Transactions of the American Philological Association 134 (2004) 107–131

Of Kings, Crowns, and Boundary Stones: Cipus and the *hasta Romuli* in *Metamorphoses* 15*

RAYMOND MARKS
University of Missouri, Columbia

SUMMARY: This paper argues that Ovid uses the story of the *hasta Romuli* in *Met.* 15 to inform our reading of the Cipus story, to which it is juxtaposed. Specifically, the poet demonstrates that the challenge Cipus faces, namely, to avoid kingship, constitutes not a moral dilemma, as it is often understood, but an historical dilemma. That is, at issue for Ovid is not whether Cipus should or should not avoid being king, but whether he or anyone else at Rome can avoid the legacy of kingship that Romulus left to the city by his foundational act.

IN *METAMORPHOSES* 15.552–612 OVID RECOUNTS THREE STORIES, each introduced by a connection with Virbius' astonishment at Egeria's transformation into a spring: Virbius was amazed no differently than when (553 *haud aliter stupuit, quam cum*) an Etruscan ploughman saw Tages born out of a clod of earth, or as when (560–61 *utue ... cum*) Romulus saw his spear turn into a tree, or when (565 *aut ... cum*) Cipus saw that he had horns on his head.[1] The manifestly artificial manner in which the poet connects these three stories has led readers to view them as separable and, in particular, to dismiss the stories of Tages (552–59) and the *hasta Romuli* (560–64) as transitions that bear only a superficial resemblance to each other and to the longer Cipus episode that follows (565–621).[2] As a result, it is rarely explained how the stories are re-

* For their many helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper I would like to thank Dan Hooley, David Konstan, Joseph Pucci, Michael Putnam, and Dennis Trout. I am also very grateful to the anonymous readers of *TAPA* and Cynthia Damon, whose suggestions greatly improved the paper in its final stages.

[1] The text of *Metamorphoses* 15 is that of Hill. Translations are my own.

[2] Most scholars classify the tales of Tages and the *hasta Romuli* among linking stories, but consider Cipus' tale an episode in its own right: Miller 475, Schmidt 84–85, Galinsky 182–83, Frécaut 249, Bömer *ad* 15.552–621, Schmitzer 260. Differently, Otis 1970: 293 considers the stories of Egeria, Tages, Romulus, and Cipus as a collective link between the

lated to each other, and rarer still is the attempt to give a comprehensive interpretation of the group. Most surprising, perhaps, is that little has been done to elucidate the relationship between the stories of the *hasta Romuli* and Cipus, although political interpretations of Cipus' story are common and kingship is a clear point of contact between the two.[3]

That Ovid groups all three stories thematically as well as formally will become apparent in the course of my discussion. My more specific objective is to demonstrate how the second story, the one about the metamorphosis of Romulus' spear, informs our interpretation of the third, that concerning Cipus. I argue that the intimate relationship between kingship and Rome's foundation evoked through Romulus' story compels us to see Cipus' attempt to avoid kingship as a dilemma thrust upon him by Rome's past, by the legacy of Romulus' foundational act. This interpretation will lead to a reconsideration of Ovid's aims in recounting Cipus' story. All too often his story is read strictly as a morality tale: Cipus' refusal to be king of Rome testifies to his pious devotion to Republican values, and our task is simply to decide whether Ovid endorses those values or not. Yet what really interests our poet in this story, I contend, is neither the moral force of Cipus' actions nor the question of whether monarchy is a morally defensible form of government, but an historical truth exposed by his dilemma, that in a city such as Rome, which is founded by and thus owes her existence to a king, the prospect of kingship is ever present, maintaining a firm grasp on the collective consciousness of her citizens.

THE *HASTA ROMULI:* MYTHOLOGICAL CONTEXT

Ovid's version of the *hasta Romuli* story gives us only a small part of a much larger picture. He focuses exclusively on the metamorphosis itself, the spear's

stories of Hippolytus and Aesculapius. The artificiality and artlessness of these links are often stressed: Miller 475, Schmidt 84–85, Wilkinson 240, Frécaut 249.

[3] Most interpreters of the Cipus episode overlook Romulus' story completely. Galinsky 183, however, considers it briefly, suggesting that it anticipates the issue of kingship in Cipus' story: "The brief reference to the *hasta Romuli* (15.560–64) serves to recall the Romulus story of Book 14 and appropriately associates the first Roman *rex* with the king-in-spite-of-himself, Cipus." Schmitzer 261 argues that Romulus' and Cipus' stories are connected in that they both contain allusions to Augustus, but, in the end, denies to the former story the capacity to inform the latter any more deeply than it does in Galinsky's judgment: "... gibt Ovid der *hasta Romuli* die Funktion, auf das von Bezügen zu Augustus bestimmte Kolorit der Cipus-Sage vorauszudeuten." Fabre-Serris 168 sees the two stories as instructive examples for the emperor of how one should refuse "d'utiliser la divination pour fonder une autorité de type royale," but, to support this reading, must make the unlikely argument that Ovid considers Romulus a reluctant king. The suggestion that

transformation into a tree (560–64), and says nothing about the context or meaning of the event. From other ancient testimonia for the story—Plutarch *Romulus* 20.5–6, Arnobius *adversus Nationes* 4.3, Servius ad *Aen.* 3.46, pseudo-Lactantius Placidus *Narrationes fabularum Ovidianarum* 15.48—we can fill out that picture. These sources agree that Romulus' spear landed on the Palatine and turned into a tree. Plutarch and pseudo-Lactantius Placidus specify that the tree was a cornel. Plutarch and Servius report that Romulus threw the spear from the Aventine. Pseudo-Lactantius Placidus says that Romulus was pursuing a boar from the Aventine (*ex monte Auentino*) before he hit it on the Palatine (*in colle Palatino haeserit*). As Ovid and Arnobius do not contradict the detail of the Aventine—they do not indicate from where the spear was thrown—there is no reason to discount it.

The wider context of the event is more elusive, yet we do find clues that help us reconstruct it. Plutarch says that Romulus threw the spear "making a trial of himself" (πειρώμενος ... αὐτοῦ), Arnobius that in throwing the spear he "was superior to all in strength" (*cunctorum praestiterit uiribus*). These statements suggest that Romulus' cast was a sort of test or that he was engaged in a competition. But why should Romulus need to give proof of his superior strength, and with whom is he in competition? An answer can be derived from the context supplied by Servius: "For Romulus, after the augurium was taken, threw a spear from the Aventine to the Palatine, and this, when transfixed, sprouted leaves and produced a tree" (*nam Romulus, captato augurio, hastam de Auentino monte in Palatinum iecit: quae fixa fronduit et arborem fecit*). If the *augurium* referred to by Servius is the one that proved the legitimacy of Romulus' claims to kingship over against those of his brother Remus, as has been widely accepted by scholars,[4] Romulus is here staking a claim against Remus.

If the spear cast followed this *augurium*, it is reasonable to suppose that it took place shortly before Romulus' foundation of Rome on the Palatine, since his authority to found the city is intimately tied to the *augurium*. In fact, a remark by Arnobius suggests that this is the case: "Before these deeds, therefore, there never would have been gods, even if Romulus had not taken hold of the Palatine by the tossing of his spear" (*ante facta et haec ergo numquam fuerant numina et nisi Romulus tenuisset teli traiectione Palatium*). Arnobius must be referring here to Romulus' selection of the Palatine as the site on which

all three stories are unified through oriental motifs seems to me unlikely; see Dornseiff 269–70 with Bömer *ad* 15.565–621.

[4] For good reason: not only is it the defining and most celebrated *augurium* connected with Romulus, it is also the only one of which Servius appears to be aware. See Bayet 53 n. 1, Briquel 1980: 308, Piérart 108, Skutsch 1985: 222, Bruggisser 117–18, Magdelain 251, Fabre–Serris 167, Wheeler 2000: 112–13. Cf. Serv. ad *Aen.* 1.273, 6.777–78, 779.

he will found Rome.[5] The spear cast closely resembles similar gestures used to indicate a claim of possession to territory or property. We may compare the spear casts in informal declarations of war[6] or in the formal *indictio belli* of the *fetiales*,[7] and perhaps also the custom of fixing a *hasta* into the ground at auctions.[8] It is likely, therefore, that after taking the auspices that confirm his claims to kingship on the Aventine Romulus throws a spear that lands on the Palatine, turns into a cornel tree, and marks the place where he will found the city of Rome.

