*, when it detected Coronis committing adultery. For a wide familiarity with this second punishment as characteristic of ravens see the passages collected in Aristotle fr. 343 Rose.

Content is here taking on an attribute of its form, for the poem is famously a 'monumentum aere perennius'<sup>71</sup> in adding the dimension of immortality to the subject it treats. The mythological significance of the constellations, with their juxtaposition and synchronous risings recalling the 'antiquum factum' of the raven's deception, is immortalized in the *poem*, not in the sky, but their secure continuity offers a model for the future which the poem itself can expect to enjoy. Even if the Fabii were to become stars, as the Caesars did, their celestial immortality would be enhanced by the critical interpretation offered by the poet, as in the case of the 'sidera iuncta' here (266).

#### 6. *The Lupercalia* (267–474)

Ovid's ambivalent response to the legend of the Cremera is one result of his setting the battle in the wider context of Roman literary and family history. The same approach can be seen in the sequence of episodes collected for the Lupercalia, the most important of the *fésta domestica* of the Fabian *gens*, and this suggests that a broader strategy may be at work here. Ovid's treatment of the Fabii follows his superficially eulogistic treatment of Augustus on the Nones (119–32), which I have argued elsewhere is heavily qualified by its surrounding context.<sup>72</sup> Certainly, the ancient Fabii provide a fitting sequel to the Princeps himself, a *gens* claiming descent from Hercules and Evander (by a dubious conflation of quite distinct traditions),<sup>73</sup> and formed into a priestly college and named by Remus (they are contrasted with Romulus' inferior Quinctilii at 371–8) and thus joint perpetual guardians of the *sacra* of the Lupercalia. It is therefore no surprise to find that Evander, Hercules and Remus all feature in Ovid's account of the festival, and that it is in part through them that themes and critical approaches deriving from the Cremera narrative continue to find varied expression.

The connection between Remus and the Fabii is reserved for the central panel of the whole section (359–80), a panel whose significance for the poet is emphasized by the chariot metaphor in 360<sup>74</sup> and by his finally placing here the Roman *causa* for the nudity of the Luperci. But it is not any indigenous myth which is primarily being honoured here; for the climax of the story tells us of the victory of the Fabii under Remus over their rivals and explains their authority as joint superintendents of the festival (375–8). Ovid shows no awareness of the modern view<sup>75</sup> that such stories as this are transformed versions of earlier stories in which the protectors of the herds were themselves rustlers. On the contrary, the earlier distinction of the Fabian *gens* has a permanence and continuity of its own, stretching down to the rituals of the Augustan age ('forma manet facti' 379) and compensating by its 'memor fama' (380) for what we have seen to be the less dependable continuity of the family line itself.

The continuity theme is already a dominant feature of the opening section (269–302), which honours the crucial, transitional role of Evander in importing the

<sup>71</sup> For an Ovidian treatment of the motif from Hor. *Carm.* 3.30.1 see *Met.* 15.871ff. and *Tr.* 5.14.1ff.

<sup>72</sup> Art. cit. (n. 20), 166–7.

<sup>73</sup> For the way in which these traditions were conflated see F. Spaltenstein's note on Sil. *Pun.* 6.627, though his view that the conflation goes back no further than Silius should be treated with scepticism, despite the lack of literary evidence.

<sup>74</sup> See Bömer on 4.10 for some Ovidian parallels, and A. S. Hollis on *Ars* 1.39–40 for their Greek ancestry and further references. Their literary significance in the light of Callimachus' *Aetia* fr. 1 is discussed by W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (Wiesbaden, 1960), pp. 105–11.

