

## CELABITUR AUCTOR: THE CRISIS OF AUTHORITY AND NARRATIVE PATTERNING IN OVID *FASTI* 5

BARBARA WEIDEN BOYD

*DISSENSERE DEAE*: SO OPENS OVID'S DESCRIPTION of his interview with the Muses regarding possible etymologies for the name of the fifth month, May (*Fasti* 5.9). This scene has received deserved attention of late in a flurry of scholarly activity: Fantham sees in it evidence for Ovid's post-exilic revision of the *Fasti*, and the influence of Germanicus upon Ovid; Miller considers it in his investigation of the ways in which Ovid follows, modifies, or innovates upon Callimachean models in describing divine interventions in the poem; Barchiesi looks at the generic cacophony inherent in the different etymologies offered by each of the three speaking Muses; and Harries considers the implications of disharmony among the Muses for Ovid's authorization as poet.<sup>1</sup> Taking these readings as a point of departure, I want to direct my readers' attention along a course which has heretofore been little pursued: the effect of the Muses' disharmony on the character and shape of the stories narrated in the remainder of *Fasti* 5.

In addition to considering the implications of the Muses' failure for the reliability of Ovid's poetic narrative, I intend to scrutinize the apparent randomness of several of the book's juxtaposed episodes, and to suggest that beneath the superficial discontinuities of theme there is in fact a network of narrative patterns that pulls together much of the otherwise disparate material in *Fasti* 5. Newlands has recently offered us an interpretation of *Fasti* 5 that integrates the narratives concerning the spring festival of Flora, the catasterisms of Orion and Chiron, and the celebration of the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor into a unified reading of the book, with the advent of Mars Ultor and the holiday's Augustan associations its centerpiece.<sup>2</sup> While my reading does not challenge the details of Newlands's interpretation, it does suggest an alternative and more complex way of understanding this book (and at least potentially, of reading the other books of the *Fasti* as well), a way which effectively "de-centers" Mars Ultor as at the putative heart of the book and instead sees the crisis of authority created by the

<sup>1</sup> Fantham 1985 (cf. also Hinds 1987: 12–16); Miller 1983: esp. 187–188; Barchiesi 1991; Harries 1989: esp. 172–173. For an overview of the interconnection between the question of authority and framed narrative, see Myers 1994: 67–73.

Bömer's editions of the *Fasti* (Bömer 1957–58) and *Metamorphoses* (Bömer 1969–86) are cited throughout the notes by means of the abbreviations Bömer, *F.* and Bömer, *Met.* All quotations from the *Fasti* are based on the text of Alton, Wormell, and Courtney 1985.

<sup>2</sup> See Newlands 1995: 87–123. For a useful overview of the structural patterns that inform each book of the *Fasti*, see also Braun 1981; the value of Braun's work is limited, however, by his attitude regarding the poem's lack of depth: "Die Prinzipien der Komposition in den 'Fasti' reichen nicht tief unter die Oberfläche" (2369).

Muses as itself a rich source of narrative material for Ovid. I shall not attempt in this limited discussion to offer a harmonious reading of every detail in *Fasti* 5; there is in fact a pitched battle between order and randomness constantly being waged in the *Fasti*, as, directed by Ovid, we move back and forth between the rigid constraints of the Roman calendar and the juxtaposition, random in its studied effect if not in its cause, of Greek astronomical lore on the one hand and Roman myth and ritual on the other. Instead, it is my goal here to argue for a narrative method which informs the book's appearance of studied chaos even as it makes meaning emerge from the Muses' dissent. I believe it is important for our understanding of the poem as a whole to tolerate the narrative tensions thus created rather than to assuage them; it is precisely Ovid's purpose—and perhaps nowhere in the *Fasti* more so than in Book 5—to keep us on our guard, ever alert to the poetic possibilities (and dangers) of a world without Muses.

The primary focus of the discussion that follows is the formal character of *Fasti* 5; nevertheless, no work on the *Fasti* can now afford to disregard the problems of closure and political stance which inform most contemporary discussions of this poem. I have chosen, however, not to separate these issues from the “purely” literary characteristics on *Fasti* 5, nor to allow them to take its place, lest these issues all but supplant the text itself. Instead, I shall show that the literary character of Ovid's exploration of authority in this book is inextricably connected to, even perhaps to be identified in some ways with, these concerns—but that it cannot thereby be reduced to the status of evidence for the alleged drying up of Ovid's material<sup>3</sup> or for a decision by him to end the poem six books short of its original goal as some sort of protest against, or self-fulfilling prophecy of, voicelessness.<sup>4</sup> The following discussion will suggest that second thoughts are in

<sup>3</sup> Fantham 1983: 210: “There are many signs that in composing Book 6 Ovid was conscious of dwindling material and failing inspiration: . . . the last book, or even the last two books, are lackluster and largely without poetic momentum”; and 215: “What I have argued is not that the *Fasti* are a desolate failure, or devoid of the basic piety and patriotism to be convincing, but that the material was drying up.” See also Johnson 1978–79.

<sup>4</sup> For example, Feeney 1992: 19: “The unfinished *Fasti* [Ovid] turns into the obverse of the self-assertive exile poetry, so that its failure to reach its goal stands as an actualisation of one of its main thematic preoccupations, becoming a mute reproach to the constraints set upon the poet's speech. The silent second half of the work has, in its own way, as much to say about the principate and its ideology as the vocal first half.” More strongly, Newlands 1995: 26: “The poem's ideological foundation in the moral and religious revival of the state receives no firm authorization from a poet who mocks as well as celebrates, and who resisted the subsuming of his poetic identity in the powerful, controlling myths of his age by leaving his poem unfinished.” Barchiesi equivocates (1994: 166 = 1997a: 177): “The conclusion (or halfway mark) of the poem at the end of June . . .”; cf. the equally non-committal Italian version: “La conclusione (dimidiata) dell' opera alla fine del giugno . . . .” See also 1994: 269 = 1997a: 262 = 1997b: 200: “Are we so sure that the *Fasti* are just an interrupted utterance and that the interruption cannot be a communicative ‘gesture’? The personal situation of the author invests the damaged year with at least a potential metaphorical meaning: the time of Ovid's life is severed like the structure of the poem.” For ease of reference in the notes, I have cited page numbers for both the

order, and that the poem's end—and ends—are more elusive than most scholars have recently given Ovid credit for devising.<sup>5</sup>

# I. ARATUS, VIRGIL, AND OVID'S HOMAGE TO HESIOD

I begin, as does Ovid after his ineffective interrogation of the Muses, with Jupiter: *ab Iove surgat opus* (111). A clever move for a second proem: Ovid translates the opening of Aratus' *Phaenomena*, a poem whose astronomical relevance to Ovid's calendar is apparent. But the allusion to Aratus here hardly stops with its formal function as a transition: it also both comments retroactively on the beginning of the book and looks forward to the tales to follow. In the interview with the Muses that had begun approximately one hundred lines earlier, the first Muse to attempt an etymology for May was Polyhymnia; her tale concerning the birth of Maestas (5.11–52) is almost double the length of each of the succeeding etymologies (twenty-two and twenty-six lines, respectively). Its unusual length and pride of place, when combined with the novelty of the tale itself,<sup>6</sup> mark out this story as worthy of particular attention: and the results of that attention send us directly back to Aratus,<sup>7</sup> and, by way of Aratus, to Hesiod.<sup>8</sup>

---

Italian (1994) and English (1997a) versions of Barchiesi's book. A third work by Barchiesi, 1997b, contains the same concluding section, virtually verbatim; when the text appears a third time in this essay, I cite these page numbers also.

<sup>5</sup> See now the suggestive comments of Harries (1989: 165) and the balanced remarks of Fantham (1998: 38–42); cf. also Volk 1997: 302–306, and 303, n. 37.

<sup>6</sup> See Mackie 1992. Mackie discusses the novelty of Ovid's personification of Maestas and briefly notes the theogonic tradition behind Ovid's scene (1992: 85–86). She does not, however, draw a connection between Maestas and Dike, nor does she look at the Aratean influence on Ovid. See also below, n. 8.

<sup>7</sup> In claiming the centrality of Aratus here, I do not mean to disregard the possibility of Ovid's familiarity with Germanicus' translation of the *Phaenomena*: see Gain 1976: 16–20; Fantham 1985: 254–256. Fantham believes that the opening of *Fasti* 5, in particular the tale of Maestas, is evidence of Ovid's post-exilic revision of the *Fasti*, completed after the death of Augustus and in accordance with Tiberius' initial pro-senatorial interests, and thus under the poetic influence of Germanicus (1985: 268–272). Cf. Herbert-Brown 1994: 173–202, arguing against any internal evidence for poetic influence by Germanicus on Ovid, aside from the revised proem to Book 1. It will become evident in what follows that, regardless of the influence of Germanicus detected elsewhere, Ovid's interest in Aratus at the beginning of *F.* 5 quickly eclipses the possible momentary influence of a friend. Several other poetic responses to Aratus' poem, and the scene involving Dike in particular, were also surely known to Ovid, including Catullus' depiction of Iustitia in 64.397–406, Cicero's translation of Aratus (cf. fr. 1 Soubiran, *a Iove Musarum primordia*, and *Rep.* 1.36.56), and Virgil's mention at *Georg.* 2.473–474. Cf. also Theocr. *Id.* 17.1, and Virg. *Aen.* 7.219. Finally, there is Ovid's own *Phaenomena* itself, presumably an early work (and, like the others mentioned here, a translation): two fragments (totalling five hexameters) remain (Owen 1915: frs. 6–7 = Courtney *FLP*, Ovid frs. 1–2); cf. Hinds 1987: 13–14. Ovid appears, however, to have been much less interested in these presumptive influences than in Aratus and his model Hesiod, presumably because of his particular desire to reassert the cosmic pretensions of his own poem.

<sup>8</sup> Fantham (1985: 267–268), much like Mackie 1992 (above, n. 6), notices the Hesiodic character of Polyhymnia's theogony; but she does not associate Maestas with Dike, or comment on the

At *Phaen.* 96–136, Aratus tells the story of Dike, astronomically significant as the constellation Parthenos. The daughter of either Astraeus or another—thus points Aratus to his own divergence from the Hesiodic version (*Theog.* 901–902, *Op.* 256)<sup>9</sup>—, Dike dwelled happily among mortals during the golden age (*Phaen.* 101–114). When the generation of silver came into existence, she withdrew to the hills and upbraided these people for their κακότης (*Phaen.* 115–128); and the emergence of the bronze age compelled her to flee heavenward and so to become a constellation (*Phaen.* 129–136). The paradigm of a series of ages defined by a metallic metaphor is clearly modelled on Hesiod's version of the history of human development (*Op.* 106–201), though of course Aratus also varies this metaphor: the Hesiodic age of heroes is gone from his version, as is our own age, that of iron. Also innovative in the *Phaenomena* is the very fact of Dike's withdrawal; in Hesiod, it had been the divinities Aidos and Nemesis who withdrew from earth when they could face its degeneration no longer (*Op.* 197–200).

The story of Maiestas that Ovid's Polyhymnia tells repeatedly recalls details of the Hesiodic–Aratean tradition, with an important twist: now it is the goddess's arrival on earth rather than her departure from it with which the story culminates.<sup>10</sup> Polyhymnia begins, like Hesiod, with Chaos (11); she then proceeds to offer in six verses an exceedingly abridged version of the cosmogony. Beginning at verse 17, she brings anthropomorphic divinities, both Olympian and Titanic, on to the scene; the organizing principle she uses to structure this part of her narrative has to do not, however, with the births of the gods, but with their oddly democratic lack of social hierarchy (17–22). Only with the legitimate marriage of Honor and Reverentia (23–24) is an organizing principle introduced into divine society: Maiestas, daughter of Honor and Reverentia, is its embodiment. Her immediate assumption of the throne (*nec mora, consedit medio sublimis Olympo/ aurea, purpureo conspicienda sinu*, 27–28) not only valorizes *honor*, but also brings with it Maiestas' close attendants, Pudor and Metus (29).

The section in which Polyhymnia describes Maiestas' survival into the reign of Jupiter is of particular importance in directing our attention to her theogonic personality. It also introduces a new element into our discussion, as we see Ovid turning now to Virgil to provide a means of focusing our attention even more clearly on the Hesiodic model they share.<sup>11</sup> For Virgil, the transition from the

---

contribution of Aratus as intermediary between Hesiod and Ovid's narrative. See also Barchiesi 1991: 8–9.

<sup>9</sup> See Hopkinson 1988: 140–141 on *Phaen.* 98–99; Dike is the daughter of Zeus in Hesiod. On the broader relationship between Hesiod and Aratus in this passage, and on the latter's significant innovations upon his model, see now Schiesaro 1997.

<sup>10</sup> Ovid may also have taken some inspiration here from the conceit of Virg. *Ecl.* 4, envisioning the return of the Golden Age: *redit et Virgo*, 6. Unlike Virgil's Virgo, however, Maiestas is present even in the reign of Jupiter.