This reconstruction of the *hasta Romuli* story is consistent with the evidence handed down to us by all of our sources but one. Pseudo-Lactantius Placidus says that Romulus threw his spear when hunting a boar, a version that conflicts with his performance of augury in close connection with the event. While it is possible that pseudo-Lactantius' version underlies Ovid's brief account,[9] it is more likely that our poet is drawing on a version such as that reconstructed above, which connects the spear cast with Romulus' auspices. The critical detail here is the Aventine. In his *Annales* Ennius maintained that Romulus was on this hill for the *augurium* (Cic. *Div.* 1.107 = *Ann.* 72–91 Skutsch).[10] Sometime after Ennius, however, Romulus began to be associated so exclusively with the Palatine that it became a widely accepted belief that he

[5] So also Skutsch 1985: 222, Bruggisser 114–18, Magdelain 252. It is not clear to me, however, that Arnobius is relying on Varro for the Romulus story, as is assumed by Jocelyn 46–47, Skutsch 1985: 222, and Bruggisser 114. It is true that Arnobius cites Varro as his source for the etymology of *Luperca* (4.3 *Luperca, inquit, dea est auctore appellata Varrone*), but it is by no means certain that Varro is to be understood as his source for the etymologies of *Praestana* and *Panda* (or *Pantica*) that follow.

[6] For examples and discussion see Schwegler 395, Bayet 51–53, Jocelyn 47, Briquel 1980: 310, Piérart 110, Bruggisser 121, Magdelain 251, Fabre-Serris 167.

[7] The cornel tree is a particular connection: one part of the fetial rite consisted of the throwing of a spear made of cornel wood into enemy territory or its symbolic equivalent. Most scholars follow Bayet 75–76, who in his analysis of the magical properties of the cornel concludes that this rite carries with it a claim of possession even though that may be a "secondary" or "subordinate" feature of the event: Briquel 1980: 310–11, Jocelyn 47, Piérart 109–10, Bruggisser 116, Magdelain 251, Fabre-Serris 167. Watson 20–30 comes to a similar conclusion, but does so by focusing on parallels between the rite and the *legis actio per manus iniectionem*, according to which a creditor could bring a defaulting debtor before a magistrate.

[8] For this practice see Alföldi 3, 8–9.

[9] For traces in pseudo-Lactantius Placidus of learned commentary on the *Metamorphoses* that preserve older variants on which Ovid might have drawn see Otis 1936 and Tarrant.

[10] For a recent discussion of the passage see Wiseman 6–9.

took the auspices on that hill as well.[11] Since Romulus' station on the Aventine for the auspices is peculiar to Ennius, it has been plausibly argued that the version of the *hasta Romuli* myth that connects the spear cast with that event on that hill is of Ennian provenance.[12] If so, it is likely that Ovid would privilege this version over that reported by pseudo-Lactantius, since Ennius is a privileged source in the "Roman history" of *Metamorphoses* 14–15.[13]

THE *HASTA ROMULI:* NARRATIVE CONTEXT

If Romulus' *augurium* does constitute the mythological context for the *hasta Romuli* story, it helps account for this story's connection with those of Tages (552–59) and Cipus (565–621). Consider, first, the story of Tages. Ovid focuses on two aspects of that myth, the metamorphosis (553–56) and its aetiological significance (557–59). In so doing, he passes over details commonly found in other versions of the Tages myth, such as the prophet's death on the day of his birth or the recording of his teachings in books.[14] Ovid's treatment thus foregrounds two themes, divination and ploughing, the former by pointing to Tages' role as the founder of Etruscan divination (the aetiology), the latter by recounting in detail his birth from the earth as it is being ploughed (the metamorphosis).

These two themes are revisited in the third story of the group. After discovering that he has horns on his head Cipus makes an animal sacrifice to find out what they portend (571–76). An Etruscan *haruspex* (577 *Tyrrhenae gentis haruspex*) examines the entrails of the victim, looks up at Cipus' horns, and declares that he will become king should he be received into Rome (577–85). Ploughing comes later in the story, when the senate awards Cipus an honorarium of as much land as he can encircle with the plough in one day (616–19).[15]

[11] This is the reasoning of Skutsch 1968: 65. For *loci* relating to Romulus' station on the Palatine see Pease *ad* Cic. *Div.* 1.107 and Skutsch 1968: 81 n. 1.

[12] Schwegler 387–88 n. 4 considers it "wahrscheinlich" that Ennius placed Romulus on the Aventine to link the *augurium* to the spear cast. Piérart 110 suggests that it is possible because the gesture is "par essence épique." Skutsch 1985: 222 states that the spear cast "very probably" followed the *augurium* in the *Annales*; he is closely followed by Wheeler 2000: 112–13. Bayet 53, more conservatively, proposes that "la tradition qui nous est parvenue est très ancienne."

[13] For Ovid's use of Ennius, esp. in *Met.* 14–15, see Hofmann 223–26, Conte 57–60, Knox 69–72, Myers 159–62.

[14] For the Tages myth see esp. Cic. *Div.* 2.50, Schol. Bern. *ad* Luc. 1.636, Lyd. *de Ost.* 3, and Isid. *Etym.* 8.9.34–35 with Wood.

[15] Neither divination nor ploughing is reported by Valerius Maximus in his version of the Cipus myth (5.6.3), the only other to have come down to us from antiquity. The in-

The themes witnessed in the first and third stories are also, I argue, present in the second. If Ovid is using the version of the *hasta Romuli* story reconstructed earlier and thus places the metamorphosis of the spear after the *augurium* that confirmed Romulus' kingship and before his founding of Rome, then divination and ploughing are both at issue here. After all, it was widely known, and in fact mentioned by Ovid himself, that when taking the auspices Romulus availed himself of the practice of divination, augury specifically (*F.* 4.813–18, 5.151–52), and that when founding Rome he ploughed a furrow around the Palatine (*F.* 4.819, 825–26).[16] Admittedly, Ovid is asking a lot of his readers here, who must recall the context of the *hasta Romuli* story, draw out from it certain themes, and acknowledge its thematic coherence with the stories of Tages and Cipus. As obscure and inaccessible as the *hasta Romuli* story seems to us, however, there is no reason to suppose that it would have seemed so to Ovid's ancient readers. Moreover, the brevity of the account suggests that there is a story, or a part of the story, that is not being told here; Ovid expects his readers to fill in the gaps.[17]

It might be argued that Ovid's failure to mention the contextual details of the auspices and Rome's foundation indicates that they are irrelevant to his version of the myth and to the story's place within the group. Apart from the fact that it would be a strange coincidence that divination and ploughing are themes present in this story as well as in those of Tages and Cipus, there is another reason why the mythological context of the *hasta Romuli* story is

terpretation of the horns, however, is a necessary element in the story's plot, and even Valerius cannot do without this detail: *namque in capite eius subito ueluti cornua erepserunt, responsumque est regem eum fore, si in urbem reuertisset.* Even so, Ovid describes at length the process by which the message of the portent is divined, whereas Valerius simply reports its result (*responsum est*).

[16] For Romulus' use of augury also see Enn. *Ann.* 72–91 Sk. (= Cic. *Div.* 1.107), Liv. 1.6.3–7.3, D. H. 1.85.4–87.3, Plut. *Rom.* 9.4–10.2, D. S. 8.5–6. For Romulus' performance of foundation rites see D. H. 1.88.2, Plut. *Rom.* 11, Tac. *Ann.* 12.24.

[17] While the poet's methods may be learned and subtle, their application here is not wholly unexpected. The proximity of Egeria's metamorphosis, described in 547–51, is especially suggestive; for in *Fasti* 3.273–76 Ovid confesses to having drunk from her spring, there called *dea grata Camenis* (275), and to having done so often but with small draughts (274 *saepe, sed exiguis haustibus, inde bibi*), a claim that, as Hinds 119–20 observes, identifies him as a practitioner of Callimachean poetics. Given Ovid's approach in the following stories of Tages, Romulus, and Cipus, and their relatively obscure subject matter, Egeria's transformation into a spring is a fitting choice to initiate the sequence; it informs us how to read what follows, revealing a shift into a decidedly Callimachean mode as each story springs from Egeria's like the waters that flow from her source. For other examples of Ovid's Callimacheanism in *Met.* 15 see Knox 65–83.

relevant here. Before identifying that reason, however, we need to take a closer look at the following Cipus story.