<sup>75</sup> See most recently J. N. Bremmer (n. 88), p. 33. I have not seen Y. M. Duval, 'La victoire de Rémus à la course des Lupercales chez Ovide', *Caesarodunum* 7 (1972), 201–19.

cult of Pan/Faunus into Italy. The section begins in elevated style with an invocation of the Muses (269), whose favourable response can be immediately seen both in the selection of obscure Arcadian place-names versified in 273–6 as the ‘sacrorum... origo’ (269) and in the learned ‘testis eris/erit’ construction (273–4) which, as elsewhere,<sup>76</sup> is used to integrate the place-names into the narrative.<sup>77</sup> The elaborate descriptive technique here has for its subject ironically the unsophisticated world of Arcadian Pan, but the apparent disjunction between style and content is deceptive. Ovid’s interest is not in any supposed reconstruction of primitive rites but in their (alleged) uninterrupted transmission to the age of Augustus. Pan is imported into Italy by Evander (279) to ‘become’ Faunus, whose festival is still kept ‘prisco more’ (282).<sup>78</sup> Evander also supervises the first settlement on the site where Rome will grow (280; cf. *Aen.* 8.337ff.). Fidelity in the transmission of ritual and continuity in the *situs urbis* find their textual complement in a further poetic reminiscence. Mention of Faunus evokes at 291–300 a description of the pastoral world of Evander’s Arcadia, one which turns out to be a literary memory of the Saturnian Golden Age,<sup>79</sup> free (as such worlds were before the *Eclogues*) from both an aggressive *virtus* like that shown by the Fabii and a deceptive cunning to which their *virtus* falls victim (cf. 292 ‘artis adhuc experts’) – *virtus* and *fama* forming a combination which we observed at the Cremera, and which will shortly reappear in quite unexpected circumstances.

Everything would seem to be consolidating the idea of fidelity to an unbroken tradition. The nakedness of early peoples is reproduced by participants in the Lupercalia, who ‘referunt monimenta vetusti | moris et antiquas testificantur opes’ (301–2), with *opes* ironically suggesting the happy simplicity of the Golden Age. But this usage encapsulates the difference between the present passage and the emphasis which Janus’ speech in the first book lays on the *discontinuity* between the first age and its modern sequel. For Janus, *opes* are the subversive factor which corrupts primitive virtue (1.197, 211, 217), and early Rome was glorified as a *populus pauper* (1.198), from whose pious values the modern (Augustan) city has radically departed;<sup>80</sup> the city’s modern practices illustrate the extent to which ancient rites have been corrupted (1.221–2). The stress in the second book on the continuity of ritual practice within a framework of social change (cf. 301 ‘nunc quoque...’) must be considered in the light of the decisive rejection of continuity in Janus’ speech in the first.<sup>81</sup> The

<sup>76</sup> Cf. *Fast.* 3.707, 4.69, 6.765. A few non-Ovidian instances are listed by Littlewood (1975), 1061 n. 6, with some interesting observations on the tone of 269–76.

<sup>77</sup> Bömer on 273; see Fedeli on Prop. 3.15.11–12 (p. 478).

<sup>78</sup> See Bömer on *Fast.* 1.471, Eden on *Aen.* 8, p. 111 and Wissowa 208–10.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. the many parallels with Tib. 1.3.35–48, whose sources are discussed by K. F. Smith ad loc. (pp. 244–51) and by R. J. Ball, *Tibullus the Elegist* (Göttingen, 1983), pp. 54–6. In Tibullus and most similar instances description of the Saturnian Age introduces a *σχετλιασμός* against contemporary society (cf. Tib. 1.3.49 ‘nunc Iove sub domino...’), but uniquely at *Fast.* 2.301–2 ‘nunc quoque...’ introduces the *continuation* of the rites of the Saturnian Age in the present (cf. 289).

<sup>80</sup> This contrast in the connotation of *opes* recurs early in the third book. At 3.50 *opes* refers to the glittering incentive which induced Amulius to kill Numitor, while at 56 the more restricted reference is suggested by the oxymoron in the second half of the line ‘nec taceam vestras, Faustule pauper, opes’.