<sup>11</sup> This is a good example of what Thomas calls “window reference” in his discussion of Virgilian poetic techniques: Thomas 1986: 188–189; see also McKeown 1987: 37–45 on “double allusion.”

age of Saturn to that in which Jupiter reigns is a mytho-historical moment of continuing significance, and a theme to which he returns in all his works.<sup>12</sup> Ovid uses a very compact set of allusions to this moment to affirm the durability of *Maiestas* (*F.* 5.33–46):

*hic status in caelo multos permansit in annos,  
dum senior fatis excidit arce deus.  
Terra feros partus, immania monstra, Gigantas  
edidit ausuros in Iovis ire domum.  
mille manus illis dedit et pro cruribus angues,  
atque ait 'in magnos arma movete deos.'  
exstruere hi montes ad sidera summa parabant  
et magnum bello sollicitare Iovem;  
fulmina de caeli iaculatus Iuppiter arce  
vertit in auctores pondera vasta suos.  
his bene Maiestas armis defensa deorum  
restat, et ex illo tempore culta manet;  
assidet inde Iovi, Iovis est fidissima custos  
et praestat sine vi sceptrum tenenda Iovi.*

This sequence of events recalls, in a highly compressed and generalized fashion, the series of battles waged by Zeus in the *Theogony*: the Titanomachy (*Theog.* 617–719) and Typhonomachy (*Theog.* 820–880). Closer scrutiny of the individual attributes of Jupiter's foes, however, shows that this passage is closer to a Hesiodic pastiche, with an Homeric item embedded in it for good measure, than to actual reference; for although Ovid calls Jupiter's foes *Gigantes*, the details of their assault on heaven for the most part come from scenes from archaic Greek poetry describing other divine monsters. Their thousand hands (*mille manus*, 37) recall (and trump) Hesiod's Hundred-handers (*Theog.* 148–151), while their snaky feet and legs (*pro cruribus angues*, 37) are a reversal of Typhoeus' one hundred snaky heads (*Theog.* 824–825).<sup>13</sup> Ovid's description of these Giants' attempt to build a path to heaven by piling mountains on top of each other (*exstruere hi montes ad sidera summa parabant*, 39) is actually a feature not of a Gigantomachy, but of the non-Hesiodic tradition concerning the Aloidae, Otus and Ephialtes, first and best known from Homer's description (*Od.* 11.315–316) of their piling mountains one atop another in an attempt to scale heaven. And the reference to Jupiter's use of his lightning-bolt (*fulmina . . . iaculatus*, 41) takes us to the *Theogony* again, not to one specific episode but to the repeated emphasis that Zeus' heavenly weapons

<sup>12</sup> See esp. *Ecl.* 4; *Georg.* 1.118–146 and 2.136–176; *Aen.* 8.314–327 and *passim*.

<sup>13</sup> See West 1966: *ad loc.* and on *Theog.* 306, noting that visual representations of Typhoeus/Typhon in Greek art almost always reverse the Hesiodic portrait and give the monster an anthropomorphic upper body and snakes or dragons for the lower parts. Cf. also Naev. fr. 8 Büchner/Blänsdorf, *FPL* (= Naev. fr. 19 Morel/ *ex lib. inc.* 44–46 Warmington): *inerant signa expressa, quomodo Titani, bicorporum Gigantes magnique Atlantes/Runcus ac Purpureus filii Terras*. For a summary of interpretations of this fragment in the context of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*, see Goldberg 1995: 51–52.

receive there: they are a gift to him from the Cyclopes (*Theog.* 501–506), he uses them against both Titans and Typhoeus, and his power still depends upon them (*Theog.* 71–72).

Ovid's homage to Hesiod (as I am tempted to call this passage) may be explained simply as typical of post-Hesiodic poetry, in which the various cosmic battles described by Homer and Hesiod become increasingly confused and conflated over time.<sup>14</sup> Comparison with a passage in the *Georgics*, however, suggests that a consequent attribution of sloppiness to Ovid may be a bit too hasty. In *Georgics* 1, in the middle of a passage ostensibly modelled on the *Works and Days*,<sup>15</sup> Virgil places an explanation of why the fifth of the month is to be avoided for certain types of work (278–283):

... tum partu Terra nefando  
 Coeumque Iapetumque creat saevumque Typhoea  
 et coniuratos caelum rescindere fratres.  
 ter sunt conati imponere Pelio Ossam  
 scilicet atque Ossae frondosum involvere Olympum;  
 ter pater exstructos disiecit fulmine montis.

Coeus and Iapetus are Titans and children of Gaea (*Theog.* 134), while Typhoeus is the final monster she produces to challenge Zeus (*Theog.* 821). The brothers (*fratres*) are Otus and Ephialtes, whose mountain-stacking efforts are closely modelled on the passage from the *Odyssey* mentioned above; and the lightning-bolt with which Jupiter destroys their efforts is the lightning used repeatedly by Zeus against his enemies in the *Theogony*. As in Ovid, the various challengers to Jupiter's authority are conflated and confused: like Ovid, Virgil begins with Earth as monstrous mother (*partu Terra nefando*, *Georg.* 1.278; *Terra feros partus*, *F.* 5.35); like Ovid, Virgil ends the heavenly assault with the lightning-bolt of Jupiter (*Georg.* 1.281–283; *F.* 5.39–42). It is clear that Ovid knew the striking passage from *Georgics* 1 and chose to emulate it here. In fact, with his naming of Terra's offspring, *Gigantes*, i.e., > γῆγενεῖς, "earth-born" (*Terra feros partus*, *immania monstra*, *Gigantas*/ *edidit*, 35–36), Ovid gives us an example of a device he uses frequently to direct his reader to Virgil in particular: an etymology which Virgil had suppressed and glossed, instead naming two Titan offspring (*partu Terra nefando*/ *Coeumque Iapetumque creat*, *Georg.* 1.278–279), is made explicit by Ovid.<sup>16</sup> Ovid also looks back through Virgil to Hesiod to find a way to describe his Giants that will surpass Virgil's own phrase *partu nefando* (278), itself a translation of Hesiod's description of the Hundred-handers as οὐκ ὀνομαστοί (*Theog.* 148): Ovid's more elaborate appositional construction, *immania monstra*, *Gigantas* (*F.* 5.35), is modelled on the construction found in the

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., Bömer, *F.* on 5.35.

<sup>15</sup> See Thomas 1988 on *Georg.* 1.276–277.

<sup>16</sup> On γῆγενεῖς, see Bömer, *F.*: *ad loc.*; on Virgil's gloss, see Thomas 1988: *ad loc.* For a valuable discussion of Ovid's tendency to make explicit what Virgil suppresses in allusion, see O'Hara 1996a.

next line in Hesiod's description, Κόττος τε Βριάρεώς τε Γύγης θ', ὑπερήφανα τέκνα.<sup>17</sup>

Unlike the Virgilian passage, however, the purpose of the scene in Ovid is not to instruct readers regarding the character of a particular day (although this is in fact the ostensible function of much of the rest of Ovid's narrative in *Fasti* 5!). Rather, in this scene Ovid uses reminiscences of archaic poetry, including archaic poetry as read through Virgil, to locate Maiestas, temporally and spatially, in a Hesiodic heaven. Indeed, since Jupiter's victory, Maiestas has become his close companion, sharing the throne with, and protecting, him; in this final detail Maiestas closely parallels Hesiod's description of Dike, seated next to Zeus (*Op.* 259), and so unites in one character reminiscence of the two Hesiodic poems.<sup>18</sup>

But the place of Maiestas is not among the gods alone: she has come to earth, too, to popularize *honor* (47–52):

*venit et in terras: coluerunt Romulus illam  
et Numa, mox alii, tempore quisque suo.  
illa patres in honore pio matresque tuetur,  
illa comes pueris virginibusque venit;  
illa datos fasces commendat eburque curule,  
illa coronatis alta triumphat equis.*

The birth of Maiestas, then, can be seen as a lengthy example of *oppositio in imitando*. In both his Greek models and in Ovid's own invention, we have the birth of a goddess whose significance as an intellectual abstraction results in the bringing of order to society: Aratus' Dike, taken from Hesiod, brings order to the people of the golden age and even, though pessimistically, to their silver descendants; Ovid's Maiestas brings order to Olympus and then to human, specifically Roman, society. The flight of Aratus' Dike is modelled on the flight of Hesiod's paired Aidos and Nemesis; the birth of Ovid's Maiestas brings with it the emergence of the couple Pudor and Metus.

The influence of Ovid's Greek models is both pervasive and enduring; indeed, the literary tradition behind this scene is so vivid that its influence continues to be felt in the next speech of *Fasti* 5, the rival etymology for May offered by Uranie. She picks up on Polyhymnia's narrative by opening with a reference to the reverence in which elders, *maiores*, were once held: *magna fuit quondam capitis reverentia cani* (57). In implicit contrast with these senior citizens are the *iuvenes* of 59–60, a pious but war-loving generation: "*Martis opus iuvenes animosaque bella*

<sup>17</sup> An etymological connection between ὑπερήφανος (see Chaintraine 1980: s.v.) and either *immanis* or *monstrum* (see Ernout and Meillet 1979: ss.vv.; Maltby 1991: ss.vv.) is tenuous at best, although Ovid may have had in mind a possible link between ὑπερήφανος > φαίνομαι and *monstrum* > *monstrare/monstrari*, or between the general similarity in meaning of ὑπερήφανος and *immanis* ("wicked," "cruel").

<sup>18</sup> Mackie (1992: 92) adds a further detail which would support this reading of the scene as a sort of *oppositio in imitando*: at *Theog.* 385–388, Kratos and Bia sit by Zeus' throne.

*gerebant/ et pro dis aderant in statione suis.*" As Uranie continues, the point of her narrative—viz., that the etymology for May is to be derived from the respect in which the *maiores* are held—becomes apparent; but with her opening words, she recalls briefly the implicit contrast between gold and silver ages made by Hesiod, who at *Op.* 130–131 describes the childishness of the generation of silver: ἄλλ' ἑκατὸν μὲν παῖς ἔτεα παρὰ μητέρι κεδνῇ/ ἐτρέφετ' ἀτάλλων μέγα νήπιος ᾗ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ.<sup>19</sup>

In a brief note on the status of the tale of Dike as a digression within the *Phaenomena*, Hopkinson points to the way in which the opening of the passage is recalled at its end.<sup>20</sup> The diction and contents of *Phaen.* 96–97, ἀμφοτέροισι δὲ ποσσὶν ὑπο σκέπτοιο Βοώτῳ / Παρθένον, are echoed in *Phaen.* 136, Παρθένος, ἐγγὺς εὐόσα πολυσκέπτοιο Βοώτῳ. Because Ovid's adaptation of Aratus is structured as a narrative within a narrative, the story of the birth of Maestas has no astronomical significance; yet Ovid does offer us elsewhere in *Fasti* 5 homage to the thematic focus of his source. Book 5 closes with a couplet describing the setting of Bootes at the end of May: *auferet ex oculis veniens aurora Booten,/ continuaque die sidus Hyantis erit* (733–734). Ovid thus uses Aratus, and in particular the frame for his tale of Dike, to provide a formal structure for the whole of *Fasti* 5: the book begins and ends with allusions to Aratus' digression, to which we are sent also by the opening of the book's second proem and its translation of the first line of the *Phaenomena*.<sup>21</sup>

## II. MARVELOUS BIRTHS: JUPITER

The *Phaenomena* opens with an eighteen-line proem in praise of Zeus; after another eight lines describing the rotation of the sky around a fixed axis terminating at the celestial poles (19–26), Aratus introduces the first constellation in his poem, and the first myth explaining a catasterism.<sup>22</sup> The first constellation named by Aratus is Ἄρκτοι, also known as Ἀμαξαί (the Bears or the Wagons, 27). These receive pride of place in Aratus' poem not only because of the Great Bear's visibility in the night sky,<sup>23</sup> but also, he asserts, because of their role as nurses of Zeus on Crete (*Phaen.* 30–35). Their catasterism was their reward, according to Aratus, for their year of service to the baby Zeus.

Aratus' version of the story of Zeus' infantile sequestration on Crete is unusual; in fact, we find it in no other source before Aratus, and it appears not to have

<sup>19</sup> Fantham (1985: 269) also observes that Reverentia and Honor are carried over from Polyhymnia's etymological tale into that of Uranie, framing as they do the alternative she proposes: Uranie's story begins with the words "*magna fuit quondam capitis reverentia cani*" (57) and concludes with "*nec leve propositi pignus successor honoris/ Iunius . . . habet*" (77–83).

<sup>20</sup> Hopkinson 1988: 142 on *Phaen.* 136. See also Kidd 1997 on *Phaen.* 96.

<sup>21</sup> See now also Gee 1997 for another instance of Aratean features in the *Fasti*.

<sup>22</sup> For an introduction to the organization of Aratus' poem, see Kidd 1997: 5–8, and his comments on 733–757.

<sup>23</sup> See Kidd 1997 on *Phaen.* 27.



gained much popularity in his wake.<sup>24</sup> More familiar, of course, is the story of Zeus' babyhood-in-hiding on Crete tended not by bears but by a nymph and/or her milk-giving goat; and as we shall see presently, Aratus knows this version of the tradition also, and alludes to it elsewhere in the *Phaenomena*. First, however, let us look at how Ovid takes advantage of this tale's prominence in Aratus to give a final nod to this model even as he brings another into the foreground.

In fact, Aratus' innovation upon the usual story may be a reaction on his part to the prominence given Zeus' birth by Callimachus, if Hopkinson is right that Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* is an early work.<sup>25</sup> Aratus certainly seems to be anticipating his readers' familiarity with Callimachus when he begins his own version with the words εἰ ἔτεδον δῆ,/ Κρήτηθεν . . . (*Phaen.* 30–31), obliquely but cleverly alluding both to the problematic status of authority in Callimachus' hymn and to the logical conundrum concerning Cretan origins to which I shall return below.<sup>26</sup>

The reference to Jupiter with which Ovid's second proem begins provides an obvious bridge to the first constellation described and the first tale told in *Fasti* 5, Capella and her role as the nurse of baby Jupiter (113–128). Thus, as in Aratus' poem, Ovid's first catasterism in *Fasti* 5 occurs as the result of Jupiter's desire to reward his Cretan nurse(s). In following Callimachus (at least to some extent), however, rather than Aratus in his description of Zeus' Cretan nursery, Ovid neatly moves away from the Aratean framework we have already considered and makes Callimachus both the primary model and the focus of his narrative.<sup>27</sup>

In *Fasti* 5, Ovid's transition from one tradition to another is made both cleverly and logically: rewarded by catasterism for her service to Jupiter, the goat Capella features in both the Aratean and Callimachean traditions. Ovid begins with another allusion to Aratus, but this time not to his proem:

αἷζ ἱερή, τὴν μὲν τε λόγος Διὶ μαζδὸν ἐπισχεῖν,  
Ὡλενίην δέ μιν Αἴγα Διδὸς καλέουσι ὑποφῆται.