CIPUS

Over the years Cipus' story has played an increasingly important role in discussions about Ovid's attitude toward kingship and, in particular, the principate.[18] There is a prevailing inclination to read it as a Republican morality tale with an anti-regal message. When there is disagreement, it generally centers on the political ends to which Ovid uses that message.[19] The morality tale approach accounts well for some elements of the myth. For one, Cipus' choice to live in exile rather than to subject Rome to his own kingship conforms to the well-known paradigm of the individual who patriotically sacrifices himself to preserve the Republic.[20] And the rejection of kingship by which he preserves the Republic parallels the foundation of the Republic through the expulsion of kings from the city. Some scholars, however, demur. Galinsky, for example, notes that Ovid pays little attention to Cipus' piety and suggests that this self-proclaimed anti-king does not even want to avoid kingship.[21] Barchiesi observes that Cipus' actions on behalf of the Republic may have decidedly imperialist consequences.[22]

A comparison with Valerius Maximus' version of the story (5.6.3) clarifies Ovid's aims. First, the poet shows relatively little interest in the political consequences of Cipus' self-imposed exile. Whereas Valerius relates that Cipus went into exile to avoid being king ("lest that happen, he imposed a voluntary and permanent exile on himself" *quod ne accideret, uoluntarium ac perpetuum sibimet indixit exilium*), Ovid merely says that Cipus was prohibited from entering the city (616 *muros intrare uetaris*). The poet's silence about whether Cipus did or did not go into exile[23] is the more notable because Cipus'

[18] The issue of kingship, the Republican context, allusions to Augustus, or, according to some, to Julius Caesar, all have led scholars to see in this episode some form of political commentary or, at least, political awareness: Marg 56, Galinsky 181–91, Fränkel 226 n. 104, Lundström 73–79, Porte 193–95, Schmitzer 262–72, Barchiesi 251–52, Fabre-Serris 166–69, Wheeler 2000: 128–30.

[19] Lundström and Schmitzer, for example, agree that Cipus is an idealized Republican figure, but Lundström 77–79 takes this as evidence of Ovid's anti-Augustanism (i.e., Cipus does what the *princeps* should have done, but did not) whereas Schmitzer 260–72 argues that Ovid identifies Cipus' attempt to preserve the Republic with Augustus' own attempt to restore it.

[20] Compare, for example, the stories of the praetor Aelius, Marcus Curtius, and the Decii Mures, discussed by Wiseman 109–10.

[21] Galinsky 183–85.

[22] Barchiesi 251–52.

[23] Noted by Galinsky 184.

exile must have been a standard part of the story and should constitute, one would think, its climax, i.e., the end of the threat of kingship and the preservation and continuation of the Republic at Rome. Second, absent from Ovid's account is the moralizing tone so prominent in Valerius. Although Cipus is himself committed to serving his *patria* (571–73) and to sparing it from his own kingship (586–89), the poet never openly praises or, for that matter, condemns him.[24] For Valerius, by contrast, it is precisely the moral lesson that deserves our attention: "... piety worthy to be preferred to the seven kings, as far as lasting fame goes" (*dignam pietatem quae, quod ad solidam gloriam attinet, septem regibus praeferatur*).[25]

What most distinguishes Ovid's account from Valerius', however, is that Ovid's Cipus must carry out an elaborate ruse to spare Rome from his own kingship, this despite the fact that the fate of the city is placed in his hands and he is clearly determined not to become its king. In Valerius, Cipus finds a simple solution to his dilemma: he goes into exile and avoids becoming king of Rome. In Ovid, the situation is more complicated: Cipus heads for Rome, calls together the people and senate outside the city, and, concealing his horns, tricks them into preventing the horned man, i.e., himself, from entering the city and thus from becoming king (590–602). Since Ovid's Cipus will become king not on entering the city (as with Valerius' *si in urbem reuertisset*) but on being received into it (15.584 *urbe receptus*), he needs to prevent himself from being welcomed at Rome. But there seems to be no reason why Ovid's Cipus could not go into exile, as does Valerius' Cipus, and avoid kingship in that manner. Moreover, by going to Rome as he does he runs the risk of being let in.

Before addressing the people Cipus hides his horns with laurel (591–92 *ante tamen pacali cornua lauro / uelat*). This ruse, along with his speech (594–602), is intended to deceive the Romans so that he may convince them, without knowing that he is the horned man, to prevent the horned man from entering the city and thus to avoid being ruled by a king. Yet we sense that Cipus' plan, despite his good intentions, could easily back-fire. At the beginning of the story Ovid says that Cipus was returning from a victorious campaign (569 *ut uictor domito ueniebat ab hoste*) when he noticed the horns.[26] This fact,

[24] Cf. Galinsky 184: "[Cipus'] piety is not even mentioned, let alone made the moral point of the story."

[25] Valerius' version is generally believed to be the more traditional of the two: Aust, Galinsky 184, Lundström 68, 112 n. 94. If so, Ovid's reluctance to highlight Cipus' *pietas* is all the more significant. But even if it is not—Valerius may have followed Ovid's version (so, Schmitzer 263 n. 67)—there is still no reason to assume that the poet considers, or has to consider, Cipus a praiseworthy example of self-sacrifice or anti-regal Republicanism.

[26] Note that according to Valerius Maximus Cipus was a general leaving the city (5.6.3 *praetori paludato portam egredienti*) when he saw the horns.

which may have seemed a superfluous detail at the time, turns out to be a crucial piece of information. By placing the laurel crown on his head, Cipus presents himself to the people as a *triumphator*,[27] but the *triumphator*'s entry—a vital part of the triumph ritual—would make him king.[28] In his attempt to avoid kingship, he (unwittingly?) takes steps toward becoming king.

Cipus' troubles do not end there, however. The populace reacts to him as if he were a king, as is shown by the Homeric allusion in Ovid's simile describing the scene (603–6, cf. *Il.* 2.142–49):[29]

> qualia succinctis, ubi trux insibilat eurus,
> murmura pinetis fiunt, aut qualia fluctus
> aequorei faciunt, siquis procul audiat illos,
> tale sonat populus.
>
> As the murmur which, when the fierce east wind hisses,
> arises from dense pine forests or as that which the waves
> of the sea make if anyone should hear them from afar,
> such was the noise the people made.

> ὣς φάτο, τοῖσι δὲ θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ὄρινε
> πᾶσι μετὰ πληθύν, ὅσοι οὐ βουλῆς ἐπάκουσαν·
> κινήθη δ' ἀγορὴ φὴ κύματα μακρὰ θαλάσσης,
> πόντου Ἰκαρίοιο, τὰ μέν τ' Εὖρός τε Νότος τε
> ὄρορ' ἐπαΐξας πατρὸς Διὸς ἐκ νεφελάων.
> ὡς δ' ὅτε κινήσῃ Ζέφυρος βαθὺ λήϊον ἐλθών,
> λάβρος ἐπαιγίζων, ἐπί τ' ἠμύει ἀσταχύεσσιν,
> ὣς τῶν πᾶσ' ἀγορὴ κινήθη ·
>
> So he spoke, and he aroused the hearts in the breasts
> of all throughout the crowd who did not perceive his design.
> The assembly was stirred like the long waves of the sea,
> of the Icarian sea, which the east and south winds,
> down from the clouds of father Zeus, bluster upon and raise up.

[27] So, Haupt et al. *ad* 15.591, Galinsky 188–90, Versnel 395–96, Lundström 76–77, Bömer *ad* 15.590–92, Santini 293–95, Schmitzer 267, Barchiesi 251–52. Wheeler 2000: 128 n. 96 observes that the role of *triumphator* for Cipus is also hinted at shortly before he dons the crown: "Cipus does not wish the Capitol to see him as *rex* (15.589, "*quam me uideant Capitolia regem*"), which would have been the final destination of the triumphal procession."

[28] See Versnel 163, 388. Cipus' status as *triumphator* itself identifies him as a sort of king; as Wheeler 2000: 129, following Versnel 396, points out, "in the Roman triumph, the *victor* was represented as a *rex*."

[29] Noted by Haupt et al. *ad* 15.603 and Bömer *ad* 15.603, who offers other possible models for the simile.