<sup>81</sup> The problem of reconciling a *σχετλιασμός* against the corrupting influence of *opes* with an asserted continuity in primitive ritualistic observance at Rome arises in a slightly different form in Evander’s meeting with Aeneas and the *περίηγησις* in *Aen.* 8, but the parallels with Evander’s Saturnian Age (8.314–32) are sufficiently strong to confirm the association. For the *σχετλιασμός* cf. 8.327, 348, 364; for continuity see the Lupercal (342–4), Argiletum (345–6) and the presence of Jupiter (353), not to mention the wider setting of the festival of Hercules (see Eden on 102 for its contemporary relevance).

reader's experience of the poem encourages a sceptical attitude to the αἴτιον offered at 299–302, and we are not surprised to find Ovid quickly moving on to offer a quite different explanation.

Since the Lupercalia had long been associated with fertility ritual,<sup>82</sup> we would expect the theme of fertility, which I suggested in section 4 had a special relevance to the family history of the Fabii, to assert itself in Ovid's treatment of the festival. As we shall see, the comic narrative of Faunus and Hercules (303–58) centres around a fertility rite; a different emphasis is given to the same theme in the sentimental, pathetic narrative of the twins and the wolf, where the fertility of the Vestal Silvia is symbolically continued in the Ruminal fig-tree (411–12) and the 'lupa feta' (413). But the significant section in this connection is 423–52, the αἴτιον for the use by the Luperci of strips of goat-skin to strike women. No episode in the Lupercalia sequence is designed to illustrate so clearly the effect of divine intervention in securing a continuity in the race or family when all human effort is frustrated. What had been the case after the Cremera in the more restricted area of the Fabian gens is now presented as an imminent threat of ἀνὰδρῆα in Roman society as a whole. The failure of religious observance and magic (425–6), and even of the brute force which Romulus organised against the Sabine women (431–4), to ensure future generations of Romans is overcome by the direct intervention of Juno (440), just as the same crisis (arising for a different reason) was subsequently resolved for the Fabii only by the goodwill of the gods (237–8). The mysterious religiosity of the ecphrasis of the wood (435–6)<sup>83</sup> and the studied imprecision with which the goddess's priestly interpreter is delineated (443–4) both intensify the melodramatic atmosphere of awesome mystification and dependence upon divine favour. The transition in this case from supplication (438) to revelation (440) to interpretation (445–6) and to actual fulfilment (447–50) is smooth enough to serve well the story's purpose of illustrating continuity in ritual practice and the poet's role in organising myth and its loosely attendant rituals into a single narrative entity. If the resulting sequence here seems a little facile, it is partly because the same poet has placed this story to follow a far more desperate and perilous instance of divine intervention, one which suggests (like the aftermath of the Cremera) that few things in fact run as smoothly as traditional rituals might lead one to expect.

The narrative of the birth and exposure of Romulus and Remus at 381–422 follows immediately after the victory of the Fabii under Remus over the cattle-rustlers.<sup>84</sup> The remarkable survival of the twin founders of the city parallels the earlier extraordinarily slender thread by which a single child from the Fabian gens survived the Cremera to ensure the continuity and expansion of his own house and of Rome itself (239–42).

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Servius auct. on *Aen.* 8.343 (ii.250 T–H), Wissowa 210 with references collected in note 3, and the discussion in Ogilvie 51–2.

<sup>83</sup> A similar effect is achieved with the woods at 2.165f. and 6.411ff.; cf. also *Met.* 3.175ff. and the standard example at *Am.* 3.1.1. At *Fast.* 2.449 the religious significance of the *lucus* is emphasized by deriving Juno's title *Lucina* from it, a unique departure from standard opinion (Varro, Cicero, Plutarch; see Frazer ad loc. for references) which associated *Lucina* with *lux* (cf. also [Tib.] 3.4.13), an opinion which Ovid follows without question elsewhere in this poem (3.255, 6.39–40 and even 2.450).

<sup>84</sup> If Ovid derived the story of the repulse of the rustlers (369–72) from a source which gave the etymology of *Lupercal* as *lupus/arcere* as Servius did (on *Aen.* 8.343), he suppressed the etymology to be able to accommodate without apparent contradiction the story of the wolf and the twins which he placed immediately after that of the rustlers. For the etymology see Wissowa 559 (with note 1), Frazer ii.337 and W. Warde Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People* (London, 1911), pp. 478–9, and for its possible connection with this episode see Bömer on 2.359.