(Aratus *Phaen.* 163–164)

*nascitur Oleniae signum pluviale Capellae;  
illa dati caelum praemia lactis habet.*

.....

*. . . ubere, quod nutrix possit habere Iovis.  
lac dabat illa deo.*

(Ovid *F.* 5.113–114, 120–121)

<sup>24</sup> See Kidd 1997 on *Phaen.* 31. Cicero (at least to the extent that can be inferred from the extant fragments) and Germanicus (*Arat.* 31–39) follow it in their translations.

<sup>25</sup> Hopkinson (1988: 127–129 on *Hymn* 1.55–67; 121–122, his introduction to the hymn) suggests 280 B.C. as a possible composition date; see also Kidd 1997 on *Phaen.* 30.

<sup>26</sup> On the importance of this opening to an understanding of Callimachean (and Ovidian) poetics, see Goldhill 1986: esp. 27–30.

<sup>27</sup> In fact, the *Hymn to Zeus* is a model of which Ovid appears to have been very fond, for he uses it not only here, but also in *Am.* 3.10, and earlier in the *Fasti* as well, at 4.203–210. On the birth of Cretan Zeus in *Am.* 3.10, see Boyd 1997: 71–73; on the scene in *Fasti* 4, see Barchiesi 1994: 182–183 = 1997a: 194–195; Fantham 1998 on 4.197–214.

The epithet Ὠλένιος appears first in this passage from Aratus, where the scholiast explains that the adjective incorporates a play on ὠλένη, referring to the crook of the arm in which Amalthea holds the divine baby to nurse him.<sup>28</sup>

Ovid's use of the epithet in this setting clearly points to Aratus, therefore, as an initial source of inspiration, as does his decision to tell the story of Jupiter's birth at this point. As Ovid continues, however, he shifts his focus away from the Aratean constellation and back to the Callimachean version of Zeus' birth, in which Rhea entrusts the newborn Zeus to the Arcadian nymph Neda, who transports the baby to a hiding-place in Crete and there entrusts him in turn to Adrasteia. This nurse has a she-goat named Amalthea, whose job it is to feed the divine child (Callim. *Hymn* 1.33–48).<sup>29</sup>

Ovid compresses this tale into fewer than seven verses, making a few alterations along the way to streamline the action of the fuller (and somewhat repetitious) Callimachean tale. Now Amalthea is both nymph and nurse: like Neda she is charged with concealing the baby in Crete (Νέδη δέ σε δῶκε κομίζειν/ κευθμόν ἔσω Κρηταίων, Callim. *Hymn* 1.33–34; *dicitur in silvis oculuisse Iovem*, *F.* 5.116), and like Adrasteia she owns a she-goat, unnamed by Ovid except as Capella. There is no reference here to the Arcadian tradition regarding Zeus' birth, with which Callimachus had begun his hymn; Ovid's two references to Crete (*Cretaeta* . . . *Ida*, 115, and *Dictaeos* . . . *greges*, 118) place his tale securely within the frame of reference provided by the second half of Callimachus' poem.<sup>30</sup>

This frame of reference in turn has implications for how we are to read the scene in *Fasti* 5. Zeus' birth on Crete had been a relatively uncontroversial "fact" of myth<sup>31</sup> before Callimachus raised doubts about its authenticity; but in the opening of *Hymn* 1, Callimachus turns this tradition into a logical enigma, asserting that the Cretans who claim Zeus' birthplace as their own cannot be trusted, for Cretans are always liars.<sup>32</sup> His decision to follow the alternative Arcadian tradition, therefore, makes perfect sense; but his eventual restoration of

<sup>28</sup> Bömer, *F.* on 5.113 notes three ancient etymologies for *Olenius*: the first is the apparent Aratean reference to ὠλένη (on which, see also Kidd 1997 on *Phaen.* 164); the second, found in Erat. *Catast.* 13, Hyg. *Poet. astr.* 2.13, and perhaps alluded to at Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.202, identifies Amalthea as the daughter of Hephaistos' son Olenos; and the third is derived from an alternative tradition locating Zeus' birth at Olenos in Achaea (see Bölte 1937). Clearly, all three are relevant to, and would suit, the Ovidian context; but the relevance of the Aratean instance is best supported by surrounding allusions to Aratus. See also O'Hara 1996b: 247, noting a possible pun on Olenos (< ὠλένη) in Damoetas' riddle at Virg. *Ecl.* 3.104–105, in a poem which earlier (60) incorporates an Aratean opening much like Ovid's: *ab Iove principium*. O'Hara cites Putnam 1965 for further discussion of the pun in *Ecl.* 3.

<sup>29</sup> See McLennan 1977.

<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, the *dicitur* of 116 is a typical "Alexandrian footnote," directing us back to compare the Callimachean and Ovidian versions; for the term, see Ross 1975: 78; see also Hinds 1987: 40, 58, n. 22 and 1998: 1–5.

<sup>31</sup> See Bömer, *F.* on 5.113 for the tradition, beginning with Hes. *Op.* 477–484.

<sup>32</sup> "Κρητες αἰὲ ψεύσται," *Hymn* 1.8, a saying generally attributed to Epimenides, himself a Cretan. On the identity of the speaker of these words in Callimachus' hymn, see Hopkinson 1984 for a summary of opinion; see also Clauss 1986.

Zeus to the Cretan cave as the location of his nursery is thereby made all the more suspect. How are we to take this tale when we have already been told not to trust tales concerning Crete? Callimachus himself gives us a second warning about the veracity of his narrative when, later in the same hymn, he expresses a desire to be a convincing liar: ψευδοίμην ἄϊοντος ἃ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκούην, 65.<sup>33</sup> The effect is to place the entire narrative in doubt. Which story can we believe—if any? Or is the authority that Callimachus claims for himself a mirage?

Ovid's endorsement of the Cretan tale has significant implications, then, for our reading of this first episode after the book's second proem. Ovid indicates clearly that his authority for this tale comes from Callimachus; yet the reliability of Callimachus as authority is cast into doubt by the very tale Ovid chooses to recall.<sup>34</sup> Much as with the battle of the Muses, Ovid here simultaneously sends us back to his sources and thwarts our ability to rely upon them. As we shall see presently, there is reason to doubt the presence of reliable authority behind a number of the tales in *Fasti* 5; as it is, the story of Jupiter's birth when placed in such close proximity to the aporetic battle of the Muses makes the potential for poetic lies on Ovid's part an inextricable feature of the book's narrative. I wish now, therefore, to turn my attention away from tracing the poetic genealogy of Ovid's tales as a form of authority and legitimization, and towards Ovid's unauthorized version of May.

### III. MARVELOUS BIRTHS: MARS

The necessary antagonism of his mother Rhea towards his father Saturn and Jupiter's special status as Amalthea's (or Adrasteia's) foster-child<sup>35</sup> are familiar features of this myth, and make a pleasant enough story with which to open this book. The description of the origins of the Horn of Plenty, created from one of the horns of Capella accidentally broken in the course of her service to baby Jupiter (5.121–124),<sup>36</sup> gives Ovid the opportunity to outdo the reference to Capella's catasterism with which the episode opened: now we learn that the transformed Capella is to be joined among the stars by a second new constellation, her horn (5.127–128):

<sup>33</sup> See Hopkinson 1984: 144; Goldhill 1986.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. also *F.* 4.203–204, on the story of Jupiter's birth: *pro magno teste vetustas/ creditur; acceptam parce movere fidem*, words with which Ovid once again draws particular attention both to the provenance of the tale and to its questionable reliability; and Barchiesi 1994: 169–175 = 1997a: 180–186.

<sup>35</sup> There is no nurse in Hesiod's version other than Gaia herself (*Op.* 479); on Hesiod's reference to Αἰγαίῳ ἐνὶ ὄρει as the location of the cave, see West 1978: *ad loc.*

<sup>36</sup> The cornucopia has a long history, found as early as Pherecydes of Athens (*FGrH* 3 F 42) and Anac. fr. 8 (361 P), both of whom appear to have linked the horn with Amalthea; cf. also Phocylides fr. 3 West. See also, e.g., Plaut. *Pseud.* 671; Hor. *Od.* 1.17.14 (with Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: *ad loc.*); and Strabo 3.2.14 (quoting Anacreon) and 10.2.19 (associating the origins of the cornucopia not with Amalthea and Zeus but with the battle between Heracles and Achelous, on which see also *Met.* 9.85–88 and Bömer, *Met.*: *ad loc.*). Cf. Otto 1890: 94, and schol. on Callim. *Hymn* 1.49.

[i.e., *Iuppiter*] *sidera nutricem, nutricis fertile cornu  
fecit, quod dominae nunc quoque nomen habet.*

While this couplet neatly frames and closes the story of Jupiter's birth and allows Ovid to move on to something else, several features of this story will nonetheless appear again elsewhere in *Fasti* 5. I want now to consider two other divine births described in this book, and to begin to look at how Ovid plays with variations on a theme as one means of bringing his diverse material into a novel (though museless) harmony. I shall call the technique he uses "narrative patterning," since as we follow individual narrative threads through the fabric of the book we shall begin to see thematic repetitions in the narrative, and thus, the emergence of a number of intertwined patterns in *Fasti* 5.

The antagonism of Rhea towards Saturn was motivated by the god's relentless desire to annihilate their offspring. Soon thereafter in *Fasti* 5, we hear of Juno's antagonism toward her mate, likewise provoked by his behavior—though in this case he is not destroying their children but reproducing without his mate's assistance (*F.* 5.231–232):

*sancta Iovem Iuno nata sine matre Minerva  
officio doluit non eguisse suo.*

The story is a familiar one—in fact, much like the tale of Jupiter's hidden babyhood, Ovid's ultimate source for this tale is Hesiod. Also Hesiodic is the information that Hera too gave birth without her mate's assistance (οὐ φιλότῃτι μίγεισα, *Theog.* 927): the child thus born, according to Hesiod, was Hephaestus.<sup>37</sup> Ovid, however, introduces a different source for the tradition of Juno's parthenogenesis—and as is often the case, this alternative source offers an alternative story of Juno's retaliatory reproduction. Ovid's source is not a Muse—how, after the poem, could it be?—but the goddess Flora, introduced by Ovid at 5.183 to provide information about her origins, powers, and festival. Ovid has invested her with great authority as a source, allowing her to speak at length and with only brief interruptions from him;<sup>38</sup> and he highlights his rationale for doing so by the opening request which he addresses to her (5.191–192):

*"ipsa doce quae sis: hominum sententia fallax;  
optima tu proprii nominis auctor eris."*

<sup>37</sup> Cf. *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 305–355, for the story that Hera, disappointed by the lameness of her first parthenogenically produced child, next produces Typhon by herself; and Stes. fr. 62 *PMG* (= fr. 239 *Davies*): Τυφώεα· Ἡσίοδος Γῆς θενεαλογεῖ· Στησίχορος δὲ "Ἡρας μόνης κατὰ μνησικακίαν Διὸς τεκούσης αὐτόν. Cf. also West 1966 on *Theog.* 820–880. The story of Hera's production of Typhon is a doublet for the tale of Gaia's production of Typhoeus—in each case, the pre-eminent female divinity, associated with earth and fertility, is single parent of a divine serpent meant to challenge Zeus or, in his turn, Apollo: see Sourvinou-Inwood 1986: esp. 226–227.

<sup>38</sup> See Miller 1983: 174–179.

Ovid thus explicitly makes Flora her own authority;<sup>39</sup> and in the inventive tale which follows, we can see that Flora takes Ovid at his word and creates a past for herself, building a history out of analogies with long-familiar stories. A brief example of Flora's self-invention through analogy is the story she tells early on in her narrative regarding her rape by Zephyrus—she explains that he had received permission from his more famous rapist brother, Boreas, to take her by force (5.201–204):

"ver erat, errabam: Zephyrus conspexit, abibam;  
insequitur, fugio: fortior ille fuit.  
et dederat fratri Boreas ius omne rapinae,  
ausus Erechthea praemia ferre dono."

Flora's reference to the well-known tale of Orithyia's rape by Boreas allows her to abbreviate her own experience to a pithy couplet—we all know, she suggests, how these rape-stories go.<sup>40</sup> When she arrives at the story of Juno's parthenogenesis, therefore, we have already been prepared to hear a story that, although new, is closely analogous to another long-familiar tale: the couplet quoted earlier, with its reference to the birth of Minerva (231–232), prepares us to hear about another unusual divine birth.<sup>41</sup> The authority of Flora has by now been established.

While traveling to Ocean to complain about her husband's unspouselike behavior, Juno stops to rest and to visit Flora (231–234). When Flora offers a sympathetic ear, Juno relays her unhappy tale, ending with a request for Flora's help (235–250). Flora produces a magical flower (*Oleniis . . . mihi missus ab arvis/flos*, 251–252), with which she touches Juno; no sooner said than done, Juno becomes pregnant (*tangitur et tacto concipit illa sinu*, 256). The child thus born is Mars;<sup>42</sup> and as Flora comments at the outset of her story, Jupiter still does not know the facts and it would be best to keep it that way: *Iuppiter hoc, ut adhuc, nesciat usque, precor* (230).