> As when the west wind comes and stirs up a deep crop,
> fiercely blustering upon it, and it bows down its ears of grain,
> so all their assembly was stirred.[30]

Homer's simile vividly renders the commotion of the Greek forces; in Ovid's the sounds of the wind-struck pines and the waves capture the confused and indignant murmur of the Romans (606–7 *per confusa frementis* / *uerba ... uulgi*). In Homer, however, the Greeks are responding to a speech delivered by Agamemnon, the paradigmatic scepter-bearing king; Ovid's allusion, therefore, should give us pause, since it introduces the unsettling prospect that this king and Cipus, the anti-king to whose speech the Romans respond, are comparable. And in fact if we look closely at the events leading up to the two similes, several parallels emerge between Agamemnon and Cipus.

At the beginning of *Iliad* 2 Zeus sends Hypnos to Agamemnon to tell him to continue with the war because the gods are no longer divided and will ensure a Greek victory. The god's purpose is to encourage the king to keep fighting so that the Greeks will suffer heavy losses and Achilles' return to battle will be necessitated (1–35). Agamemnon, who does not recognize the divine trick, calls together the Greek leaders and recounts to them his dream. He then says that he will call together the Greek forces and tell them that he has had a dream that advises him to give up the siege (36–71); this deception is intended to test the Greek troops, for he expects, and indeed wants, their leaders to dissuade them from abandoning Troy (72–75). Homer's simile (144–49) describes the Greeks' reaction to Agamemnon's speech (84–141). Turning to Cipus' story, we see that the simile of 603–6 is just one of many points of contact with the situation in *Iliad* 2. Cipus, like Agamemnon, receives a sign from the gods, i.e., his horns (565–85), calls together and addresses an audience whose fate is in some way affected by the sign, i.e., the Romans gathered outside the city walls, and in reporting the sign deceives his audience (590–602). His speech is then followed by the crowd's reaction, which is conveyed by the simile.

The presence of Homer's story behind Ovid's highlights the potential for failure in Cipus' ruse. For one, the allusions identify Cipus with a king, the

[30] Ovid's dependence on the Homeric simile is clear. The phrase *ubi trux insibilat eurus* is modeled after ὅτε κινήσῃ Ζέφυρος βαθὺ λήϊον ἐλθών, / λάβρος ἐπαιγίζων; Εὖρός is retained in *eurus*; *fluctus aequorei* corresponds to κύματα ... θαλάσσης; and the simile is applied to a crowd (*tale sonat populus*) just as in Homer (κινήθη δ' ἀγορὴ, ὣς τῶν πᾶσ' ἀγορὴ κινήθη). Our poet also modifies the model; he focuses not on movement (κινήθη, κινήσῃ, κινήθη) but on the sound caused by movement (*murmura*, *siquis procul audiat illos*, *tale sonat populus*), and pine forests (*pinetis*) replace ears of grain (ἀσταχύεσσιν).

very thing that he does not wish to become. Second, Agamemnon's speech is followed by a reversal. The Greeks at first obey Agamemnon and prepare to depart for home (149–54), but soon after are persuaded by other leaders, such as Odysseus and Nestor, to stay and fight (155–368). Of course, Agamemnon all along intended for the Greeks to stay, i.e., to do the opposite of what he had ordered, because his speech, as was noted above, was merely a ruse to test them. Although Cipus' intentions are quite different—he surely wants the Romans to do as he tells them, to refuse him, the horned man, entry into the city—the reversal in Agamemnon's story gives disquieting support to the possibility that Cipus' ruse will backfire. Finally, Agamemnon's tale pointedly informs the paradoxical force of Cipus' actions. By being disobeyed, Agamemnon, ironically, gets his wish; for he wanted the Greeks to be dissuaded from departing although he had previously ordered them to do so. What is more, this whole affair leads, in the end, to a reaffirmation of his status as king: to convince the Greeks to stay Odysseus reminds them of the oath of allegiance they swore to Agamemnon to see the war to its end (284–88), while Nestor advises Agamemnon not to relinquish his command over the forces (344–45). As for Cipus, Ovid sets up a similar paradox through his ruse: if the Romans should obey Cipus, he will not be king, but if they should disobey him, he will be.

The simile is not the only element of the crowd's reaction that resists the simple moral tale of Cipus' rejection of kingship. Something similar is seen in the people's struggle to come to terms with his identity. When someone from the crowd asks Cipus who the horned man is (607), he declares that it is he and reveals his horns (609–15):

> rursus ad hos Cipus "quem poscitis" inquit "habetis"
> et dempta capiti populo prohibente corona
> exhibuit gemino praesignia tempora cornu.
> demisere oculos omnes gemitumque dedere,
> atque illud meritis clarum (quis credere possit)
> inuiti uidere caput; nec honore carere
> ulterius passi festam imposuere coronam.
>
> In turn Cipus said to them, "you have the one you seek,"
> and he removed the crown from his head, as the people were protesting,
> and revealed his temples distinguished by twin horns.
> All dropped their gaze and let out a groan,
> and that head, deservedly famous, (who could believe it?)
> they were unwilling to behold and, not allowing it any longer
> to be without some sign of honor, they placed a festal crown on it.

We expect that the revelation will lead to a resolution to the crisis: the people, now knowing who the horned man is, can refuse him entry into the city, and the threat of kingship will be thwarted. Instead, the people's reaction to this news leaves us wondering whether they are really refusing Cipus anything or even whether they want to.

The most detailed analysis of this scene is that of Lundström. He argues that the people avert their gaze because they cannot bear to look at the horns, the mark of royalty, and that in so doing they make it clear that they do not want a king.[31] The principal advantage of this reading is that it explains Cipus' exile soon after; otherwise, the phrase *quoniam muros intrare uetaris* (616), which indicates that Cipus will not enter the city, and the awarding of the land honorarium (617–19), which looks ahead to his exile, seem to lack point or purpose. But we can make sense of these details even if we do not understand the people's reaction to be a rejection of Cipus' kingship as Lundström does. The passive verb *uetaris* leaves open the question of who has forbidden him entry, and even if we assume that it is the Roman people, it is not clear whether they do this because they want to or because they have been told to do so by Cipus. Indeed it could be said that Cipus has already forbidden himself.[32] As for the land honorarium, this is awarded by the senate, and there is no reason to assume that the senate and the people are in agreement over the prospect of Cipus' kingship.

In other respects, too, Ovid's account is so vague that we cannot accept Lundström's interpretation to the exclusion of others. One could interpret the people's refusal to look at the horns simply as a sign of their disbelief. It may indicate that they are ashamed of their former eagerness to punish the horned king (606–8) or that they do not want to accept the responsibility of having to refuse their victor entry into the city. It may even be that they do not want to have to reject the only man they would have welcomed as their king. We must ask, after all, why Cipus earlier had to trick the Romans into refusing him entry. Is this not a meaningless gesture if the people would never have been willing to accept a king?[33]

[31] Lundström 75.

[32] Cf. Galinsky 184: "Ovid leaves it entirely open whether Cipus himself or the *proceres* (15.616) insisted on this withdrawal."

[33] Doblhofer 90 and Bömer *ad* 15.594–95, 598–600 identify Cipus' ruse as a case of "Ichspaltung," but do not explain why he decides to employ it. Unlikely is the suggestion of Galinsky 186 that Cipus hides the horns because as symbols of his royal destiny they are a source of embarrassment for him. Cipus must have known that he would have to display his horns at some point. Furthermore, if he is so earnest about being rejected by the city, it would be to his advantage to show his horns from the beginning.

Lundström's interpretation (75) of the people's coronation of Cipus in 615 is also subject to question. He considers this gesture an extension of their refusal to look at the horns and thus of their unwillingness to be ruled by a king. It could also be argued, however, that the coronation has more to do with honoring Cipus as victor than with rejecting him as king: the phrase *illud meritis clarum ... caput* (613–14) suits well the context of his recent victory, referred to earlier in 569, *festam ... coronam* (615) appears to denote a victory crown,[34] and the people's earlier attempt to prevent Cipus from removing the crown (610 *populo prohibente*) could suggest that they crown him later in 615 simply to restore to him this deserved military honor.[35] Thus, rejecting Cipus, if that is what their attempt to recrown him entails, may not be the people's intention, but an accidental consequence of their actions.[36]

No less problematic is the senate's reaction to this news; they award Cipus a land honorarium (616–19) and commemorate him by having horns sculpted on the *porta Rauduscula*na (620–21). I will discuss the honorarium shortly. For the moment, it deserves to be noted that the adorning of the gate sends an ambiguous message. When the Romans founded a city, a furrow was ploughed to demarcate the circumference of the city, which was sacred and inviolable. Wherever there was to be a gate, however, the ploughshare was lifted, thus leaving that stretch of land unploughed; this was done to ensure that one could enter and leave the city without violating the sanctity of its walls.[37] A gate, then, is an ambiguous part of the city's boundaries. On the

[34] Cf. Ov. *Met.* 10.598 (*festa corona*), *Tr.* 3.1.43 (*festa* [sc. *laurus*]) with Luck ad loc., Sil. 12.641 (*festa lauro*). It is not certain that this crown is the same laurel crown that Cipus wore before, as is assumed by Galinsky 184, Lundström 75, and Santini 294. We do not even know whether it is made of laurel; so, Barchiesi 252.