In both cases the future of the city is at stake: the Fabian *puer impubes* will eventually enable Rome to be delivered from Hannibal (239, 242), while references to such symbols of civic life as the fora and the Circus Maximus (391–2) illustrate in the present context the city's debt to the rescue of the infants from the Tiber.<sup>85</sup> The future significance of Romulus (cf. 386) is confirmed by the precedent established in 389–90: as the drowning of the hero Tiberinus in the Albula gave a new name to the river, so Amulius' servants attempt to drown Romulus in the very part of the Tiber where the city named after him will rise (391–4).<sup>86</sup> The turbulence of the Tiber ('hibernis forte tumbat aquis' 390), like that of the Cremera ('turbidus hibernis ille fluebat aquis' 206), already anticipates the dreadful events in which it will play a part, and in both cases a single day is enough to turn the potential for greatness into tragedy, or near-tragedy (cf. 235–6, 402–3). Here again it is Livy's version (1.4) which is the obvious source of virtually all Ovid's narrative detail from the overflowing of the Tiber to the Ruminal fig-tree. A major point in the Cremera narrative was the way the gods can intervene to avert the worst consequences of human recklessness and folly: as they save the Fabii from total extinction (237–8), so there is confidence they would do the same for the twins (399–400), whose eventual rescue by the she-wolf is quasi-miraculous (414). The hot-headed rashness of the Fabii is suggested partly in the rhetorical question 'quo ruitis?' (225), and at 386 Ovid addresses a similar (and familiar) rebuke 'quid facis?' to the reckless and irresponsible Amulius,<sup>87</sup> whose attempted killing of the twins may abort the future greatness of Rome (cf. 408).<sup>88</sup>

The delivery of the twins from their planned death in the river is presented as both extraordinary and as a sentimental narrative with openly emotional gestures.<sup>89</sup> But their ordeal and narrow escape are put into a new perspective by the final story of the Lupercal sequence (453–74), the rescue of Venus and Cupid from imminent danger on the banks of the Euphrates. The story itself has nothing to do with the Lupercalia,<sup>90</sup> except that the Roman festival occurs at about the same time the sun moves from the sign of Aquarius to that of the Great Fish, so that the fair weather which (under the influence of Aquarius) prevails for the festival of the Fabii now takes

<sup>85</sup> Ovid's emphasis can be judged from the space allotted to the different stages of the story. The version in this book devotes 36 of its 40 lines to the threat to the life of the twins and their rescue by the wolf, while the version in the third book (11–58) devotes only 6 of its 48 lines to the same episode.

<sup>86</sup> Romulean etymologies are naturally in evidence here; cf. 412 with Bömer's note and Ogilvie on Livy 1.4.5 for an explanation of the fiction.

<sup>87</sup> The exclamatory *quid facis?* is regularly used by Ovid as a reprimand. So Triptolemus' mother rebukes Ceres as she pulls her son from the fire in which the goddess has put him (4.556), Ariadne warns Bacchus against taking another lover (3.496), and Ovid himself tries to warn Juno against punishing the innocent Callisto (2.178). For further examples see *Met.* 3.641, 13.225, *Heroid.* 5.115, 8.7, *Am.* 2.5.29, 3.2.70, 71, *Ars am.* 3.735, *Ex P.* 4.3.29.

<sup>88</sup> Recent landmarks in discussing the wider issues raised by the story of the twins are G. Binder, *Die Aussetzung des Königskindes: Kyros und Romulus* (Meisenheim, 1964), T. J. Cornell, 'Aeneas and the Twins; the Development of the Roman Foundation Legend', *PCPS* 21 (1975), 1–32, and J. N. Bremmer, 'Romulus, Remus and the Foundation of Rome', in J. N. Bremmer and N. M. Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography*, *BICS* Suppl. 52 (London, 1987), pp. 25–48. The last two items record an extensive bibliography.

<sup>89</sup> *Mirum* (413) and *quis credit?* (414) have the effect of distancing the reader from the subject-matter, just as the weeping of the servants (388) and the screaming of the infants (405) suggest a warm human intimacy with it.