Ovid's Flora seems to be entirely his own creation, assembled from allusions to what were probably among Ovid's favorite poems. Certainly the cosmogonic and theogonic poetry of Hesiod was a major preoccupation and inspiration for him,<sup>43</sup> as it was for several generations of Latin writers; and his familiarity with, and

<sup>39</sup> See Fantham 1992: 49–52. Cf. Newlands 1995: 108.

<sup>40</sup> In addition to Boreas and Orithyia's popularity in Attic tragedy and vase-painting, see, e.g., Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.212–218; Ov. *Met.* 6.675–721 and Bömer's introduction to the story, *ad loc.* See also Porte 1983: 880 for the suggestion that Boreas and Orithyia are the models for Flora's autobiography.

<sup>41</sup> There is no ancient parallel for Ovid's Flora's tale, although Bömer (*F.*: *ad loc.*) notes an odd etymology connected with Mars and preserved by Festus (86 L): *Gradivus Mars appellatus est . . . quia gramine sit ortus, quod interpretantur, quia corona graminea in re militari maximae est honorationis*. Mars' epithet *Gradivus* appears later in this book, at *F.* 5.556; but the difference between a name associating him with grass and a story of origin associating his birth with a magical flower are different enough to make interdependence seem unlikely.

<sup>42</sup> Elsewhere, the son of Zeus/Jupiter and Hera/Juno: see Hes. *Theog.* 921–922.

<sup>43</sup> See esp. Myers 1994.

liking for, the Homeric hymns (including the *Hymn to Demeter*, important for Flora's portrait) is evident throughout his long career.<sup>44</sup> But Ovid does not stop with allusion to his models in creating Flora; he moves outward from them, filling a gap in Roman literary tradition as he does so. Fantham has shown how Ovid picks up on a gap in the text of Virgil's *Georgics*, giving form and life to the one rustic divinity included by Varro but excluded by Virgil from their respective lists of the twelve chief rustic divinities.<sup>45</sup> I want to add to Fantham's discussion two observations: first, that Flora herself (and so Ovid) points to the innovation upon which she is about to embark in telling of Juno's parthenogenesis by suggesting as she begins that the tale she tells is one which we and Ovid may not know: "*Mars quoque, si nescis, per nostras editus artes*" (5.229).<sup>46</sup> Second, as Juno attempts to win Flora's help, she persuades the hesitant goddess by offering her anonymity: the author of this deed, Juno promises, will be hidden ("*fer, precor, auxilium!*" *dixit, 'celabitur auctor' / et Stygiae numen testificatur aquae*," 249–250). With both of these statements, Flora (along with Ovid) signals the novelty and lack of authority for the tale she tells us; it really comes as no surprise, then, that Jupiter, himself a master of deceit since the time of his birth (and, hardly coincidentally, a time to which this book has already directed our attention), is himself outdone by the "nobody" goddess Flora.

Finally, I want to suggest one other way in which Ovid effects the interrelationship of ostensibly discrete episodes in the *Fasti*: consider the terms in which Flora describes the special flower she uses to impregnate Juno. It has come to her from Olenian fields (*Oleniis . . . ab arvis*, 251). The rare epithet *Olenius* has provoked the notice of commentators, eager to speculate on the geographical origin and botanical identification of the plant Flora uses. I want to observe here that, while the topography of botany is not entirely irrelevant to Ovid's purpose,<sup>47</sup> we should probably not think it wholly coincidental that this word appears here for only the second time in the *Fasti*, the first and only other occasion being the one we encountered earlier in the story of Jupiter's birth (*Oleniae . . . Capellae*, 5.113).<sup>48</sup> The story of one divine birth has a fleeting echo, then, in the story of

<sup>44</sup> See Hinds 1987: esp. 51–98; Boyd 1997: 67–79. For the suggestion that Flora is an Italic Ceres, see Porte 1983: 880.

<sup>45</sup> Varro *RR* 1.1.6, and Fantham 1992: 49–50.

<sup>46</sup> Newlands (1995: 110) notes the wordplay here in Flora's/Ovid's use of the word *editus* to describe Mars' creation: he is conceived of (!) by them as a literary creation.

<sup>47</sup> Bömer (*F.*: *ad loc.*) notes that the place referred to here must be the Achaean Olenos, home of a famous shrine of Asklepios; the medicinal properties of the flower would be ensured by this source. Ovid, however, offers no clear indication of the site he imagines here. Cf. also Porte 1983: 881–883.

<sup>48</sup> Other occurrences of the word in Ovid are limited to *Met.* 3.594 and *Her.* 18.188. Cf. also *Met.* 10.69, where, within a simile, we find a character named Olenos, metamorphosed along with his wife Lethaea into stone, but their tale is found nowhere else: see Bömer, *Met.*: *ad loc.* Porte (1983: 883–884) suggests that we are dealing here with an Ovidian pun on the name of the famous Lycian prophet Olen, known from *Hdt.* 4.35 and mentioned by Callimachus at *Hymn* 4.305. Pausanias (2.13.3) reports that Olen composed a hymn in honor of Hera and her two children, Ares and Hebe.

another; and while Ovid can hardly intend for us to linger over the repetition and its implications, the echo offers one more indication of how Ovid imposes a sort of order on his material even as he revels in its randomness.

#### IV. SOME STELLAR HUNTERS

The *sphragis* with which Ovid concludes the description of his encounter with Flora occurs at an important moment (*F.* 5.375–378):

*omnia finierat: tenues secessit in auras,  
mansit odor; posses scire fuisse deam.  
floreat ut toto carmen Nasonis in aevo,  
sparge, precor, donis pectora nostra tuis.*

The imagery with which Ovid describes Flora's departure suggests an almost symbiotic relationship between the two—she is all fragrance, while he is all nose.<sup>49</sup> Which one of them has created the poetry just completed? Who inspires whom? The next story to which we shall turn suggests that Flora is effectively Ovid's muse and role-model, now that the official nine have proven so useless; and yet the incongruous humor of this story also suggests that Ovid's self-made muse has her limits, and that her authority, such as it is, can bring him to unheard-of extremes. The story is the second instance in this book of an irregular birth—not precisely parthenogenesis, since in this case no female is involved; but autochthony is a defective term, too, since it ignores entirely the humorous novelty we shall discover in Ovid's narrative of the birth and triumphant catasterism of Orion (*F.* 5.493–544).<sup>50</sup>

With a couplet correcting his readers' presumed assumption that Orion is visible on 11 May, Ovid promises an explanation for this constellation: *signi causa canenda mihi*, 494. Orion's birth and childhood in fact have nothing to do with his eventual catasterism, so we might expect that Ovid will handle them as summarily as, earlier in Book 5, he has handled the story of Hyas' birth and death, and of the catasterism of his weeping sisters (165–182). We learn in the earlier tale that Hyas and his sisters were children of Atlas and Aethra, Hyas being the eldest (171–172); that Hyas loved hunting, but as he matured and took on increasingly dangerous beasts, he dared too much and became prey to a lioness (173–178); and that his sisters so surpassed all others in their mourning for their brother that they were transformed into stars, and took their name from him (179–180). All

Porte (1983: 883–884) suggests that, thanks to Callimachus, Ovid knew of Olen, and in describing Flora's magical flower as *Olenis* . . . *missus ab arvis* (251), he intends the phrase to have both literal (i.e., "from the fields around Olenus") and metaphorical (i.e., "the fields evoked by the poet Olen") meanings.

<sup>49</sup>Barchiesi 1994: 123 = 1997a: 134; cf. Miller 1983: 178–179; Newlands 1995: 123. See also Callim. *Aet.* fr. 7.13–14 Pf., a request by the poet to the Graces to place their perfumed hands on his poetry.

<sup>50</sup>Newlands (1995: 110–111) also notes a similarity between the two birth stories.

this occurs swiftly; there is no lingering over details, virtually no development of character or personality; the stellar status of Hyas' sisters is the one "permanent" feature in the story.

I shall return to several other features of the Hyas tale presently; but first let us consider Ovid's very different treatment of Orion. We in fact begin not with Orion at all, but with the gods Jupiter, Neptune, and Mercury, who in the course of their travels on earth are invited by a certain Hyrieus to take shelter at his home (*F.* 5.495–502). Hyrieus, characterized as a farmer and old man (*senex Hyrieus, angusti cultor agelli*, 499), has a modest home and modest resources to share; but, in an abbreviated tale highly reminiscent of the story of Baucis and Philemon in *Met.* 8, Hyrieus stokes the fire, serves beans and vegetables, and pours ruddy wine for his guests (503–512).<sup>51</sup>

Heretofore having concealed their divinity (*disimulantque deos*, 504), the gods now reveal their identity. After his immediate fear passes, Hyrieus resumes his bustling, sacrificing his one ox and bringing out the best wine. The modest meal is a successful divine feast (515–522), and Jupiter decides to show his gratitude by offering Hyrieus the fulfilment of his greatest wish (523–524). Hyrieus in turn explains to Jupiter a logical predicament: since his wife passed on some time ago, he has remained faithful to her memory by honoring his promise to her not to remarry (525–528). Thus, he has been unable to satisfy his one great wish, to have a child: *nec coniunx et pater esse volo* (530).

Before proceeding to the solution provided by his visitors, it is worth wondering where in the world Hyrieus had gotten the idea that such a thing was possible: it is, after all, the ultimate misogynist's dream, and as such has since time immemorial been impossible of fulfilment.<sup>52</sup> In fact, however, he must know already that gods can do such things; not only is he likely to have heard of Minerva's birth from Jupiter's head, but, as the imminent epiphany of Mars on earth at *F.* 5.550 immediately after Orion's surprising birth and abrupt catasterism will soon remind us, Juno too, with the help of Flora, has successfully reproduced parthenogenically. I do not mean to suggest, of course, that we are to imagine Hyrieus as somehow "reading" the narrative of which he himself is a part; but in fact this is very much the behavior Ovid indulges in himself and expects of his readers. Just as Flora had used analogies to create an identity and a past for herself, so we see Ovid looking to the stories he has already told and using them as raw material from which to build something new. The story of Orion's birth that Ovid now proceeds to tell is far-fetched and in questionable taste; but then, the same could be said about Flora's tale of the conception of Mars. The willing suspension of disbelief that is

<sup>51</sup> For verbal reminiscences, see Bömer, *F.* on 5.493, and Hollis 1990: 341–354 on "The Hospitality Theme" in ancient literature. Cf. also Hollis 1970 on *Met.* 8.611–724, and Harrison 1993 on the influence of the *Hecale* on an episode in *F.* 3.

<sup>52</sup> See, for example, Hes. *Theog.* 590–612 (and West 1966: *ad loc.*); Eur. *Hipp.* 616–624 (and Barrett 1964: *ad loc.*).



framed so nicely by Flora's muse-like presence is much more difficult to maintain in reference to Orion's birth; Ovid nonetheless proceeds, taking full advantage of our memory as readers as he follows in Flora's footsteps.

Orion's conception proceeds without delay. The three gods, taking advantage of the available hide from the recently-slaughtered bull, stand behind the hide, "water" it, and then cover the damp spot with soil. Ten months pass, and Orion is born (531–534). Hyrieus names the boy Urion in honor of the way in which he was conceived; the passage of time has caused a change in the initial vowel of his name, and so he is now called Orion (535–536). Having built up carefully to this grand moment, Ovid now allows the remainder of the story to be told in a quick four couplets: Orion's growth, his attachment to Diana, his hybriistic challenge to wild beasts, Earth's production of a scorpion which attacks Latona, Orion's resistance, and his subsequent catasterism by Latona, are all rapidly surveyed (537–544). In fact, we never really hear of Orion's death at all; instead, Ovid encapsulates in the words *obstitit Orion* (543) Orion's resistance and its consequences.

This tale is curious.<sup>53</sup> Rather than suggesting the possibility of a derivation of Orion (or Urion) from Hyrieus, Ovid offers us an elaborate etymology of obscure pedigree. According to Euphron (fr. 101 Powell), Hyrieus the son of Poseidon is Orion's father; and it may be the case (hypothetically, given the limited information available from the fragments) that Euphron proceeded to make an explicit etymological link between the names of father and son. Our other sources for Orion's life are few and conflicting: Hesiod and Pherecydes appear to have identified Orion as son of Poseidon,<sup>54</sup> while Aristomachus and Parthenius make Hyrieus the father of Orion.<sup>55</sup> As it stands, however, the version of the story Ovid gives us is by far the fullest and most detailed, and we probably are not wrong to suspect that Ovid enjoyed lingering over this tale. Particularly prominent in Ovid's version is the detail regarding Hyrieus' deceased wife, and the consequent logical quandary in which Hyrieus finds himself; elsewhere we hear no mention of a wife, dead or otherwise.<sup>56</sup> Ovid's emphasis on the absence

<sup>53</sup> For the sources regarding Orion, see Fontenrose 1981: 5–7 for a summary. For a different interpretation of the Orion narrative, see Newlands 1995: 111–114.

<sup>54</sup> Hes. fr. 148a M–W = ps.-Erat. *Catast.* 32; Pherec. Ath. *apud* Apollod. 1.4.3. Apollodorus (*loc. cit.*) also knows of a tradition in which Orion is earth-born (= Pherec. Ath., *FGrH* 3 F 52).

<sup>55</sup> Arist. *apud* Hyg. *Poet. astr.* 2.34 = Hes. fr. 148b M–W; Parth. 20. Hyginus (*Poet. astr.* 2.34) alludes to a Pindaric version of the story of Orion's birth, noting that, while Aristomachus locates the birth in Thebes, Pindar places it on Chios. But there is no clear evidence for this among the fragments of Pindar's poetry: see fr. 72f Snell, and the following note. In Corinna fr. 654.3.35–36 *PMG*, an apparently Theban Hyrieus is identified as son of Poseidon; Orion is mentioned shortly thereafter (in a genealogical context), but his connection to Hyrieus is implicit at best.