[35] So, Bach *ad* 15.610: "Das Volk, theils aus ehrfurchtsvoller Liebe, theils aus Scheu vor einer schlimmen Vorbedeutung will nicht zulassen, daß der Sieger seinen verdienten Schmuck abnehme." Of course, one's interpretation of the people's objection to the crown's removal also depends on whether they understand that Cipus is referring to himself when he says *quem poscitis habetis* (609). Ovid is teasingly vague on this point.

[36] Cf. Galinsky 184: "Instead of exiling him, the people, while not tolerating that he openly show his regal insignia, nonetheless insist that he be not entirely without honor and then crown him again with the laurel wreath ... ."

[37] For ploughing and foundation rites see Festus 271 Lindsay, Serv. ad *Aen.* 1.12, 4.212, Aug. *Dialect.* 6.11, and Pomp. at *dig.* 50.16.239.6. For the practice of lifting the ploughshare see Cato *apud* Serv. ad *Aen.* 5.755 and *apud* Isid. *Orig.* 15.2.3–4, Var. *L.* 5.143, Plut. *Rom.* 11.3, *Mor.* 270F–71B. Although the boundaries of the *pomerium* and of Rome's first fortifications were not coextensive, the Romans usually made no distinction between the two (for evidence see Valeton). Hence, when Romulus ploughed the *sulcus primigenius*, he was believed to have defined both the *pomerium* and the boundary of the city walls;

one hand, it serves to mark the limits of the city just as the walls do; on the other, it offers the only permissible way for someone to enter. Oddly enough, by the end of the story, a story in which Cipus' principal goal is not to enter Rome and to preserve the integrity of her walls from kingship, we are left wondering whether the horns sculpted on the gate will serve as a warning to those who wish to rule Rome or an admission of the city's vulnerability to kingship, maybe even an invitation.

As we can see, avoiding kingship at Rome can be a complicated business even for someone who, like Cipus, is adamantly opposed to monarchy and yet is in a position to determine the city's destiny. If his story teaches us anything, it is not that kingship should or should not be avoided, but that kingship is difficult to avoid. This can be seen not only in Cipus' struggle to hide his identity but also in the events that unfold from his confession; indeed there, when the issue of kingship seems most likely to be resolved, we are led farther into uncertainty. The episode's ambiguous message leaves us with the distinct impression that even if Cipus does avoid becoming king, his achievement will do little to resolve the broader question of kingship and its place in Rome.

ROMULUS, CIPUS, AND KINGSHIP

It has been suggested that the Cipus myth grew out of a tradition of plebeian apologetics.[38] As the mythical ancestor of the Genucii he gives his descendants a pedigree to match those of their patrician counterparts. Moreover, his selfless act of patriotism might explain why it took so long for a plebeian *gens* such as the Genucii to achieve positions of power in the Roman government. Ovid, however, does not seem to be interested in celebrating Cipus' deeds (or, by extension, those of his descendants) and, further, shows no apparent sensitivity to the history of the struggles between patricians and plebeians. For him, rather, the story is a meditation on kingship and its abiding place in Rome; accordingly, Cipus' dilemma becomes, in his hands, a dilemma posed by Rome's regal past.

It is principally through the *hasta Romuli* story that Ovid conveys the regal legacy of Romulus' foundational act, as we shall see in a moment, but he lays the groundwork for it through his Roman history, beginning with a famously terse reference to Rome's foundation in Book 14 (774–75 *festisque Palilibus urbis / moenia conduntur*). Ovid passes over a great deal in this re-

so, Ov. *F.* 4.811–12, 819 (*qua moenia signet aratro*), 825 (*inde premens stiuam designat moenia sulco*).

[38] Wiseman 108–9. A Lucius Genucius was one of the first plebeians to be elected consul (362 B.C.); Lucius Sextius appears to have been the first (367 B.C.).

markable understatement, including that Romulus was the city's founder and that he was a king. These facts reveal themselves in short order (e.g., 14.837 *Romani regis*, 14.849 *Romanae conditor urbis*),[39] but his failure to mention them in connection with Rome's foundation suggests that he is uninterested in establishing some original, intimate relationship between the city and the institution of kingship. Yet even if Ovid passes over the cause or *aition* of this relationship, we cannot fail to comprehend that it will be, in the long run, a lasting effect of Romulus' foundational act. The city's history, as it unfolds from that event until Cipus' story in Book 15, is a regal history, spanning, with some digressions along the way, the reigns of Romulus and Numa (14.775–15.484). In fact, Ovid explicitly addresses the question of the continuity of kingship in Rome in the transition from Romulus to Numa, which he places prominently at the beginning of Book 15: "Meanwhile it is sought who may take up the weight of so great a responsibility and may succeed so great a king" (1–2 *quaeritur interea, quis tantae pondera molis / sustineat tantoque queat succedere regi*).

After Numa's death Rome's history continues with an account of Egeria's mourning for him (485–96); this story frames the tale of Virbius (497–546) and ends with her transformation into a spring (547–53). This transformation leads to the next chapter in Ovid's history of Rome, which, one expects, given the sequential chronology thus far, should comprise or at least touch on the reign of Rome's third king, Tullus Hostilius. The expectation is confounded, however, by a chronological sleight of hand; the historical narrative passes over the rest of the regal period and even the foundation of the Republic—instead, we are given the stories of Tages and the *hasta Romuli* (553–64)—then lands somewhere in the early Republic with the story of Cipus (565–621). The resultant juxtaposition is telling. It invites us to read Cipus' story in relation to Rome's regal past and to see, more specifically, his struggle to avoid kingship as an attempt to free himself and Rome from that past. It also raises, however, the prospect that Cipus may not or even cannot succeed in ending the legacy of kingship in Rome. He tries, but, given the regal pattern to this point in Ovid's Roman history and the ambiguous outcome of Cipus' actions in his story, one may plausibly ask whether he is not, in fact, the next king in line, the king who, we expected, would succeed Numa and Romulus.

The story of the *hasta Romuli* poses this question still more directly and pointedly and seems to have been juxtaposed to Cipus' for precisely this purpose. Romulus' appearance, after all, is curiously anachronistic; he died and

[39] Cf. 15.862–63 *genitorque Quirine / urbis.*

was made a god at the end of Book 14, and the historical narrative has since moved on to Numa and beyond.[40] His reintroduction to the narrative is, nevertheless, entirely appropriate at this point as it puts into bold relief the fact of kingship's historical place in Rome and thus critically informs our reading of the following story of Cipus, where this fact becomes a central issue.[41] I shall return to this point in a moment. First, however, we can tie up a loose end concerning Ovid's version of the *hasta Romuli* story. Earlier I remarked that the poet's failure to mention the auspices that precede the spear's transformation or the foundation of Rome that follows it might lead some to believe that these details are irrelevant to his version of the story, but suggested that such an interpretation was untenable. Since the relationship between the metamorphosis and its context has a direct bearing on our understanding of its relation to the Cipus episode, I shall now explain why.

Scholars have long understood that the context in which the metamorphosis occurs is decisive for ascertaining its message. There is some difference of opinion, though, as to whether the metamorphosis of the Romulus' spear should be interpreted in connection with Rome's foundation or with the auspices. Some believe that the spear's transformation into a tree foreshadows the flourishing of the city Romulus would found on the Palatine,[42] others that it is a divine reconfirmation of his kingship, previously confirmed by the auspices on the Aventine.[43] Of course, to demonstrate the critical interdependence of "myth" and "context," it makes little difference to which inter-

[40] The anachronism is noted by Granobs 77.