<sup>90</sup> For the background and a survey of the versions see Frazer ii.393–6. No version is like Ovid's in every respect. Ps.-Eratosthenes *Catast.* 38 (p. 43 Olivieri) offers a similar story about Derceto, while Hyginus *Astron.* 2.30 (72–3 Le Bœuffe) and Manilius 4.579–81 (800–1 are too brief to establish a context) both involve Venus in a temporary metamorphosis. As the evidence is so slight, it is impossible to gauge the extent of Ovid's independence.

a violent turn for the worse as the festival draws to its close (453–6). A myth which clearly derives from catasterismic compilations has found a place here because of its thematic relevance to the motifs which emerge from Ovid's treatment of the central festival of the month. As Venus and her son, fleeing the battle between Jupiter and Typhon, crouch for fear among the rushes of the Euphrates (463–6), there can be no doubt that a miraculous rescue is there for the asking. The cry for help, which emphatically draws attention to the divinity of the refugees (469–70), is immediately answered by the appearance of the rescue-vehicle in the form of the fish. 'Nec mora, prosiluit' (471) suddenly dissolves whatever sense of danger has been evoked in the description of 461–70.<sup>91</sup> The rescue of the Fabian house after the Cremera and of the future greatness of Rome from a raft on the Tiber generated a tension which is simply absent from the instantaneous delivery of the goddess of love 'comitata Cupidine parvo' (463) from the Euphrates. That these three rivers increase in size only intensifies the sense of anti-climax we feel at the ease with which the gods can effect their own escape.<sup>92</sup>

The episode of the twins and the wolf is balanced at 303–88 by a more piquant extension and adaptation of themes from the Cremera. The story of Faunus, Hercules and Omphale is often taken as a comic interlude, following Ovid's own reference to it as 'fabula plena ioci' (304). Its ancestry has been variously traced to satyr drama, New Comedy, Laberian mime, Plautus and Hellenistic wall painting.<sup>93</sup> Put into context, it forms a part of the Fabian sequence, though its subject is very different from the heroism of Hercules' descendants at the Cremera. The Fabii were entitled the 'gens Herculea' at 237,<sup>94</sup> and the story of the Cremera was prefaced at 193–4 with an anticipatory reference to the rites of Faunus, preparing us for the fact that when Faunus' story begins at 303 he too will fall victim to a simple deception while mounting his attack. At 307–8 Faunus turns his back on the 'montana numina' of Arcadian simplicity, tempted by what has been shown to be a Dionysiac luxuriousness and sumptuousness which are the very antithesis of the world he comes from.<sup>95</sup> He

<sup>91</sup> 'The intentions of deities are swiftly accomplished', McKeown on *Am.* 1.6.13 'nec mora, venit amor'. Bömer's list (on 471) of other instances of *nec mora* in the *Fasti* is indiscriminating. The one interesting parallel case of its phrase being followed by a sudden break at the third foot caesura is at 4.843 'nec mora, transiluit', where the abruptness of the expression suggests the sudden recklessness with which Remus (lacking the security conferred by divinity) leaps to his destruction.

<sup>92</sup> The difference between the earlier rescues and that of Venus and Cupid by the fish is all the clearer when we consider the parallel between the latter and Arion's rescue by the dolphin on 3 February (79–118). At first, Ovid may seem to be following Herodotus (1.24) in allowing the gods no interest in Arion's rescue until the story is complete: 'di pia facta vident' (117) introduces Jupiter at the last moment, to arrange the dolphin's translation to the heavens. Despite this, it would be misguided to see Arion as effecting his escape merely through his own mortal skill, for uniquely among narrators of this story Ovid presents the bard as virtually transforming himself into a second Apollo. This transformation is already foreshadowed at 91–2 and is completed in 105–10, and it is as the garlanded Phoebus (cf. 106) that Arion descends to the water to be rescued by the dolphin, which is sacred to the god. Like Venus', Arion's rescue has all the characteristics of a magic escape, with a suitable vehicle divinely conjured out of the water and subsequently rewarded with a future among the stars.