<sup>56</sup> The two fullest versions of this story besides Ovid's appear in Hyginus *Fabulae* and *Poetica astronomica*: in Hyg. *Fab.* 195, the three gods visit a king Hyrieus in *Thrace* and are received hospitably; Mercury is the one to come up with the bull's-hide plan; and so Orion is born (the etymology is only implied here); in Hyg. *Poet. astr.* 2.34, two gods (Jupiter and Mercury) visit a certain Hyrieus in *Thebes*

of a biologically essential parent leads us back to the story told by Flora, and Juno's determination to reproduce alone. This association in turn raises once again the problem of poetic authority in a museless poem. The Muses had been unwilling, or unable, at the beginning of the book to authorize any one of the three etymologies proposed for May; consequently, in this episode we see Ovid, perforce without their help, making hilarious sense of two alternative traditions regarding Orion's birth.

With the story told in *Fasti* 5, Ovid manages to offer a solution in which both Neptune and Hyrieus can be thought of as fathers of Orion—Neptune as one of the three gods who answer Hyrieus' prayer by fertilizing the soil-covered oxhide and Hyrieus as the foster father who desires and raises the baby thus produced. Comparison with the similar but more elaborate tale of Baucis and Philemon's hospitality and its consequences in *Met.* 8 lends further support to this reading, for Neptune's inclusion in *Fasti* 5 is the one addition Ovid makes to the cast of divine characters portrayed in *Met.* 8.<sup>57</sup> There, Jupiter and Mercury alone had visited the earth and stopped at the home of Baucis and Philemon; the addition of Neptune to the divine group visiting Hyrieus in *Fasti* 5—and consequently, the meeting of the two presumptive fathers—is, therefore, a sort of narrative shorthand indicating Ovid's intention to reconcile the two competing traditions about Orion's birth.

Ovid's procedure here, in bringing together and introducing to each other, as it were, characters from two variant versions of Orion's birth, is paralleled, and indeed modelled, in another of the catasterisms found in *Fasti* 5: the meeting of Hercules and Achilles in the cave of the centaur Chiron (5.379–414). Chiron's tutelage of Achilles is a familiar mythical event, as is his accidental demise caused by the poisoned arrows of Hercules;<sup>58</sup> but this "meeting of the minds" is a novelty, to which Ovid draws our attention just after he has set the scene (389–390):

*stare simul casu Troiae duo fata videres;  
hinc puer Aeacides, hinc Iove natus erat.*

---

(or *Chios*), are made welcome, and respond to Hyrieus' request for a child by proceeding as in Ovid's version; and so Orion is born (here, the etymology is made explicit). We know from Suet. *Gram.* 20 that Ovid was friendly with C. Iulius Hyginus, freedman of Augustus, scholar, and Palatine librarian; thus, Ovid could well have been inspired by this Hyginus' work in composing his tale of Orion. Much less clear, however, is whether we are dealing with one, two, or even three different people named Hyginus, and which of the two works mentioned here, if either, was composed by Ovid's friend. On the current state of confusion regarding the identity and date of Hyginus and his/their works, see the recent Teubner editions of *Poetica astronomica* and *Fabulae*, each of which takes a different position on the question: Viré 1992 and Marshall 1993; see also Harries 1989: 180–181, nn. 79–80. In the face of this confusion, it is nonetheless clear that Ovid's narrative is fundamentally novel and ingeniously integrated into its setting.

<sup>57</sup> See also the version of the story told by Hyg. *Poet. astr.* 2.34 (above, n. 56), as well as the uncertainty expressed there regarding the relationship between this work and Ovid's.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Bömer, *F.* on 5.379; Brookes 1994: 445.

Ovid's use of *videres* is striking: this is one of a very few occasions in the *Fasti* when he invites us to visualize something in the narrative.<sup>59</sup> The result is to heighten our awareness of Ovid's new juxtaposition here. Hercules' tendency to pop up unexpectedly on the scene has by now become something of a cliché in ancient myth and literature; indeed, Ovid himself will exploit this cliché again later in *Fasti* 5, first in a tale with which, thanks to Virgil in particular, we are much more familiar, viz., the meeting of Hercules and Evander (643–648), and again when, in an address to the poet, Mercury refers to the number of Hercules' labors as something everyone knows (696). On the former of these occasions, Ovid will use language which emphasizes the repetition: the hexameter *excipit hospitio iuvenem Pallantius heros* (647) contains only the variant patronymic necessary to make it fit its new home, having been lifted otherwise entirely from the Chiron episode: *excipit hospitio iuvenem Philyreius heros* (391).<sup>60</sup> Notice of this feature also suggests the narrative patterning we have already seen elsewhere in *Fasti* 5: the briefly narrated catasterism of Chiron looks ahead to the story of Hyrieus and his son, to the meeting of Evander and Hercules, and to Mercury's narrative concerning Castor and Pollux, while the mention of Evander looks back to Calliope's speech at the beginning of the book, in which she describes how Evander brought the cults of Arcadia, including that of Mercury, to Latium; and it is Mercury, she explains, who is responsible for May's name, having memorialized his mother Maia thereby (5.91–104).<sup>61</sup>

In addition to the "meetings of the minds" found in the stories of both Orion and Chiron, a few other repeated motifs are worth noting: in both, a foster-father is a central character,<sup>62</sup> and in both, we are in exclusively men's worlds.<sup>63</sup> The occurrence of the Chiron-narrative immediately after Ovid's encounter with Flora, and in particular immediately after her story of parthenogenesis (though with the manliest of male offspring, Mars, as the result), takes advantage of this juxtaposition; the unusual emphasis Ovid places on Achilles' identification of the dying Chiron as his virtual father ("*vive, precor, nec me, care, relinque, pater,*" 412) is in sharp contrast to Mars' fatherless state, and it paves the way for the meeting of Orion's two fathers.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>59</sup> See also *posses*, 5.376 (in Flora's *sphragis*). On this device, see Gilmartin 1975 (examples in Latin prose) and Block 1982.

<sup>60</sup> This hexameter-type appears nowhere else in Ovid, although the hemistich *excipit hospitio* appears at *Her.* 15.129; cf. also *accipis hospitio*, *Her.* 12.29.

<sup>61</sup> For the wordplay of the Chiron episode, see Weiden Boyd forthcoming. For other discussions of this episode, see Santini 1976 and Brookes 1994.

<sup>62</sup> Similarly, Jupiter has been depicted as a foster-child earlier in this book (5.115–124); but in his case, all the central characters in the story besides Jupiter himself are female.

<sup>63</sup> Newlands (1995: 115–122) emphasizes the justness and humanity of Chiron, but not the masculine exclusivity of this scene.

<sup>64</sup> For this emphasis on Chiron as father-figure, see Brookes 1994: 445–446 and Newlands 1995: 118.

Before leaving the story of Orion, I want to turn back once more to another catasterism: that of the Hyades, sisters of the dead Hyas (*F.* 5.163–182). I have already noted how dissimilar are the structures of the stories of Orion and Hyas: with both, we hear of both the birth and the death of the hero, yet whereas the Hyas tale is unexceptional, even perfunctory, that of Orion is remarkably odd. But other features in the two stories demonstrate how Ovid creates our expectation of similarity or analogy even as he exploits it. Significant differences make the stories of Hyas and Orion unique; at the same time, significant similarities indicate that Ovid means to juxtapose them.

Both Hyas and Orion are bold hunters. Hyas' audacity, however, develops only gradually: at first, he goes after rather skittish and timid animals, only later taking on the fiercer sort. And it is this that leads to his death (*F.* 5.173–178):

*dum nova lanugo est, pavidos formidine cervos  
terret, et est illi praeda benigna lepus:  
at postquam virtus annis adolevit, in apros  
audet et hirsutas comminus ire leas;  
dumque petit latebras fetae catulosque leaenae,  
ipse fuit Libycae praeda cruenta ferae.*

From deer and hares to boar and lionesses—a natural progression, that leads inexorably to Hyas' death. Orion is a hunter, too, but in his case, so famous is his reputation as hunter (and so repetitious would it be to hear of his hunting education so soon after having read of Hyas') that Ovid need not spell out his career. Instead, we hear of his companionship to Diana and of his rash challenge to the gods regarding his ability to overcome any beast (*F.* 5.537–540):

*creverat immensum: comitem sibi Delia sumpsit;  
ille deae custos, ille satelles erat.  
verba movent iras non circumspecta deorum:  
"quam nequeam" dixit "vincere nulla fera est."*

The circumlocution here tells us implicitly that Orion is a bold hunter; his boast comes as the result of a proven record of success against wild animals. Likewise, his sudden, almost monstrous growth (*creverat immensum*, 537) is Ovid's way of substituting for narrative the ellipsis of an adolescence comparable to that of Hyas. Again, unlike Hyas, Orion appears not to have been the victim of his own audacity: whereas Hyas is killed by a lioness, Orion stands up against the scorpion produced by Tellus, and so saves the mother of his beloved Diana, Latona (541–543)<sup>65</sup>—or so it seems. Ovid's reticence about the actual cause of

<sup>65</sup> In the struggle between Orion and a monster produced by Earth can also be heard an echo of the cosmogonic tale with which we dealt earlier (see above, 67–70), in Polyhymnia's story of Maiestas: yet another example of narrative patterning.

Orion's death is curious: does the scorpion get him or not?<sup>66</sup> We can only infer that Orion's death does not result from his daring nor even from his hybris, but comes instead as a reward (543–544):

*obstitit Orion. Latona nitentibus astris  
addidit et "meriti praemia" dixit "habe."*

We have, then, two hunters with virtually identical careers in profile; yet Ovid emphasizes the differences in telling their stories, so that one might almost be said to complete the other. In fact, the narrative gaps Ovid leaves in each of these stories make them seem more alike than they really are—as does the etymological play upon which each story is based. O'Hara has demonstrated how, in his Hyas-narrative, Ovid performs a delicate balancing act, introducing and controlling within the framework of the tale three different etymologies for the name of the group of stars known as Hyades: from the translation into Latin of their name as *Suculae*, Piglets (cf. *F.* 5.164, and the *grex* of Hyades); from their identification as nurses of Dionysus (*F.* 5.167); and from their role as weeping sisters of Hyas (*F.* 5.171–172), their name thus combining a memory of his name and of their own weeping (> ὕειν).<sup>67</sup> A fourth etymology for the Hyades (*navita quas Hyadas Graius ab imbre vocat*, 166), noted by O'Hara as a gloss on Virgil's references to the Hyades, can also be seen to function as an analogy that makes the etymology of Orion > Hyrieus > οὐρεῖν plausible, too: they are starry embodiments of heaven-born water, just as is the constellation Orion. Indeed, Isidore (*Orig.* 3.71.10) provides an explanation for the etymology of Orion that could easily be used to etymologize Hyas/Hyades, too: *dictus Orion ab urina, id est ab inundatione aquarum*.<sup>68</sup>

#### V. SIBLING PIETAS

This comparison of Hyas' and Orion's careers emphasizes a curious feature of Ovid's etymological interest in the Hyades: as the sisters of Hyas, these girls (and their stellar namesakes) bear not a patronymic—and certainly there is one of distinguished literary pedigree available, viz., *Atlantides*<sup>69</sup>—, nor even a

<sup>66</sup> Most frequently Orion's demise is said to be the result either of an hybristic attempted assault on Diana or of the success of the earth-bred scorpion: see Bömer, *F.*: *ad loc.*; cf. Newlands 1995: 111.

<sup>67</sup> O'Hara 1992 and 1996a: 271–273; see also O'Hara 1996b: 64, 101, 130, 145, 257–258. For an extensive discussion of the etymology, see also Kidd 1997: 274–275; Farrell 1991: 214–216.

<sup>68</sup> Though peripheral to this discussion, Bömer's observation (*ad loc.*) is of interest, viz., that the repetition of Hyas' name at *F.* 5.179 (*mater Hyan et Hyan maestae flevere sorores*) echoes Virgil's repetition of Hylas' name at *Ecl.* 6.43–44—another youth associated in myth, though very differently, with *inundatio aquarum*. On this echo, see now also Wills 1996: 53–54.

<sup>69</sup> For *Atlantis* (singular), see Hes. *Theog.* 938; Lycoph. *Alex.* 72, 744; Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.916, 4.575, etc. Virg. *Georg.* 1.221 is the first extant example in the plural: see Thomas 1988: *ad loc.*; and German. *Arat.* 322 (in an addition to the Aratean description). The Hyades are daughters of Atlas and Aethra, according to Ovid, and half-sisters of the Pleiades, daughters of Atlas by Pleione (*F.* 3.105, 4.169, 5.84); O'Hara 1992: 54–59; cf. Kidd 1997: 244, 246, 274–275.

matronymic,<sup>70</sup> but an adelphonymic.<sup>71</sup> The oddity of this fact is both marked and explained by Ovid in his description of the girls' reaction to Hyas' death (179–182):

*mater Hyan et Hyan maestae flevere sorores  
cervicemque polo suppositurus Atlas.  
victus uterque parens tamen est pietate sororum:  
illa dedit caelum, nomina fecit Hyas.*

The *pietas* they feel toward their sibling has won them this unusual distinction—unusual and even perhaps a bit out of proportion, given Ovid's indication here that the parents of Hyas showed less emotion and more restraint in their mourning than did his sisters.<sup>72</sup>

The almost excessive demonstration of *pietas* attributed to Hyas' sisters gives way immediately to the appearance of Flora on the scene at *F.* 5.183; Ovid has endowed the catasterism of the Hyades with a novel degree of anthropomorphism, but he neither lingers over it nor does he seem to expect us to do so. It is only after we meet Flora, in fact, and observe how she innovates through analogy that we may return to the tale of Hyas and his sisters and realize that, in giving the girls this unusual name, Ovid has provided another key to understanding the narrative in which they appear: just as Hyas proves to be a sort of Orion manqué, his sisters mourn him as did the sisters of Phaethon mourn their dead brother—girls whose endless weeping led to their transformation into alders (or poplars) and who at least in one highly stylized Alexandrian setting are memorialized by the adelphonymic *Phaethontides* (*Ecl.* 6.62).<sup>73</sup> At the close of *Fasti* 5 as well, Ovid provides an ironic reminder of his own cleverness in this narrative: in noting the movement of the constellations at the end of the month, he incorrectly describes the rising of the Hyades as the rising of Hyas (*continuaque die sidus Hyantis*

<sup>70</sup> Like their sisters the Pleiades: see previous note, and O'Hara 1996b: 257.