[41] This move on Ovid's part is also consistent with his emphasis on the effects rather than the causes of kingship, and, as such, helps to account for the fact that a story connected with Rome's foundation, that of the *hasta Romuli*, is given so much attention later in his Roman history and that Rome's foundation was given so little at its beginning, which is itself a matter of considerable debate (on this, see Wheeler 2000: 111–14); for to demonstrate that kingship has an enduring place in Rome, it is less important to stress that Rome was founded by a king than that kingship keeps presenting itself as an option to the city throughout her history. Whether kingship remains a relevant theme through the end of Ovid's Roman history in Book 15 is a somewhat controversial question, however, as there is much disagreement about whether Julius Caesar (745–851) and Augustus (852–70) should be seen as kings or king-figures themselves; see the works cited in n. 18 above. Nevertheless, it deserves to be noted, as Hardie 207–9 has recently emphasized, that Rome's history in the *Metamorphoses* is a history of the *unus homo*.

[42] Plut. *Rom.* 20.5–6 says that the cornel tree was considered sacred, was protected by a fence, and was watered with the greatest care and urgency whenever it appeared to be withering. This has led most to conjecture that the cornel tree was a symbol of Rome's vitality: Schwegler 395, Scholz 31, Briquel 1980: 309, Bruggisser 119, Schmitzer 261.

[43] Jocelyn 47, Fabre-Serris 167.

pretation one happens to subscribe; if either is correct, or rather if either corresponds to Ovid's understanding of the myth, then it follows that his ancient readers would have had to take into account either the auspices or Rome's foundation in order to comprehend its message. Therefore, his failure to mention these events may indeed serve to foreground the act of metamorphosis but should not suggest that they are irrelevant to the interpretation of it.

But what is the message of the *hasta Romuli* story? And what does Ovid accomplish by recounting it? While there are good arguments to be made for both of the interpretations mentioned above, neither one, on its own, provides a wholly satisfactory answer to the former question or allows us to address properly the second. For what makes the metamorphosis so significant, it seems, is not that it is related to one event or the other, namely the auspices or Rome's foundation, but that it has something to do with both. Ovid mentions neither event, therefore, because both are so intimately related to the *hasta Romuli* myth, so central to and implicit in its message, that the metamorphosis of the spear is itself sufficient to make this point clear and, indeed, best conveys it. If so, we may also better understand why Ovid relates this story before that of Cipus. As the event that ties together the auspices and foundation rites, the transformation of the spear gives incontestable proof of how simultaneously conceived and inextricably intertwined kingship and Rome's foundation are and in so doing assures us that not only will divination and ploughing be important elements in the following story—these were already prepared for in Tages' story—but also kingship, Rome, and the historical fact of their interrelatedness. So prefaced by Romulus' tale, then, the Cipus episode becomes a study of the dilemma that a king's foundational act has left to Rome and of the difficulties that attend attempts to deny it.

In order that we read these two stories off of and against each other in precisely this way Ovid not only juxtaposes them but also alludes to Romulus' story at specific moments in Cipus' tale. Early on in the story an Etruscan diviner (577 *Tyrrhenae gentis haruspex*) consults the entrails of a victim, looks up at Cipus' horns, and declares to him that the horns portend that he will be king when received into the city. At first, this figure appears to take us back to the first story of the group, where an Etruscan ploughman (553 *Tyrrhenus arator*) ploughs the furrow out of which springs Tages, the founder of the *Etrusca disciplina*.[44] There is something about this diviner that should give us

[44] So, Galinsky 183, Lundström 112 n. 90, Schmitzer 261, Fabre-Serris 168. In fact, such a connection between the two stories is all the more likely, because of the divinatory arts that Tages was credited with founding haruspicy was by far the most notable. Ovid does not mention this fact, but it is consistently reported in our ancient sources on the myth,

pause, however: even though he is initially identified as a *haruspex*, he is later identified as an *augur* (596). On the surface, such a discrepancy is not surprising. Although haruspicy and augury are, strictly speaking, different disciplines, serving different purposes and requiring different methods, there is some overlap between them; *haruspices* and *augures* are both practitioners of divinatory arts, and we know that the Romans, including Ovid, sometimes failed to distinguish between them.[45] Even so, it is hard to imagine how a diviner who consults entrails could be referred to as anything but a *haruspex*, especially in this case where that process is described for us; for while one could call a diviner either a *haruspex* or an *augur* indiscriminately on the mere grounds that each practices divination, no one would consider the consultation of entrails anything but haruspicy; it is certainly not augury.[46]

The use of the term *augur*, though striking in the context of Cipus' story, makes sense once we understand that Ovid is using this term to refer us to the *hasta Romuli* story. For in the moments directly preceding the spear cast, we recall, Romulus too practices divination; not haruspicy, but augury. Moreover, in each story the message of the interpreted sign is the same: kingship. Just as the twelve vultures confirmed Romulus' kingship, so horns portend kingship for Cipus. By having a *haruspex* interpret Cipus' horns and then by applying, or misapplying, the term *augur*, Ovid subtly encourages us to read the one story in connection with the other and thereby points to an underlying mimetic relationship between them and their respective protagonists.[47]

---

and it is safe to assume that he and his audience were well aware of it. For Tages and haruspicy (or extispicy) see Cic. *Div.* 2.50–51, Luc. 1.636–37 (with Comm. Bern. *ad* 636), Am. Marc. 21.1.10, Serv. ad *Aen.* 2.781, 8.398, Festus 492 Lindsay, Cens. *DDN* 4.13, Isid. *Etym.* 8.9.34. For more see Briquel 1991: 517–19.

[45] Birds, for example, were objects of scrutiny to both, and augury, like haruspicy, was often considered a means of telling the future (note, e.g., Ov. *Tr.* 1.9.49–52). For Ovid's free use of these terms here see Haupt et al. *ad* 15.596–97, Lundström 112 n. 90, Bömer *ad* 15.596–97. Even though haruspicy and augury were never believed to have common origins—no ancient source traces augury to the Etruscans—it is not unlikely that Etruscan divinatory practice influenced the development of augury at Rome (so Thulin 1912: 2465–66). It is suggestive too that in the *Fasti* Ovid refers to an *augur* who comes from Etruria: 2.443–44 *augur erat ... / nuper ab Etrusca uenerat exul humo.*

[46] Galinsky 187 explains the inconsistency by suggesting that Ovid uses the word *augur* to allude to Augustus through the etymology of *augur* and *augustus*. Schmitzer 267 too sees an allusion to Augustus, but argues that we are meant to think here of the *augurium augustum* performed upon his entry into Rome in 43 B.C.E.

[47] The fact that Cipus is the one who calls the *haruspex* an *augur* and that he does so while warning the Roman people about the horned king raises some interesting interpretive possibilities. Is his misapplication of the term simply a mistake, though a mistake

Cipus recalls Romulus toward the end of his story as well, when the senate grants him as much land as he can plough around in a day (616–19). Commentators often compare this land honorarium with those awarded to generals or great citizens such Horatius Cocles and Mucius Scaeuola.[48] This is certainly reasonable. But it also deserves to be noted that ploughing around land to mark it off was a rite that the Romans performed when they founded cities and colonies and that that rite was the very one performed by Romulus when he ploughed the *sulcus primigenius* during his founding of Rome.[49] Again, we were just reminded of this fact in the preceding story through Romulus' spear cast, an event which signals his intention to found Rome, when he would plough around the Palatine. Add the fact that the Romans considered their foundation rites Etruscan in origin and that in the first story of the group Ovid recounts Tages' emergence from the ploughed Etruscan earth, and we can see just how such a connection between Romulus' act and Cipus' has been anticipated.[50]

The parallels between Cipus' and Romulus' stories and thus between Cipus and Romulus are unmistakable. Just as Cipus' consultation of the *haruspex* recalls Romulus' use of augury before the spear cast, so Cipus' land honorarium recalls the foundation rites Romulus performs after the spear cast. And just as Cipus' use of divination and the awarding of the land honorarium "frame," so to speak, his tale—the one comes toward the beginning, the other toward the end—so Romulus' use of divination and his performance of foundation rites frame the metamorphosis of the *hasta Romuli*. Ironically, then, Cipus imitates Romulus at the two moments that were shown to be interrelated through the transformation of the spear recounted in the previous tale. Thus, despite his attempts to avoid kingship, Cipus has become not only a king, but an imitator of the first Roman king, Romulus. And even if he succeeds in avoiding the kingship of Rome and in this respect succeeds in devi-

that reflects his subconscious identification with Romulus? Or is it purposefully designed to lend credibility to the threat posed by the horned king since his kingship was recently confirmed, so the people are led to believe, by the same means that Romulus used to confirm his? In either case, Cipus' misapplication of the term might have been especially striking to Ovid's readers since his *gens*, the Genucii, was probably Etruscan and a Genucius was one of the first plebeian augurs; so Wiseman 109.

[48] Plin. *Nat.* 18.9, Liv. 2.13.5, D. H. 5.35. So, Haupt et al. *ad* 15.617, Bömer *ad* 15.616–19, Lundström 76, Wheeler 2000: 130.

[49] Bömer *ad* 15.616–19 also notes this similarity.

[50] For the Etruscan origins of these foundation rites see Var. *L.* 5.143 and Liv. 1.44.4. Etruscan teachings concerning these rites were contained in the *libri rituales*; on these books see Thulin 1909.

ating from Romulus' footsteps, it is nevertheless suggested that he will repeat Romulus' foundational act when he ploughs around the land awarded to him and thus will become a king, a "Romulus," if you will, of his own little kingdom outside the city.[51] Cipus' struggle is not simply to avoid kingship but also to break free from Romulus' legacy. In the end, however, it is a struggle that Cipus cannot win; the weight of the past is too strong for this staunch opponent of monarchy, so strong, in fact, that he is doomed to repeat it.

It is widely acknowledged that the name *Cipus* recalls the word *cippus*, a boundary stone, and that such name play is well suited to a story in which the main protagonist, Cipus, becomes a sort of human *cippus* who is unwilling to cross the boundaries of the city and thereby marks off, so to speak, the limits of kingship.[52] Equally well suited to the story, yet overlooked, are several subtle and clever plays on the word *cornu*, horn, that, like the parallels discussed above, serve to link and identify Cipus with Romulus.

As was noted earlier, Plutarch and pseudo-Lactantius Placidus state that Romulus' spear turned into a cornel tree. This would have been well known

[51] Barchiesi 252 suggests that Cipus' story looks ahead to Rome's growth into a world empire and compares 618–19 (*quantum ... complecti posses* ***ad finem lucis ab ortu***) with *Pont.* 3.1.127–28 (*nihil in terris* ***ad finem solis ab ortu*** */ clarius excepto Caesare mundus habet*). It should also be noted, however, that formulations of this sort (*ab oriente in occasum*, *ab oriente in occidentem*, *solis ortum et occasum*, etc.) often appear with reference to the establishment of a latitudinal axis for surveying (e.g., Front. *De Lim.* p. 11, 14, Sic. Fl. *de Cond. Agr.* p. 117, Hyg. Gr. *Const.* <*Lim.*> p. 132, 135, 146; references are to Thulin 1913) and that this agrimensory procedure was put to use in the founding of cities and colonies, even Rome. It may be reasonable, then, to see in the phrase *ad finem lucis ab ortu* (619) a simultaneous glance back to Romulus' foundation of the *urbs* and ahead to its hegemony over the *orbis*.

[52] Haupt et al. *ad* 15.565ff., Lundström 76, Porte 194, Santini 297–98, Barchiesi 251–52, Wheeler 2000: 130. The crowning of Cipus in 615 may also call attention to his status as a *cippus* since *cippi* were crowned after they were set in place and when the god Terminus was worshipped (e.g., Ov. *F.* 2.643–44, Sic. Fl. *de Cond. Agr.* p. 105 Thulin 1913). Name play may be at work in the other two stories of the group as well. Tages was believed to have been so named because he was born out of the earth: Weinstock 2009: "Seinen Namen leitete man ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ab (Schol. Lucan I 636), und auch die scheinbar zuverlässige Angabe desselben Scholiasten ... *Tages Etrusca lingua uox terra emissa* ... geht wohl auf die gleiche Etymologie (= τὰ γῆς) zurück." The central object in the second story is a spear, *hasta*, and Romulus' divine name, Quirinus, was often derived from the Sabine word for spear, *curis*: D. H. 2.48.2–4, Ov. *F.* 2.475–77 (*Quirino*, */ qui tenet hoc nomen (Romulus ante fuit)*, */ siue quod hasta 'curis' priscis est dicta Sabinis*), Plut. *Rom.* 29.1, Macr. *Sat.* 1.9.16. Perhaps we may even consider the derivation of Rome from *Romulus* since by throwing his spear Romulus chooses the Palatine as the site on which he will found the city; for this etymology see Maltby 529–31 s.v. "*Roma*."

to Ovid's audience since the tree, as Plutarch says, could be seen on the Palatine near the *scalae Caci* until the time of Caligula. Therefore, even though the poet does not specify, a reader would have known that the tree (563 *arbor*) into which the spear (561 *hastam*) was transformed was a *cornus*. Right away, as we turn from Romulus' story to Cipus', Ovid plays on this word to suggest that the metamorphosis of the spear somehow gives rise to the metamorphosis that leads Cipus into his dilemma: at the beginning of his story, Cipus, when looking at his reflection, sees horns, *cornua* (566), on his head. Just as Romulus' spear was transformed into a *cornus* before, so now that word *cornus* is "transformed" into *cornua*. The unavoidability of Rome's regal past, previously witnessed in Cipus' imitation of Romulus, is also figured at the level of language, the difference between Romulus and Cipus being as slim as the difference between *cornus* and *cornua*.

As the story unfolds, Ovid introduces another play on the word *cornua*, this time with the word *corona*. The laurel with which Cipus covers his *cornua* (591–92) turns out to be a crown of laurel (610 *corona*), which in his confession he removes to display his *cornua* (611). The people then decide to cover his *cornua* with another *corona* (615), only to have the senate display the *cornua* once again (620–21). Clearly, Cipus and Rome are going around in circles, exchanging the *cornua* for a *corona* and vice versa. In the final analysis, it does not really seem to matter what is on Cipus' head; just as the *corona* and the *cornua* are barely distinguishable as words, so they seem to be virtually interchangeable as symbols. And that is the point. To demonstrate that the issue of kingship itself is not resolved but only deflected, Ovid does not allow the dilemma of the horns to be resolved. Once again it is the story of the *hasta Romuli* that informs these developments; Rome can never entirely escape the fact of its foundation by a king, just as Cipus, whether bearing *cornua* or wearing a *corona*, cannot extricate himself from the historical fact of the *cornus* that grew out of Romulus' *hasta*.[53]

[53] This message so clearly anticipates the figures of Julius Caesar and Augustus, whom we encounter shortly hereafter in the book, that there is no reason to see in Ovid's invocation of the Muses at 15.622 (*Pandite, nunc, Musae*) such a strong break as Kraus 1942–43 and Ludwig 98 n. 84a maintain. Moreover, the epithet of Aesculapius, *Coroniden* (15.624), plays off of *cornua*/*corona* in Cipus' story and thus links the one story to the other. For more on this and other ways in which Cipus' horns anticipate what follows see Barchiesi 252–53, 256–57 and Wheeler 1999: 92–93.

CONCLUSION

Cipus' story has become an important locus for the discussion of Ovid's attitude toward the principate, and great progress has been made in identifying in it Augustan motifs, historical allusions, and the like. While I have not made the "Augustan question" a central concern of this paper, two observations may help in addressing it. First, Ovid does not take a clear moral position on Cipus' dilemma or his decision to avoid kingship. Even though Cipus adamantly opposes monarchy, Ovid gives no sign of agreeing with him. Rather, the poet carefully avoids posing the question of kingship in moral terms at all. If we wish to see Cipus' story as a form of political commentary, we will not find in it clear proof of the poet's Augustanism or anti-Augustanism, if by these terms we are referring to moral judgments.[54]

What Ovid does, instead, is pose the question of kingship in historical terms, and this leads me to my second observation: Cipus' challenge is not simply to avoid being king but also to make a break with the legacy that Romulus' foundational act has left to Rome. As his story demonstrates, however, finding a solution to this dilemma is more easily said than done. Denying kingship a place in Rome represents, it seems, a fundamental challenge to the collective identity of her people; it requires them to reject the single most important event of their city's past, her foundation by king Romulus, the moment when what it means to be Roman first meant something.[55] Therefore, if we wish to use Cipus' story to explore the "Augustan question" further, we must first ask ourselves not whether Augustus' reign should or should not have been, but whether things really could have turned out differently. For even if they had, if Augustus had made Cipus' choice, the issue of kingship, so Ovid suggests, would not have been resolved anyway; it simply would have been postponed for another day, for another Cipus or another Augustus.