<sup>93</sup> See the full discussion of the background in Fantham 196–201. Littlewood makes the interesting point that Ovid's description of the grotto fulfils exactly Vitruvius' specifications for the satyric stage-set (1064, referring to *De Arch.* 5.6.9).

<sup>94</sup> Other ancient testimonia for this ancestry are collected by Bömer ad loc. See also Syme *HO* 147 n. 3.

<sup>95</sup> The *locus amoenus* is here the setting for a festival of Bacchus (329–30), whose cultic presence throughout the passage has been analysed by R. Turcan, 'A propos d'Ovide *Fasti* II 313–330: conditions préliminaires d'une initiation dionysiaque', *REL* 37 (1959), 195–203.

invades alien territory in another sense too, introducing sexual desire into the ritual observance of chastity on the vigil of Bacchus' festival,<sup>96</sup> and so relating this narrative to the general theme of fertility in connection with the Fabian house. Like the Fabii, he is drawn irresistibly to an opening in a wood (this time a grotto, as military scenery gives way to erotic, 313–14; cf. 215–16); as also in their case, Faunus' boldness gets the better of caution and discretion, with the rhetorical question 'quid non amor improbus audet?' (331) momentarily raising his fatal single-mindedness to the Didoesque level,<sup>97</sup> and this 'temerarius adulter' (335) will also, because of his uncontrollable *ardor* (308), become the victim of *fraus* ('mendaci decipiturque nota' 344, cf. 357–8). Here too allusions to the *Aeneid* have been detected, but their fuller significance in the light of the preceding Cremera section has not been sufficiently emphasized. Faunus continues the parallel with the Fabii by approaching Hercules and his companions as Euryalus in *Aeneid* 9 approaches the Rutulians 'somno vinoque solutos' (333),<sup>98</sup> and the similes of *Aeneid* 2 are exploited here again, as we saw they were in the Cremera narrative. At 341–2 Faunus recoils in horror, misinterpreting the evidence of the clothing and deceived by the disguise, and the accompanying simile is the same as that which reflects the horror of the Greek Androgeos in *Aeneid* 2 (379–82) on discovering that the apparent Greeks he has met are Trojans.<sup>99</sup> There is a grotesque appropriateness in using the same simile here to recall the Trojans' exchange of clothing and equipment with those of Androgeos and the Greeks (*Aen.* 2.389–95) which follows the fatal consequences of the mistaken identity. These further references to *Aeneid* 9 and 2 again serve to bring the Cremera to mind,<sup>100</sup> and as Faunus mounts the couch where Hercules lies, believing the occupant to be his desired Omphale, the reader is tempted to exclaim, as Ovid does to the Fabii (226), 'simplex nobilitas, perfida tela cave!'<sup>101</sup>

This *αἴτιον* for the Fabii's own festival of the Lupercalia is presented in a way which adds, in a very different context, an interesting dimension to my interpretation of Ovid's treatment of the Cremera. In choosing the possibility of placing the Cremera on the Ides of February Ovid designed that episode so as to establish the approach with which we would read the ensuing narrative of the Lupercalia.

Llanelli

BYRON HARRIES

<sup>96</sup> See Frazer on 2.329 (ii.364).

<sup>97</sup> Commentators compare 'improbe amor, quid non mortalia pectora cogis?' (*Aen.* 4.412).

<sup>98</sup> Cf. *Aen.* 9.236 and p. 156 above for an earlier allusion in the Cremera section to the Euryalus episode and to a simile in *Aeneid* 2.

<sup>99</sup> For brief references to this and other Virgilian parallels see Littlewood 1066–7 and Fantham 194–5.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. pp. 157 above.

<sup>101</sup> For the *double entendre* see J. N. Adams on 'weapons', *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London, 1982), pp. 19–20. It is tempting to see similarly hilarious possibilities in applying 'viso...angue' from Ovid's version of the *Aeneid* 2 simile to Faunus' discovery of Hercules in bed, but Adams (30–1) can find 'no certain example' of the phallic significance of the snake in Latin.