<sup>71</sup> The term is used by Coleman 1977 on *Ecl.* 6.62, at the appearance of *Phaethontides*; Coleman cites Priscian *GLK* 2.65 for the term, and offers *Meleagrides* (cf. Varro *RR* 3.9.18) as a parallel for *Phaethontides*. Ovid's similar use of *Hyades* as adelphonymic, however, has apparently never been noted as such.

<sup>72</sup> On *pietas* as a thematic link between the catasterisms of Capella and the Hyades, see also Braun 1981: 2365.

<sup>73</sup> Coleman 1977 on *Ecl.* 6.62 has an extensive and useful note on the adelphonymic *Phaethontides* (see also above, n. 71). Cf. Huyck 1987 for the argument that *Phaethontides* is not in fact to be construed as an adelphonymic in Virgil at all; Huyck notes (1987: 217, n. 3) that only four such words are generally identified by scholars as adelphonymics; he does not include (or discuss) *Hyades*. See also Cicero's description of the sisters of Phaethon, in two hexameters added by him to his translation of the *Phaenomena*, as part of a brief description of the constellation/river Eridanus (i.e., not found in Aratus, but in a Ciceronian gloss on Aratus' use of πολὺκλαυτός to describe the river): *quem* [i.e., *Eridanum*] *lacrimis maestae Phaethontis saepe sorores/sparserunt, letum maerenti voce canentes*, *Arat.* 147–148 (cf. Ewbank 1933 on *Arat.* 145; Soubiran 1972: 92); Kidd 1997 on *Phaen.* 360. Cf. also Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 4.597–626; Lucr. 5.396–405 (the latter knows the tale of Phaethon, but does not mention the sisters).

*erit*, 734), almost as if he has forgotten his own story, and now thinks of the catasterized entity not as the weeping girls but as the Orion-like hero.

The story of Hyas and his sisters also offers a more elaborate analogy for the narrative process later in *Fasti* 5, when we hear about Romulus' mourning over the death of his brother Remus (451–480).<sup>74</sup> The source of this tale is Mercury, a factor which will presently prove to be of some importance; but before we consider Ovid's source, let us look at the story his epiphany authorizes. The first thing we hear is that Romulus performed the funeral obsequies for his dead brother while their step-parents Faustulus and Acca mourned (451–454):

*Romulus ut tumultu fraternas condidit umbras,  
et male veloci iusta soluta Remo,  
Faustulus infelix et passis Acca capillis  
spargebant lacrimis ossa perusta suis.*

With this opening, Ovid (not to mention Mercury, his source) alerts us to the fact that this will be no Livian tale of sibling rivalry over auguries and Oedipal rage: our first extended view of Romulus in *Fasti* 5<sup>75</sup> catches him in the middle of an act of *pietas*, witnessed by the foster-parents who had protected the twins since their miraculous discovery as babies. The reference to Remus' lack of swiftness (*male veloci . . . Remo*) also alerts us to the fact that Ovid knows of a tradition in which Remus' slowness (Remus > *remorari*, "to delay") somehow explains his death.<sup>76</sup> In fact, as Ovid's narrative proceeds, no more authoritative witness than the ghost of the dead Remus himself appears before Faustulus and Acca in their sleep to lament his fate, to lay the blame for his death at the door of a certain Celer, and to let Romulus off the hook (455–474). The contrast he draws between Celer and Romulus is particularly worth noting (467–474):

*"quem lupa servavit, manus hunc temeraria civis  
perdidit. o quanto mitior illa fuit!  
saeve Celer, crudelem animam per volnera reddas,  
utque ego, sub terras sanguinolentus eas.  
noluit hoc frater, pietas aequalis in illo est:  
quod potuit, lacrimas in mea fata dedit.  
hunc vos per lacrimas, per vestra alimenta rogate,  
ut celebrem nostro signet honore diem."*

The dead Remus is granted his final request: the twins' step-parents take their appeal to Romulus, who responds by making the next day a religious festival

<sup>74</sup>This episode and its companion in *Fasti* 4 (see below, 87) have been much discussed of late: see, e.g., Harries 1989: 170–171; Stok 1991; Hinds 1992: 142–149; Barchiesi 1994: 101–112 = 1997b: 112–123, and *passim*.

<sup>75</sup>Romulus makes a brief appearance earlier in *Fasti* 5, in the etymological aetiology given by Uranie for the name of May as derived from *maiores* (5.71–76).

<sup>76</sup>See Wiseman 1995: 7, 171, n. 36, and 110–113, on the possibility that the etymology goes back at least to Ennius; see also *Orig. gent. rom.* 21.4.

in honor of the dead and calling it the Remuria; this name has over time been changed to Lemuria (475–482).

This tale is one to which Ovid had made reference in *Fasti* 4 as well; in the earlier episode, we learn that Celer had been appointed by Romulus to urge on the building of the city walls and to prevent any would-be aggressor from crossing them (4.837–840). When Remus makes fun of the walls and leaps across them, therefore, Celer is ready and strikes Remus with a shovel (4.841–844). Even as he recognizes that Celer was just doing his job (4.845–848), the new king laments his brother's loss and grants him funeral honors in which Romulus himself displays his emotion (4.849–852):

*dat tamen exsequias; nec iam suspendere fletum  
sustinet, et pietas dissimulata patet;  
osculaque applicuit posito suprema feretro,  
atque ait "invito frater adempte, vale."*

Noteworthy in this scene too is the *pietas* attributed to Romulus; though civic responsibility has led to private grief, the new king acknowledges the importance of both in his farewell to his brother.<sup>77</sup>

A number of scholars have recently drawn attention to the fact that Romulus' direct address to his dead brother at 4.852 is modelled on Catullus' address to his own dead brother at 68.19–20 and 91–92 and at 101.6 and 10.<sup>78</sup> The effect of this model, however, has received proportionately much less attention: together with Ovid's use of the word *pietas* at 4.850 to describe Romulus' feelings toward his brother, the Catullan echo draws particular attention to the familial relationship between the two brothers. We see this relationship emphasized again in the episode in Book 5, when we hear virtually nothing of Celer's motive, only of the results of his action. Again, Ovid emphasizes the *pietas* Romulus feels and expresses through appropriate funeral honors for Remus; and, just as we saw with the mourning of the Hyades for their dead brother, it is the sibling relationship rather than that between parents and children that is characterized by *pietas* and so emphasized.

<sup>77</sup> The conflict between the public and private sides of Romulus is emphasized in this scene by the implicit parallel Ovid draws between Romulus here and Virgil's Aeneas. At *F.* 4.845–847, we hear of Romulus' suppression of emotion upon hearing of his brother's death: *haec ubi rex didicit, lacrimas introrsus obortas/ devorat et clausum pectore vulnus habet./ flere palam non volt exemplaue fortia servat* . . . . The description of Romulus' inner turmoil and outer fortitude recalls one of our first encounters with Aeneas, at *Aen.* 1.209, when the hero, battered by the great storm off Africa, suppresses his despair and urges his men on (and see Barchiesi 1994: 151 = 1997a: 162). Barchiesi (1994: 152 = 1997a: 164) is troubled by the attribution of *pietas* to Romulus at 4.850, and suggests an editorial change, viz., that the line be read *sustinet, et pietas dissimulata patet*—i.e., "e la sua pietà contraffatta si rivelava agli dei"/"and his simulated piety revealed itself to the gods." The interpretation I have suggested here makes this change unnecessary; cf. also Fantham 1998: *ad loc.*

<sup>78</sup> Harries 1989: 170; Hinds 1992: 147–148; Barchiesi 1994: 152 = 1997a: 163; Fantham 1998: *ad loc.*



In his address from the grave to Faustus and Acca (5.459–474), Remus expresses the complement to Romulus' *pietas*: his loss pains his step-parents because he is half of the children they once prayed for (459–460):

*"en ego dimidium vestri parsque altera voti,  
cernite sim qualis, qui modo qualis eram!"*

Remus' use of the word *dimidium* to describe himself and to characterize the loss of his step-parents suggests how closely bound together emotionally were the two brothers.<sup>79</sup> This concept of an essential pair, one which, at least on the human level, manifests itself through the birth of twins, appears on one occasion later in *Fasti* 5, in the story told by Mercury regarding the entry of Phoebus into Gemini (5.693–694). Ovid asks Mercury to explain to him the origins of this constellation (and so provokes the only catasterism described by a god in the *Fasti*);<sup>80</sup> Mercury responds with a well-known tale, i.e., the rape of Phoebe and Hilaira by Castor and Pollux, the revenge of their suitors Lynceus and Idas, and the death of Castor at the hands of his opponents.<sup>81</sup> Mercury caps his narrative with a quotation from the prayer of Pollux to Jupiter, requesting that the two brothers be allowed to share the immortality earned by Pollux (715–718):

*iamque tibi, Pollux, caelum sublime patebat,  
cum "mea" dixisti "percipe verba, pater:  
quod mihi das uni caelum, partire duobus:  
dimidium toto munere maius erit."*

<sup>79</sup> See Hor. *Od.* 1.3.8, *animae dimidium meae*, in Horace's description of Virgil (and in close proximity to a mention of the constellation Gemini; see Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: *ad loc.*); *Od.* 2.17.5, *te meae . . . partem animae*, in Horace's address to Maecenas (see Nisbet and Hubbard 1978: *ad loc.*). See also Bömer, *F.* on 5.459. The appearance of *dimidium* here also offers what may at first seem to be an arbitrary echo of an image used earlier in *Fasti* 5, when Ovid describes Capella's loss of one of her two horns and its subsequent transformation into the cornucopia: *lac dabat illa deo; sed fregit in arbore cornu, / truncaque dimidia parte decoris erat. / sustulit hoc nympha cinxitque recentibus herbis, / et plenum pomis ad Iovis ora tulit* (5.121–124). Different though these two contexts for the use of *dimidius/dimidium* are, together they emphasize an important characteristic of an entity whose identity is very much bound up in its being one of a pair: just as Romulus needs Remus, and vice versa, so the one horn of Capella is best understood as originally one of the two which stood on her forehead. I suspect that with his use of the epithet *dimidius* to describe one of Capella's two horns, Ovid may also be hinting at a feature of the story of the goat's catasterism that he otherwise suppresses: she is generally said to have been made a constellation along with her two kids, the Haedi. The number of kids is not specified by Aratus; but in his commentary on Aratus (quoted by Kidd 1997 on 157), Hipparchus implies that there are two by his use of μέν and δέ to describe their location; see also *schol. vet. in Arat.* on *Phaen.* 156. Cf. also Virg. *Aen.* 9.668; *Georg.* 1.205; Hor. *Od.* 3.1.28.

<sup>80</sup> Bömer, *F.*: *ad loc.*, referring to Heinze 1919: 96, 1.

<sup>81</sup> The story of the rape of Hilaira and Phoebe is known to us first from the *Cypria*; see also Theoc. 22.137–211; Prop. 1.2.15–16. On Castor and Pollux generally, see Bömer, *F.*: *ad loc.*, and Gow 1952: 2.382–385; on Ovid's version, cf. Harries 1989: 178–180; Newlands 1995: 69–71.

The ethic of brotherly love so strikingly espoused by Romulus in *Fasti* 4 and 5 serves as model here: in death as in life, the two brothers wish to be united in the honor they receive.<sup>82</sup>

The stories of Romulus and Remus and of Castor and Pollux share another common feature: both find their way into Ovid's narrative thanks to the inspiration of Mercury. The influence of Mercury in turn is associated with the Muses by the fact that in the last of the three etymologies for May offered by the Muses at the beginning of the book (5.81–106) Calliope asserts that Mercury himself is responsible for the name of the month, having given it the name of his mother, the Pleiad Maia. This too, we discover, is an act of *pietas*, though not the first, says Calliope, performed by Mercury: his first such act was to give seven strings to the lyre, in honor of the number of Pleiads. With this final detail, Calliope reminds us that Mercury too, though born singly and in isolation to his mother on Mt. Cyllene, is in fact closely linked to the brother to whom he eventually gives the lyre, Apollo.<sup>83</sup>

The emphasis on *pietas*, particularly between siblings, thus pervades *Fasti* 5: first attributed to Mercury itself, it is repeated with Hyas and his sisters and with Remus and Romulus; and although the word *pietas* is not used itself in the concluding episode concerning Castor and Pollux, the latter's reference to his dead brother as his *dimidium* offers another direct link to the emphasis on sibling harmony and devotion in those earlier tales.<sup>84</sup>

The attribution of *pietas* to Mercury first and foremost in the book should also, however, alert us to an implicit undercurrent in Ovid's narrative: *pietas* is, after all, hardly the dominant characteristic of the god whose birth and childhood are traditionally associated with deceit, trickery, and theft, and whose generous bestowal of the lyre on his brother Apollo is preceded by an egocentric claim to divine parity. Calliope herself connects his gift to Apollo with Mercury's thieving nature: *inventor curvae, furibus apte, fidis* (5.104).<sup>85</sup>

As an alternative to the Muses, Mercury is not an inappropriate source of inspiration, given the claim made by Hermes himself in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*—as part of the theogony with which he begins his lyre-performance—that Mnemosyne was assigned Hermes as her lot (Μνημοσύνην μὲν πρῶτα θεῶν

<sup>82</sup> It is of course not a little ironic that the very solution Pollux proposes guarantees that the two brothers will be separated forever; similarly, Romulus' establishment of a festival in honor of his dead brother helps to define his identity as survivor against the image of his brother as victim. The repetition of the image of twins or a twosome at this point in the book also serves, much like the concluding reference to Bootes that I commented on earlier, to frame the narrative of *Fasti* 5: this image has appeared in the first (see above, n. 79) and last catasterisms of the book, as well as in one of its central episodes meant to explain a Roman religious tradition. The dictional parallel suggests a thematic parallel, and the two together give the book a formal unity.