WORKS CITED

Alföldi, A. 1959. "*Hasta-Summa imperii*: The Spear As Embodiment of Sovereignty in Rome." *AJA* 63: 1–27.

Aust, E. 1899. "Cipus." *RE* 3.2 col. 2565.

Bach, E. C., ed. 1831. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri XV*. Hannover.

[54] Of course, this distinction is problematic in its own right. For a recent discussion see Kennedy 26–58.

[55] Could this be why Ovid has Cipus call the Romans *populo ... Quirini* (15.572; cf. 15.756 *populo ... Quirini*) or why the poet himself, in his preface to the following story of Aesculapius, refers to Rome as *Romuleae urbis* (15.625)?

Barchiesi, A. 1994. *Il poeta e il principe: Ovidio e il discorso augusteo*. Rome.
Bayet, J. 1935. "Le rite du fécial et le cornouiller magique." *MEFRA* 52: 29–76.
Bömer, F. 1986. *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen: Kommentar. Buch XIV–XV*. Heidelberg.
Briquel, D. 1980. "Trois études sur Romulus." In R. Bloch, ed., *Recherches sur les religions de l'antiquité classique*. Geneva. 267–346.
———. 1991. *L'origine lydienne des étrusques: Histoire de la doctrine dans l'antiquité*. Rome.
Bruggisser, P. 1987. *Romulus Servianus: La légende de Romulus dans les commentaires à Virgile de Servius. Mythographie et idéologie à l'époque de la dynastie théodosienne*. Bonn.
Conte, G. B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Ed. C. Segal. Ithaca.
Doblhofer, E. 1960. "*Ovidius urbanus*: Eine Studie zum Humor in Ovids *Metamorphosen*." *Philologus* 104: 63–91, 223–35.
Dornseiff, F. 1959. *Antike und alter Orient: Interpretationen*. Leipzig.
Fabre-Serris, J. 1995. *Mythe et poésie dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide: Fonctions et significations de la mythologie dans la Rome augustéenne*. Études et commentaires 104. Paris.
Fränkel, H. 1945. *Ovid: A Poet between Two Worlds*. Berkeley.
Frécaut, J.-M. 1968. "Les transitions dans les *Métamorphoses* d'Ovide." *REL* 46: 247–63.
Galinsky, G. K. 1967. "The Cipus Episode in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (15.565–621)." *TAPA* 98: 181–91.
Granobs, R. 1997. *Studien zur Darstellung römischer Geschichte in Ovids Metamorphosen*. Studien zur klassischen Philologie 108. Frankfurt am Main.
Hardie, P. 2002. "The Historian in Ovid: The Roman History of *Metamorphoses* 14–15." In D. S. Levene and D. P. Nelis, eds., *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*. Leiden. 191–209.
Haupt, M., et al., eds. 1966 (original edition 1881). *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen, Zweiter Band: Buch VIII–XV*. 7th ed. Zürich.
Hill, D. E., ed. 2000. *Ovid, Metamorphoses XIII–XV*. Warminster.
Hinds, S. 1992. "*Arma* in Ovid's *Fasti*. Part 2: Genre, Romulean Rome and Augustan Ideology." *Arethusa* 25: 113–53.
Hofmann, H. 1985. "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: *Carmen perpetuum, carmen deductum*." *PLLS* 5: 223–41.
Jocelyn, H. D. 1971. "*Urbs augurio augusto condita*: Ennius *ap*. Cic. *Div*. I.107 (= *Ann*. 77 96 V2)." *PCPhS* 197: 44–74.
Kennedy, D. F. 1992. "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference." In A. Powell, ed., *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. London. 26–58.
Knox, P. E. 1986. *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry*. Cambridge.
Kraus, W. 1943. "P. Ovidius Naso." *RE* 18.2 col. 1910–86.
Lindsay, W. M., ed. 1913. *Sexti Pompei Festi De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*. Leipzig.
Luck, G. 1977. *P. Ovidius Naso*. Tristia. Heidelberg.
Ludwig, W. 1965. *Struktur und Einheit der Metamorphosen Ovids*. Berlin.
Lundström, S. 1980. *Ovids Metamorphosen und die Politik des Kaisers*. Studia Latina Upsaliensia 12. Uppsala.

Magdelain, A. 1990. "L'inauguration de l'*urbs* et l'*imperium*." In A. Magdelain, *Jus, imperium, auctoritas: Études de droit romain*. Collection de l'École française de Rome 133. Rome. 209–28.

Maltby, R. 1991. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Leeds.

Marg, W. 1949. Review of Fränkel. *Gnomon* 21: 44–57.

Miller, F. J. 1921. "Some Features of Ovid's Style. III: Ovid's Methods of Ordering and Transition in the *Metamorphoses*." *CJ* 16: 464–76.

Myers, K. S. 1994. *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*. Ann Arbor.

Otis, B. 1936. "The *argumenta* of the So-Called Lactantius." *HSCP* 47: 131–63.

———. 1970 (original edition 1966). *Ovid as an Epic Poet*. 2nd ed. Cambridge.

Pease, A. S., ed. 1963 (original publication 1920–23). *M. Tulli Ciceronis De divinatione libri duo*. Facsimile reprint. Darmstadt.

Piérart, M. 1983. "L'historien ancien face aux mythes et aux légendes." *LEC* 51: 47–63, 105–15.

Porte, D. 1985. "L'idée romaine et la métamorphose." In J. M. Frécaut and D. Porte, eds., *Journées ovidiennes de Parménie*. Collection Latomus 189. Bruxelles. 175–98.

Santini, C. 1987. "La storia di *Cipus* in Valerio Massimo e Ovidio." *Filologia e forme letterarie: Studi offerti a Francesco della Corte. Vol. 3*. Urbino. 291–98.

Schmidt, R. 1938. *Die Übergangstechnik in den Metamorphosen des Ovid*. Diss. Breslau.

Schmitzer, U. 1990. *Zeitgeschichte in Ovids Metamorphosen: Mythologische Dichtung unter politischem Anspruch*. Stuttgart.

Scholz, U. W. 1970. *Studien zum altitalischen und altrömischen Marskult und Marsmythos*. Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften 2.35. Heidelberg.

Schwegler, U. 1867. *Römische Geschichte im Zeitalter der Könige*. Tübigen.

Skutsch, O. 1968. "Enniana IV: *Condendae urbis auspicia*." In O. Skutsch, *Studia Enniana*. Oxford. 62–85.

———. 1985. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford.

Tarrant, R. J. 1995. "The *Narrationes* of 'Lactantius' and the Transmission of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In O. Pecere and M. D. Reeve, eds., *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions*. Spoleto. 92–100.

Thulin, C. O. 1909. *Die etruskische Disciplin. III: Die Ritualbücher*. Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift 15. Göteborg.

———. 1912. "Haruspices." *RE* 7.2 col. 2431–68.

———, ed. 1913. *Corpus agrimensorum romanorum. Vol. 1, Fasc. 1: Opuscula agrimensorum veterum*. Leipzig.

Valeton, I. M. J. 1897. "*De templis romanis.§6 De pomerio*." *Mnemosyne* n.s. 25: 93–144.

Versnel, H. S. 1970. *Triumphus: An Inquiry into the Origin and Meaning of the Roman Triumph*. Leiden.

Watson, A. 1993. *International Law in Archaic Rome*. Baltimore.

Weinstock, S. 1932. "Tages." *RE* zweite Reihe 4.2 col. 2009–11.

Wheeler, S. M. 1999. *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Philadelphia.

———. 2000. *Narrative Dynamics in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Münchener Studien zur klassischen Philologie 20. Tübingen.

Wilkinson, L. P. 1958. "The World of the *Metamorphoses*." In N. I. Herescu, ed., *Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide*. Paris. 231–44.
Wiseman, T. P. 1995. *Remus: A Roman Myth*. Cambridge.
Wood, J. R. 1980. "The Myth of Tages." *Latomus* 39: 325–44.