<sup>83</sup> See also the association with the Muses made in the *Hymn. Hom. Merc.*, quoted below, 90.

<sup>84</sup> Newlands (1995: 97–122) organizes much of her discussion of *Fasti* 5 around the theme of *pietas*, but focuses on very different details.

<sup>85</sup> See *Hymn. Hom. Merc.* 13–19 and *passim* for the longevity of this tradition.

ἐγέрайρεν ἀοιδῆ/ μητέρα Μουσάων, ἡ γὰρ λάχε Μαιάδος υἱόν, 429–430).<sup>86</sup> As that same hymn also suggests through the story it tells, of course, wariness in the presence of this god is not unwise: he is full of surprises. Such is the case with Ovid's Mercury, too, and with the explanation he gives for the Lemuria.

Thus, when Ovid offers us at the close of the book a touching depiction of brotherly love in the catasterism of Castor and Pollux, we would do well to notice that the story is in fact told not by the Ovidian narrator himself, but as the reported speech of Mercury, to whom Ovid has turned again for guidance (5.693–720). Mercury's presence, in turn, is the result of his having been the addressee of the preceding episode, in which Ovid invokes the winged-footed son of Jupiter to preside over a description of the ritual performed by *mercatores* at the temple of Mercury on the Aventine (5.663–692). Mercury, it seems, is celebrated on the Aventine on the Ides of May because of his patronage of *merces*—a logical association, Ovid implies, because of the etymological connection between the words *merces* and *Mercurius*. The tradition of an association between Mercury and commerce is of course very old, as is that making Mercury the patron of thieves; and it is this combination, as it turns out, that Ovid is going to exploit. At this festival, merchants perform a purificatory ritual, asking the god to bless both them and their merchandise (5.675–679). Then they recite a prayer, which Ovid reports verbatim: they ask that their *periuria* be washed away and that they be forgiven if they have called upon Mercury to help them bear false witness; and they ask that, their slate having been cleaned by means of this ritual, they be permitted to lie again with impunity (687–690):

*"et pateant veniente die periuria nobis,  
nec curent superi siqua locutus ero.  
da modo lucra mihi, da facto gaudia lucro,  
et fac ut emptori verba dedisse iuvet."*

Critics have, not surprisingly, seen in this scene a playful reminder by Ovid himself that his poetic narrative may sometimes be unreliable and deceptive; the patronage of Mercury is a tell-tale indication of Ovid's poetic license to play with his subject-matter.<sup>87</sup>

Its significance does not end there, however; for as the prayer of the *mercator* suggests, we need to suspect *periuria* from this poetic merchandiser in both the past and the future. And when we look to the past as it regards the narrative of *Fasti* 5, we find an indication of suspect merchandise in the earlier tale over which Mercury presides, that of the killing of Remus by Celer, Remus' appearance in a dream to Faustulus and Acca, and Romulus' subsequent act of *pietas* in his brother's memory. The fact that Mercury is the source for this aetiological tale, rather than one of the Muses, may well make us wonder at its reliability; and

<sup>86</sup> On Hermes as poet/singer, see Sheldermine 1984.

<sup>87</sup> See Harries 1989: 177–180; Miller 1991: 100–105; Barchiesi 1994: 110–111 = 1997a: 120–121; Newlands 1995: 72–73.

even when we look to the version of the tale told in *Fasti* 4, there are reasons to withhold confidence in the narrative. There, Ovid had invoked not Mercury for help, but Quirinus (*urbis origo/ venit; ades factis, magne Quirine, tuis*, 4.807–808), the god who, Ovid tells us at *Fasti* 2.475–476, had been Romulus before his apotheosis.<sup>88</sup> We are left in *Fasti* 4, then, with a story whose source is the very divinity, once a mortal, who has much to gain from a version that shows him in a good light; and the repetition of that version in *Fasti* 5, under the auspices of Mercury, does little to give the tale even a veneer of reliability. Indeed, we should already be suspicious of a tale in which one of the major characters, Celer, embodies one of the qualities prized by the god telling the tale. Fleetness of foot is, after all, a distinctive feature of Mercury, and one which Ovid emphasizes in *Fasti* 5 (*aetherium volucris qui pede carpit iter*, 88; *alato qui pede carpit iter*, 666); and it is the swift Celer to whom is attributed the death of the slow (*male veloci*, 5.452) Remus. I have already noted that, according to one tradition concerning Remus' death, the etymological association of his name with delay is used to explain his death (see above, 86); another feature of this tradition is the correlative association of Romulus with haste and even rashness.<sup>89</sup> In the speech of Remus' ghost, however, rashness is attributed not to Romulus but to the man who had killed Remus at his behest, the citizen Celer: the dead Remus singles him out with the description *manus . . . temeraria civis*, 5.467. We can hardly trust the narrator's divine source. Furthermore, Ovid himself has already revealed on more than one occasion in this book a propensity for unauthorized tales. I would, therefore, suggest that, in having both the god of swiftness and Remus' ghost attribute to Celer the death of Remus, Mercury leads us down a blind alley, offering up a story which pokes holes in its own credibility every step of the way. Indeed, Mercury's story of Celer's act effectively enacts a version of the logical puzzle made prominent in Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* and evoked earlier in *Fasti* 5. Mercury's tale about Celer turns in upon itself, substituting for the rash Romulus the equally rash Celer, who in turn disappears from the story once Mercury has made his point. As if taking a cue from Ovid's mentor Flora, Mercury conceals the identity of Remus' murderer behind the name Celer (*celer*, "may I be hidden"), a name which punningly recalls Flora's promise to Juno: "*celabitur auctor*."<sup>90</sup> Remus' murderer is indeed hidden—behind the convenient epithet *Celer*. Let us also recall for a moment the tradition concerning Romulus the hasty, whose

<sup>88</sup> And whose post-mortem transition to divine status was made newly prominent by the elogium for Romulus that appeared in the forum of Augustus: see Barchiesi 1994: 190–191 = 1997a: 202–203 for the Quirinus scene in *F.* 4, and *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 189 (the elogium of Romulus, cited by Barchiesi 1994: 109 = 1997a: 119). Cf. also Harries 1989: 171.

<sup>89</sup> Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.80.3 (σπουδὴν μανικωτέραν); cf. Diod. Sic. 8.6.1–2; Cic. *Rep.* 2.12 (*perceleriter*). I am indebted for these references to Wiseman 1995: 3, 8–10, and esp. 111, connecting the polarities of slowness and speed reflected in many versions of the story of the twins with the language of augury.

<sup>90</sup> The difference in vowel quantity between *celo* and *celer* is not in and of itself an obstacle to such punning, as is well known: see O'Hara 1996b: 58–62.

rashness is neutralized by his brother's death and who, as sole sovereign with no potentially competitive sibling, will later give himself a bodyguard of men called *Celeres* in memory of the swiftness which won him his throne.<sup>91</sup> In *Fasti* 4, Ovid had noted that *Celer* was summoned by Romulus (*Celer . . . , quem Romulus ipse vocarat*, 4.837); the verb *vocarat* is just ambiguous enough to suggest a second connotation, i.e., that *Celer* was not only summoned but also given his name by Romulus.<sup>92</sup> The implication of his calling *Celer* by name is that Romulus gives to a trusted supporter a name indicative of a quality he prizes and wishes to reinforce. Now, as sole surviving brother, the once-hasty Romulus can afford to create an annual holiday in memory of his dead sibling and so can separate himself even further from *Celer's* deed, making it seem like patriotic necessity in the process. Likewise, the patron god of swiftness can help to put the best possible light on Remus' murder by emphasizing the swift show of *pietas* with which Romulus responds to his loss, a *pietas* for which only *Quirinus* in *Fasti* 4 and *Mercury* in *Fasti* 5 are our sources.<sup>93</sup>

#### VI. VENGEANCE PAST AND *PIETAS* PRESENT

At the outset of this essay I noted how the second proem of this book, *ab Iove surgat opus* (111), directs us back to Ovid's Hellenistic models and through them to the Greek theogonic tradition. It also serves to separate us and Ovid from the Muses and their abortive attempt to instruct us regarding the etymology of May, replacing them with the Cretan Jupiter at birth. As Ovid reminds us repeatedly in *Fasti* 5, he has had to look beyond the Muses for poetic guidance; *Flora* and *Mercury* in particular have filled this need. *Flora*, remarkably, has no parents at all, at least no parents of record; in identifying herself as once the nymph *Chloris* (195–198), she implies that she has a past, but never makes explicit reference to her parents.<sup>94</sup> Her having come from nowhere, as it were, confirms our sense that she is Ovid's own invention. *Mercury*, on the other hand, is a divinity whose parentage is famed in the literary tradition; and *Calliope's* explanation that May is so-called because *Mercury* named the month after his mother gives prominence to *Maia* throughout the book. But we should not overlook the identity of *Mercury's* father in the process: *ab Iove surgit opus*. *Jupiter*, the god whose childish identity

<sup>91</sup> Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.13.1–3; Plut. *Rom.* 26.2.

<sup>92</sup> Cf., e.g., *Met.* 1.691: *Nymphae Syringa vocabant*.

<sup>93</sup> Plut. *Rom.* 10.2 provides an interesting analogy: after describing how the famous *Celer* swiftly departed for Etruria after the murder of Remus and how in his memory the Romans call all speedy people "*celeres*," Plutarch cites as an example Quintus Metellus (i.e., Q. Caecilius [RE 85] Metellus *Celer*), who arranged gladiatorial funeral games for his father only a few days after his father's death. The people so marvelled at his speed, says Plutarch, that they gave him the *cognomen* *Celer*.

<sup>94</sup> Porte (1983: 883) connects Pausanias' notice (2.21.9–22.1) regarding a statue of a maiden named *Chloris* found in the temple of *Latona* at *Argos*, just next to the temple of *Hera Anthea* there, with Ovid's *Chloris/Flora*. The links Porte suggests, however, do not allow us to accept this connection with certainty.

is preserved through deception, is father of a swift and deceitful child;<sup>95</sup> he is also the god who, as an adult, repeatedly deceives the innocent females who cross his path—like Europa, of whose fate we are reminded by Ovid's narrative of the catasterism of Taurus at *F.* 5.603–618. Ovid's second proem also sends us back to *F.* 4.830, Romulus' address to the gods: "*auspicibus vobis hoc mihi surgat opus.*" Romulus utters these words as part of his invocation to the gods to be with him and aid him in the founding of Rome; Jupiter responds with favorable thunder and lightning. Consequently, Rome and its walls are built by Romulus' *alter ego*, Celer: even the words Ovid uses to describe Celer's action echo Romulus' prayer ("*surgat opus*," 830; Celer *urget opus*, 837). Celer then kills Remus. Divine will, it seems, enables the fulfilment of marvelous feats, granting to those who acknowledge it the power to prevail. And as Romulus, with Celer's help, builds his walls, so Ovid, with Flora and Mercury, builds his poem, moving beyond witnessed tradition to create a work that questions the fundamental character of the city whose life it celebrates.<sup>96</sup>

Rome's durability also sends us back once more to the beginnings of *Fasti* 5—in this case, to Ovid's description of the first public festival celebrated in May, that of the Lares Praestites (5.129–146). These Lares, protectors against thieves (*fures*, 141) seem strange company in a context so recently visited by Mercury; but a second look at their holiday offers yet another perspective on pairing and fraternization and shows the transformative power of *pietas*. This episode too has to do with a pair, but in this case a pair which has been diminished rather than elevated to stellar or divine status (129–132):

*Praestitibus Maiae Laribus videre Kalendae  
aram constitui parvaque signa deum:  
voverat illa quidem Curius; sed multa vetustas  
destruit; et saxo longa senecta nocet.*

Ovid proceeds to describe the restoration of their cult under Augustus, as the familiar pair gives way to a new pairing, that of the two Lares with the *genius Augusti* (143–146):

*bina gemellorum quaerebam signa deorum  
viribus annosae facta caduca morae:  
mille Lares Geniumque ducis, qui tradidit illos,  
urbs habet, et vici numina terna colunt.*

The threesome that results keeps the Lares alive, although their power has been profoundly altered: Augustus now promotes the cult as a vehicle for advancing

<sup>95</sup> His fatherhood is noted by Ovid at 5.86 and 5.664. See also Claus 1986: 161–170, arguing that Callimachus repeatedly alludes to the opening of the *Theog.* and the *Hymn. Hom. Merc.* in his *Hymn to Zeus*.

<sup>96</sup> As one of my anonymous readers observes, Propertius' use of *surgere* at 4.1.67 (*Roma fave, tibi surgit opus*) offers a precedent, and likely model, for Ovid's use of the word in *F.* 4 and 5 to describe both his poem and Rome's walls.

the popularity of his own *genius*.<sup>97</sup> It would perhaps be going too far to equate Augustus with Mercury,<sup>98</sup> the thief *par excellence*; but in Ovid's poem both have consolidated their power by knowing, and using, the power of *pietas*.

Augustus' ability to turn tradition to new uses by reinventing the past connects this episode in turn to Ovid's description of the temple of Mars Ultor, the centerpiece of the greatest Augustan holiday in the month of May. Much as with his earlier citation of Remus' speech to Faustulus and Acca (459–474), Ovid here quotes the young Octavian vowing the temple in 42 B.C. (5.573–577).<sup>99</sup> The epithet granted to Mars on this occasion (and whose repetition as the first word of 551 and the last of 577 frames the episode) is *Ultor*, "Avenger"—a word which, as used later by Mercury, describes the loyal Pollux avenging his brother's death (*ultor adest Pollux*, 711).<sup>100</sup> Mars is summoned to see the shrine built for him by Augustus, a temple, says Ovid, worthy of trophies won from Giants (*digna Giganteis haec sunt delubra tropaeis*, 555). These Giants are not in fact part of the sculptural program of the temple or its enclosing forum;<sup>101</sup> rather, like those defeated by Jupiter himself in Polyhymnia's theogonic etymology at the opening of *Fasti* 5 (35–42), Ovid mentions them here as representatives of discord and chaos, and of the violent past over which Mars—and Octavian/Augustus—have triumphed. Yet the implied contrast between Mars and the Giants is hardly as clear as this triumph would suggest; like the vengeful Pollux (711–712), Mars Ultor is himself a bringer of death and destruction. The flight of nearby constellations and other heavenly bodies from the sky at Mars' advent (545–548) is indicative of their respect and awe—and fear—in the war-god's presence. The epiphany of Mars Ultor is heralded by the sounding of arms: *fallor, an arma sonant? non fallimur, arma sonabant* (549). The repetition of *arma* suggests that we are right to wonder whether the sound is to be welcomed or dreaded—and to prepare ourselves for an answer that excludes neither response. By redefining the very nature of poetic authority through the figures of Flora and Mercury, Ovid invites us to take on faith everything that we hear (*fallor . . . ? non fallimur*). Our willingness to do so empowers Ovid in turn to blur the distinction between truth and its manipulation, between past and present, each time he offers us a tale of brotherly love, *pietas*, and divine reward.

#### VII. AN ENDING WITHOUT A CLOSE

The reading of *Fasti* 5 presented here revolves around three major interconnected narrative patterns, supported by numerous smaller repeating motifs:

<sup>97</sup> See Barchiesi 1994: 96–99 = 1997a: 106–110.

<sup>98</sup> Though Horace is known to have done so: see *Od.* 1.2.41–44 and Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: *ad loc.*

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Herbert-Brown 1994: 95–108; Newlands 1995: esp. 96–104; Barchiesi 1994: 56–57 = 1997a: 67.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Newlands 1995: 71.

<sup>101</sup> See Zanker 1988: 193–215 for a full description and analysis of the sculptural program; cf. Bömer, *F.*: *ad loc.*

1. the power of divine authorization, its scope and its boundaries, and the consequences of moving beyond it (the first and second proems, Ovid's rewriting of Hesiod, Aratus, Callimachus, and Virgil, and the failure of the Muses and consequent ascendancy of Flora and Mercury as sources of inspiration);
2. the replication of marvelous birth stories (Maestas, Jupiter, Mars, Orion, and Mercury himself) and of catasterisms (Orion, Chiron, Hyas, Castor and Pollux);
3. the power of *pietas*, the putative substitute for sibling rivalry in a well-ordered poetic, and Roman, universe (Mercury and Apollo, Hyas and the Hyades, Romulus and Remus, Castor and Pollux, the Lares Praestites and Augustus).

These patterns, I suggest, offer us a reading of *Fasti* 5 that is hardly complete or closed; rather, they have demonstrated that such a reading is impossible. The intricate narrative patterning we have seen keeps sending us back, inviting us to make new connections between previously unconnected phenomena and to revisit and grapple with the very oddities that bother—and engage—us in *Fasti* 5.

This reading has implications in turn for how we read the *Fasti* as a whole. It suggests that we must reconsider the proposition that the same poet whose *Metamorphoses* is an ever-expanding, self-replicating work of art could have chosen, or been compelled, to end the *Fasti* abruptly either for lack of inspiration or because of political pressure or disappointment.<sup>102</sup> To attempt to solve the mystery of the poem's incompleteness as evidence of poetic failure is to authorize our closing of the *Fasti* as an act of completeness—or, to revise Barchiesi just a little, we might say that the prevailing critical discourse is naturally directed toward a unifying and totalizing end.<sup>103</sup> *Fasti* 5, however, demonstrates that this authorization is as partial and provisional as is Ovid's, and that poetic time trumps those of us who would limit it.<sup>104</sup>

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS  
BOWDOIN COLLEGE  
BRUNSWICK, MAINE 04011  
U.S.A.

<sup>102</sup> See above, nn. 3 and 4, for these two explanations.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. Barchiesi 1994: 277 = 1997a: 271 = 1997b: 208; see also 1994: 277 = 1997a: 271 = 1997b: 207: "Mettere fine a qualcosa è un chiaro significante di potere."/"To bring something to an end is a clear sign of power."

<sup>104</sup> Gee 2000 became available to me only after this essay had gone to press; I was, therefore, unable to incorporate Gee's observations into my discussion. Interested Ovidians will quickly discover that Gee and I offer complementary readings of the *Fasti*.

I want to thank the Editor of *Phoenix* and the two anonymous referees for the helpful advice they gave to improve the clarity of this paper. I am also deeply indebted to the thirteen students in my advanced Latin class at the Intercollegiate Center for Classical Studies in Rome, Spring 1998, where many of the connections made here were first tested, and to my colleague in Rome, Matthew Panciera, for being there. Any errors of fact or judgment that remain are of course my own.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alton, E. H., D. E. W. Wormell, and E. Courtney (eds.). 1985. *Ovidius: Fasti*. Leipzig.
- Barchiesi, A. 1991. "Discordant Muses," *PCPS* 37: 1–21.
- . 1994. *Il poeta e il principe: Ovidio e il discorso augusteo*. Rome.
- . 1997a. *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- . 1997b. "Endgames: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 15 and *Fasti* 6," in D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn, and D. Fowler (eds.), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton. 181–208.
- Barrett, W. S. ed. 1964. *Euripides*: Hippolytos. Oxford.
- Block, E. 1982. "The Narrator Speaks: Apostrophe in Homer and Vergil," *TAPA* 112: 7–22.
- Bölte, F. 1937. "Olenos," *RE* 34: 2435–43.
- Bömer, F. ed. 1957–58. *P. Ovidius Naso, Die Fasten*. 2 vols. Heidelberg.
- . ed. 1969–86. *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen*. 7 vols. Heidelberg.
- Boyd, B. Weiden. 1997. *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the Amores*. Ann Arbor.
- Braun, L. 1981. "Kompositionskunst in Ovids 'Fasti,'" *ANRW* 2.31.4: 2344–83.
- Brookes, I. 1994. "The Death of Chiron: Ovid, *Fasti* 5.379–414," *CQ* n.s. 44: 444–450.
- Chaintraine, P. 1980. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris.
- Clauss, J. J. 1986. "Lies and Allusions: The Addressee and Date of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*," *Cl. Ant.* 5: 155–170.
- Coleman, R., ed. 1977. *Vergil: Eclogues*. Cambridge.
- Ernout, A. and A. Meillet. 1979. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: Histoire des mots*<sup>4</sup>. Paris.
- Ewbank, W. W. 1933. *The Poems of Cicero*. London.
- Fantham, E. 1983. "Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*: Sources and Motivation," *HSCP* 87: 185–216.
- . 1985. "Ovid, Germanicus and the Composition of the *Fasti*," *PLLS* 5: 243–281.
- . 1992. "Ceres, Liber, and Flora: Georgic and Anti-Georgic Elements in Ovid's *Fasti*," *PCPS* 38: 39–56.
- . ed. 1998. *Ovid: Fasti Book 4*. Cambridge.
- Farrell, J. 1991. *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History*. New York.
- Feeney, D. 1992. "*Si licet et fas est*: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate," in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. Bristol. 1–25.
- Fontenrose, J. 1981. *Orion: The Myth of the Hunter and the Huntress*. University of California Publications in Classical Studies 23. Berkeley.
- Gain, D. B. ed. 1976. *The Aratus Ascribed to Germanicus Caesar*. London.
- Gee, E. 1997. "*Parva figura poli*: Ovid's *Vestalia* (*Fasti* 6.249–468) and the *Phaenomena* of Aratus," *PCPS* 43: 21–40.
- . 2000. *Ovid, Aratus and Augustus: Astronomy in Ovid's Fasti*. Cambridge.
- Gilmartin, K. 1975. "A Rhetorical Figure in Latin Historical Style: The Imaginary Second Person Singular," *TAPA* 105: 99–121.
- Goldberg, S. 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. Oxford.

- Goldhill, S. 1986. "Framing and Polyphony: Readings in Hellenistic Poetry," *PCPS* 32: 25–52.
- Gow, A. S. F. ed. 1952. *Theocritus* 2<sup>2</sup>. Cambridge.
- Harries, B. 1989. "Causation and the Authority of the Poet in Ovid's *Fasti*," *CQ* n.s. 39: 164–185.
- Harrison, S. J. 1993. "A Roman Hecale: Ovid *Fasti* 3.661–74," *CQ* n.s. 43: 455–457.
- Heinze, R. 1919. *Ovids elegische Erzählung*. Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Klasse 71.7. Leipzig.
- Herbert-Brown, G. 1994. *Ovid and the Fasti*. Oxford.
- Hinds, S. 1987. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone*. Cambridge.
- 1992. "Arma in Ovid's *Fasti*, Part 2: Genre, Romulean Rome and Augustan Ideology," *Arethusa* 25: 113–151.
- 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Hollis, A. S. ed. 1970. *Ovid: Metamorphoses* 8. Oxford.
- ed. 1990. *Callimachus: Hecale*. Oxford.
- Hopkinson, N. 1984. "Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*," *CQ* n.s. 34: 139–148.
- ed. 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge.
- Huyck, J. 1987. "Vergil's *Phaethontides*," *HSCP* 91: 217–228.
- Johnson, W. R. 1978–79. "The Desolation of the *Fasti*," *CJ* 74: 7–18.
- Kidd, D. ed. 1997. *Aratus: Phaenomena*. Cambridge.
- Mackie, N. 1992. "Ovid and The Birth of Maiestas," in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. Bristol. 83–97.
- Maltby, R. 1991. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Leeds.
- Marshall, P. K. ed. 1993. *Hyginus: Fabulae*. Stuttgart and Leipzig.
- McKeown, J. ed. 1987. *Ovid: Amores 1: Text and Prolegomena*. Liverpool.
- McLennan, G. R. ed. 1977. *Callimachus: Hymn to Zeus*. Rome.
- Miller, J. F. 1983. "Ovid's Divine Interlocutors in the *Fasti*," in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 3. Collection *Latomus* 180. Brussels. 156–192.
- 1991. *Ovid's Elegiac Festivals: Studies in the Fasti*. Frankfurt, Bern, New York, and Paris.
- Myers, K. S. 1994. *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*. Ann Arbor.
- Newlands, C. 1995. *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti*. Ithaca and London.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. and M. Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace Odes, Book 1*. Oxford.
- 1978. *A Commentary on Horace Odes, Book 2*. Oxford.
- O'Hara, J. 1992. "Naming the Stars at *Georgics* 1.127–28 and *Fasti* 5.163–82," *AJP* 113: 47–61.
- 1996a. "Vergil's Best Reader? Ovidian Commentary on Vergilian Etymological Wordplay," *CJ* 91: 255–276.
- 1996b. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor.
- Otto, A. 1890. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*<sup>2</sup>. Leipzig.
- Owen, S. G. ed. 1915. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium libri quinque, Ibis, Ex ponto libri quattuor, Halieutica, Fragmenta*. Oxford.
- Porte, D. 1983. "La fleur d'Olène et la naissance du dieu Mars," *Latomus* 42: 877–884.

- Putnam, M. C. J. 1965. "The Riddle of Damoetas (Virgil *Ecl.* 3, 104–105)," *Mnemosyne* 18: 150–154.
- Ross, D. O. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge.
- Santini, C. 1976. "Lettura strutturale ed etimologia in un catasterismo dei Fasti," *Materiali e contributi per la storia della narrativa greco-latina* 1: 49–56.
- Schiesaro, A. 1997. "Aratus' Myth of Dike," *MD* 37: 9–26.
- Shelmerdine, S. 1984. "Hermes and the Tortoise: A Prelude to Cult," *GRBS* 25: 201–208.
- Soubiran, J. ed. 1972. *Cicéron: Aratea, Fragmentes Poétiques*. Paris.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1986. "Myth as History: The Previous Owners of the Delphic Oracle," in J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*. Totowa, N.J. 215–241.
- Stok, F. 1991. "L'ambiguo Romolo dei Fasti," in I. Gallo and L. Nicastrì (eds.), *Cultura poesia ideologia nell'opera di Ovidio*. Naples. 183–212.
- Thomas, R. F. 1986. "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference," *HSCP* 90: 171–198.
- ed. 1988. *Virgil Georgics*. Cambridge.
- Viré, G. ed. 1992. *Hyginus: De astronomia*. Stuttgart and Leipzig.
- Volk, K. 1997. "Cum carmine crescit et annus: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Poetics of Simultaneity," *TAPA* 127: 287–313.
- West, M. L. ed. 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford.
- ed. 1978. *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford.
- Wills, J. 1996. *Repetition in Latin Poetry*. Oxford.
- Weiden Boyd, B. forthcoming. "Arms and the Man: Wordplay and the Catasterisms of Chiron in Ovid, *Fasti* 5," *AJP* forthcoming.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1995. *Remus: A Roman Myth*. Cambridge.
- Zanker, P. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Tr. A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor.