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Abstract

Ovid’s *Fasti* has been the subject of renewed interest over the past few decades. However, analysis has often been limited to the exploration of a number of well-established themes and emphases such as genre, intertextuality and Augustan discourse. The study of ‘history’ in the *Fasti* has been largely neglected. This thesis will attempt to establish that ‘history’ is generally more important in the poem than previously appreciated.

Within the category of history, Ovid’s relationship with Livy is particularly significant: it is only through the poet’s engagement with the historian that the full extent of the historiographical significance of some passages in the *Fasti* can be gauged. While a relationship between Ovid and Livy is – to a certain extent – already recognised, it has been the subject of few, if any, systematic investigations in recent years (since the 1950s). Furthermore, such work is mainly concerned with establishing piecemeal similarities and differences between the poet and the historian in individual passages.

This thesis will attempt a relatively systematic investigation of the way Ovid engages with Livy in the *Fasti*. In doing so, it will argue that a close examination of the relationship between Ovid and Livy reveals that the *Fasti* can be seen to contain a version of a narrative of the ‘history of Rome’ – something that has not been acknowledged by critics so far.

Ultimately, through examining Ovid’s narration of individual historical events both within the context of his overall presentation of a ‘history of Rome’, and in conjunction with Livy, it will emerge that a set of relatively coherent emphases and themes offers some unity to Ovid’s ‘history of Rome’. Above all, Ovid appears to display a stronger interest in the ‘plebeian’ aspects of Roman history than does Livy. By developing a ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme throughout his ‘historical’ narration in the *Fasti*, Ovid can be seen to be commenting on the presentation of Roman history in its most recent and authoritative version in Livy’s history.
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CHAPTER ONE
General Introduction

This thesis will seek to establish a number of interlinked propositions. Firstly, that Livy’s own history of Rome (*ab Urbe Condita*) is important to grasping the significance and particular character of Ovid’s historical narrative in the *Fasti*, both in those passages where ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality between the two texts is present and in some significant passages where ‘thematic’ intertextuality is found. Secondly, that – contrary to the current critical consensus – a surprisingly extensive and detailed ‘history of Rome’ is narrated in the course of Ovid’s *Fasti*. And finally, that a set of relatively coherent emphases and themes emerge to offer some unity to Ovid’s ‘history of Rome’, particularly when that ‘history’ is compared to the narrative of Livy. Above all, Ovid will be shown to lend a distinctively ‘plebeian’ hue to significant portions of his ‘history of Rome’.¹

This thesis will begin by examining the way in which Ovid engages with Livy in the *Fasti*, before moving on to establish the new and particular way in which the poem can be viewed as concerned (in part) with a narration of Rome’s history (and its relationship thereby with Livy). For reasons of space, it will cover the period of history from Romulus to the Gallic siege. The last chapter of the thesis will provide an overview of the remaining periods of history in the *Fasti* (from the age of Saturn to the Augustan period), to give an idea of possible areas for future research.

Ovid and Livy

The *Fasti* has undergone something of a ‘critical renaissance’² in recent years and has shared in the general flourishing of Ovidian studies of the last few decades.³ In addition to the publication of commentaries on books one, two, three, four, and six (Green 2004a, Robinson 2011, Ursini 2008, Fantham 1998, Littlewood 2006) - the first since Bömer (1957-8) – a number of major monographs have been produced by some of the biggest names in the field.

¹ This ‘hue’ can, perhaps, be related to a broader anti-aristocratic streak identified in Ovid (*Fast. 1.217-8; Met. 13.140-1; Trist. 4.4; Pont. 1.9.37-40*) by Syme (1986:11-12).
² Newlands 1995:5.

Among all the approaches to the *Fasti* that can be identified within this literature, including various concerns with religion, politics, genre, intertextuality, gender, time and cosmology (discussed below), there is a general acknowledgement that Livy is an intermittent but significant intertext for the *Fasti*: as Bömer states: ‘Die geschichtliche Literatur hat die Fasten wieder in stärkerem Maße unmittelbar beeinflußt’, in particular Livy. Moreover, as this thesis will argue, it is only through Ovid’s relationship with Livy that both the extent to which history is significant in the *Fasti* and Ovid’s specific treatment of it becomes clear.

Ovid similarly engages with the works of historical writers in his other poems, although this is less sustained and less comprehensive than in the *Fasti*. Barchiesi notes the ‘programmatic relationship’ between the *Fasti* and works regarding Rome’s origins such as Livy’s history; Miller states that ‘Ovid’s references to his contemporaries’ works are particularly plentiful, and run the gamut of allusive functions. He engages the historian Livy’s first book in relating tales from Rome’s regal period’. Fox adds

---

4 Bömer 1957:i.26. Although Bömer does concede that the extent to which Ovid directly referred to Livy cannot always be ascertained. Fantham (1992a:156) notes the influence of Livy in the legendary episodes of the *Fasti*.


6 In the *Metamorphoses* for example, Hardie (2002:191-210) observes the influence of Ennius, Virgil, Livy and Cicero in *Metamorphoses* 14-15. Hardie claims that ‘in terms of prose classifications *Metamorphoses* 15 can be read, allusively, as a free-standing example of an ab urbe condita history of Rome’ in miniaturization (194). Stratis Kyriakidis (2002:211-30) discusses how Ovid draws on the various historial lists of the Alban kings in *Metamorphoses* 14 and adapts them in order to spotlight the negative aspects of violence implicit in Rome’s foundation myth. Wheeler (2002:163-90) argues that the overall chronological structure of the *Metamorphoses* sets the poem within an historiographical model influenced by the genre of ‘universal history’; Labate (2006:193-215) and Myerowitz (1985:61-8) both examine how Ovid uses the historical story of the rape of the Sabine women in *Ars Amatoria* to make contemporary comment on Augustan marriage legislation. Labate (2006:195) adds that Ovid’s excursus on the Sabine rape at *Ars*. 1.101-32 anticipates the poet’s parallel narrative in the *Fasti* (3.181-234).

7 Barchiesi 1997:144.

that ‘Ovid echoes Livy in all the narratives which overlap with his’. Murgatroyd claims ‘the major and most striking aspect of the poet’s engagement with the historian is what we may term “renarration”, i.e. the process whereby an author retells essentially the same story that a predecessor told, sticking very closely to the main outline, keeping the same characters, events and order of events, and repeating exactly or almost exactly many details and words, but still making some significant changes largely or entirely his own (as far as we can tell)’. This is something that Murgatroyd claims has been largely ignored.

There are however few, if any, systematic investigations of Ovid’s relationship to Livy, especially in recent years (since the 1950s). While scholarship in the last few decades acknowledges Livy as a source for Ovid, such work is mainly concerned with establishing piecemeal similarities and differences between the poet and the historian in individual passages. Murgatroyd claims his study is the first ‘to address major issues and present a broad picture, discussing departures from Livy at length’. Like many other studies however, Murgatroyd mostly concentrates on episodes from Rome’s origins and early years and limits his study to certain key passages ‘which contain extensive Livian influence’, namely the Fabii (Fast. 2.195-242; Liv. 2.48.5-50.11), Gabii (Fast. 2.687-710; Liv. 1.54.6-10), Lucretia (Fast. 2.711-852; Liv. 1.57.6-58.12) and Tullia (Fast. 6.587-608; Liv.1.46.1-48.7).

In being restricted to such a limited range of individual historical events, the extent to which Ovid engages with Livy in terms of his narration of events in Rome’s past, has not been fully recognised in modern scholarship. Similarly, modern critics have not fully appreciated what Ovid’s relationship with Livy can potentially tell us about Ovid’s representation of history in the Fasti. Murgatroyd does – in a sense – acknowledge that through this engagement, Ovid can be seen to present his own version of Roman history; but he questions whether it has any real historiographical value. Reflecting the dismissive attitude towards the Fasti of many early 20th century scholars, Murgatroyd views Ovid’s

---

9 Fox 1996:201. However, Fox does not expand any further on this, merely noting some examples of pre-1950s scholarship that have explored Ovid’s use of Livy as a source for the Fasti.
12 As well as Bömer (1957-8), the other significant studies of Livy’s influence on Ovid are Sofer 1906; Marchesi 1910; and Heinze 1919, repr. 1960.
17 See n.3.
engagement with Livy as representing little more than the poet’s personal sense of playfulness in wishing to ‘out-do’ his historian predecessor.¹⁸

Fox also limits his study of Ovid’s engagement with Livy to the regal period; where he does detect engagement with the historian, Fox sees Ovid as generally parodying the historian’s account as a means of challenging ‘conventional ways of depicting the past’.¹⁹

While hinting at the idea that the Fasti could be seen to ‘present a coherent view of Rome’s history’²⁰ within the regal period, Fox downplays the seriousness of this view: he declares that for the most part, Ovid’s ‘elegiac rewriting of history is a harmless and amusing process’²¹ that has more to say about the Augustan present than it does about Rome’s past itself.²²

Newlands accepts that Ovid follows Livy closely in his narration of the rape of Lucretia (discussed below).²³ Again, however, her analysis is restricted to looking at this story in relation to other rape narratives – both historical and mythological – and does not consider it in relation to its position within a wider overall narrative history of Rome. Ultimately, Newlands interprets any historiographical value in Ovid’s version of this event in terms of contemporary politics and the poet’s own relationship with imperial authority.²⁴

In her commentary on Fasti book six, Littlewood does go one step further in claiming that Ovid engaged more consciously with Livy, with AUC providing the poet ‘not only with a reference work for factual detail but also with a foil against which he could exploit interesting tensions and generic comparisons’.²⁵ However, as befits the parameters of her commentary, Littlewood’s study is also limited to historical events located in book six alone;²⁶ furthermore, she generally views Ovid as mirroring Livy’s attitude to events, with any deviations due to generic restrictions, the influence of contemporary politics and Ovid’s personal desire not to offend the imperial family.²⁷

Chiu considers the (thematic) intertextual relationship between Ovid and Livy but confines this to a limited number of feminine figures (Anna Perenna (3.661-74), the matron and old

¹⁹ Fox 1996:225.
²⁰ Fox 1996:225.
²³ Newlands 1995:146.
²⁵ Littlewood 2006:lxv.
²⁶ Littlewood (2006:lxviii-lxxix) does acknowledge Ovid’s engagement with Livy in his narration of the rape of Lucretia (2.721-852).
²⁷ Littlewood 2006:lxv-lxxxii.
local woman who feature in Ovid’s etymology of the Lake of Curtius (6.395-416), Claudia Quinta (4.305-48) and Lucretia (2.721-852)). In doing so Chiu claims that ‘the poet avidly engages the historian on the idea of moral exemplarity as a way to discuss Romaness’ providing alternate, or even competing, presentations of Roman identity. However, she provides little analysis regarding Ovid’s ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality with Livy.

This thesis, by contrast, will attempt to present an investigation of the way Ovid engages with Livy in the *Fasti* in a manner that is both more systematic and more wide-ranging than earlier scholarship. Although the main body of the thesis will concentrate on a (substantial) specific time span - from Romulus to the Gallic siege – almost all historical material in the *Fasti* will be examined to some extent. In doing so, the thesis will argue that a close examination of the relationship between Ovid and Livy reveals that the *Fasti* can be seen to contain a version of a narrative ‘history of Rome’ – albeit one presented in a fragmented and non-linear way (as will be seen in due course) – that has not been acknowledged by critics so far. Furthermore, the thesis will also reveal how Ovid’s engagement with Livy is more profound than previously thought. This engagement with Livy enables the poet to challenge the historian’s perspective and expose contradictions in the historian’s account, perhaps even going so far as to allow Ovid to uncover potential deviations from the established view of Rome’s past as presented by Livy. Ultimately, by reading the *Fasti* in conjunction with Livy, Ovid’s own version of the ‘history of Rome’, with its own particular emphases and concerns, will emerge.

In examining this Ovidian ‘history’, the focus of the thesis will be on the textual relationship between the *Fasti* and Livy’s presentation of Roman history, rather than on the question of factual realities and actual historical events.

**The rape of Lucretia**

One of the most popular examples employed for demonstrating Ovid’s engagement with Livy is the rape of Lucretia (*Fast. 2.721-852; Liv. 1.57.1-60.4*). This episode will now be

---

29 Chiu 2016:62.
30 This phenomenon is termed ‘retroactive intertextuality’ by Edmunds (2001:159-63). See also Hinds 1998:99f; and Murgatroyd 2005:181.
31 For an example of the latter approach to factual realities and actual historical events, see Smith 2012. In examining the varied accounts of the origin and powers of the plebeian tribunate, Smith considers the reliability of the tradition and provides an account of the function of the tribunes in the early Republic.
examined at some length in order to illustrate not only the depth of Ovid’s engagement with Livy, but also how the poet strives to make his version significantly different to that of the historian in some respects. Scholars have predominately interpreted Ovid’s engagement with Livy through the rape of Lucretia in terms of a contest between their respective genres. As will be seen in due course, this thesis will propose a complementary approach in which Ovid’s relationship with Livy can be seen in broader and more complex terms that go beyond generic convention. It will also be suggested that in order to fully understand Ovid’s own nuanced view of this historical event, a knowledge of Livy is required.

It is widely accepted that out of all his sources, Ovid is following Livy most closely in his account of the rape of Lucretia. As Robinson notes, ‘Ovid invites comparison between his text and that of the historian through frequent verbal echoes, and thus draws attention to the individual features of his own narrative’. One of these ‘individual features’ is Ovid’s manipulation of genre in this episode, with the poet juxtaposing the worlds of elegy and epic through his oppositional generic treatment of Lucretia and her rapist Sextus, the youngest son of king Tarquinius Superbus. This elegiac/epic opposition results in Ovid placing a greater emphasis on the more emotive aspects of the story – the wider effects of which have been interpreted in various different ways. It may seem unremarkable that Ovid is employing elegiac convention in an elegiac poem; but the specific focus that Livy applies to the rape of Lucretia, together with the extent to which Ovid engages with it, may indicate that Ovid is doing more than just inviting comparison between his text and that of the historian. What has not been suggested before is that Ovid’s ‘elegising’ of the rape of Lucretia could actually be the direct result of his engagement with specific sentimental elements in Livy’s account.

Livy’s treatment of the rape of Lucretia is in itself unusual in that he uses a number of dramatic features that bring out the more emotional qualities of the episode. As will be seen throughout this thesis (and discussed in the next chapter), it is largely through further comparison with Dionysius of Halicarnassus that the specific character of Livy’s version of historical events can best be ascertained. As will become evident later, Dionysius provides a

32 Otis (1966:38) suggests that the story of the rape of Lucretia ‘is perhaps the best – at least the most serious – thing that Ovid did in elegiac narrative’. See also Wilkinson 1955:280.
34 Robinson 2011:462. See also Fox 1996:212.
35 Formerly Tarquinius Lucius, referred to throughout as Tarquin.
key yardstick for measuring Livy: his is both the most comprehensive extant account of the history of Rome and one that (as far as can be determined), often replicates established and standard traditions. It is through such a comparison that Ogilvie claims to discern not just differences in terms of the details of Livy’s account of the rape of Lucretia, but also ‘the extent to which [Livy] has manipulated his material to secure the impression of a play’. 37

Although Ogilvie questions whether Livy was influenced by a specific play, 38 he notes a number of dramatic features in Livy’s version of the rape of Lucretia, such as limited scene changes (whereas Dionysius has several), 39 and a style of dialogue more suited to tragedy than late Republican oratory: ‘While D.H. describes at length the scenes of emotion (66.2-67.3), L. represents the characters experiencing and reacting to their emotions’. 40 Ovid’s decision to provide a deliberately emotive account of the rape of Lucretia, therefore, could have been influenced by Livy’s own evocative version of events.

As well as being influenced by drama, Livy’s account of the rape of Lucretia also contains a number of elements with clear elegiac potential. Ovid it seems, has cast a particularly keen poetic eye over Livy’s account, and exploited the generic ‘potential’ of the historian’s narrative by evolving any apposite terms or imagery within it for his own elegiac version of events. 41 For example, Livy narrates how during a lull in activity during the siege on

---

37 Ogilvie 1965:219. Ogilvie (1965:219-20) notes a number of influences from tragedy and New Comedy in Livy’s account and a range of intertexts with Plautus, Terrence and Menander. Josel (1992:115) also notes that Dionysius’ history (in relation to his stories of Lucretia and Verginia) ‘allows us to see how Livy used the tradition’.

38 Wiseman (1998:8) questions Ogilvie’s insistence that Livy did not use a dramatic source for his treatment of Lucretia, noting Michels’ (1951) proposal that Livy was influenced by a whole dramatic trilogy of the Tarquins – a Tanaquil, a Tullia and a Lucretia. Wiseman (31) further criticises Ogilvie’s stance here, claiming he does not adequately confront the arguments of his sources Michels and Wright (1910), who were both convinced that Livy did have a tragedy plot in mind in his narration of Lucretia (and the Tarquins in general). Owing to the lack of extant dramatic sources, Wiseman’s argument is difficult to either prove or disprove. Certainly, nothing can be built on Wiseman’s speculations.

39 In Livy, all the action takes place at the military camp in Ardea (1.57.1-8), the home of Collatinus and Lucretia (1.57.8-10; 1.58.1-59.2) and the forum (1.59.3-6), with just a brief reference to the soldiers returning to the camp after their expedition to spy on their wives (1.57.11), until Brutus sets off for Rome to overthrow the monarchy (1.59.5-6). In Dionysius, rather than sending for her father and husband to come to her after her assault, Lucretia travels to her father’s house where she kills herself, with her journey described at relative length (4.46.1). From there, Publius Valerius is sent to the camp to inform Collatinus of what has happened and he meets Collatinus accompanied by Brutus at the city on their way to Rome (4.67.3-4). Dionysius then interrupts his narrative to provide a biographical account of Brutus and his involvement with the Delphic oracle (4.68.1-69.4), which Livy narrates prior to his account of the rape of Lucretia (1.56.5-12). Dionysius then narrates that all three subsequently travel to Lucretia’s father’s house (4.70.2) from where they eventually carry her dead body to the forum (4.76.3).

40 Ogilvie 1965:219. Ogilvie further cites Liv. 1.57.7, 58.7, 59.1 as examples of dialogue more suited to tragedy than late Republican oratory.

41 Oakley (1997:142-8) discusses Livy’s use of poetical, as well as archaic and ‘coloured language’. He observes that the ‘archaic and poetical tinge’ (147) to Livy’s language ‘increases in those episodes which he found more romantic or worthy of elaboration. Thus the legends of book i bring forth a greater density of
Ardea, Sextus and Lucretia’s husband Collatinus while away their time in the military camp by dining and drinking (regii quidem iuuenes interdum otium conuuiis comisationibusque inter se terebant – 1.57.5-6). It is during one of these leisurely gatherings that Collatinus comes up with the idea of a competition to determine who has the most virtuous wife (1.57.6-7) and the friends set off for home to spy on their respective spouses (1.57.7-10). Despite the fact that it is the sight of Lucretia during this expedition that arouses Sextus’ passion (1.57.10) and eventually leads to him raping her, Livy describes the whole endeavour as an iuuenalis ludus (Et tum quidem ab nocturno iuuenali ludo in castra redeunt - 1.57.11). In the Fasti, Ovid provides a similar, albeit shorter, account of the idle besieging soldiers (2.721-4), explaining that with nothing to do: luditur in castris; otia miles agit (2.724). With Livy’s use of both otium (1.57.5) and ludus (1.57.11) ripe for elegiac exploitation, Ovid brings out the ‘particular generic bite’ of these terms by placing them closer together. In doing so, Robinson sees Ovid as ‘improving’ on Livy here, ‘ostentatiously reworking his text to produce something a little more punchy’.

As the soldiers embark on their spying expedition, Ovid also concurs with Livy in his description of the scenes of their respective wives that first greet the men: the partying daughters-in-law of Tarquinius (Liv. 1.57.9; Fast. 2.739-40) contrast with the virtuous Lucretia who is engaged in wool-making (Liv. 1.57.9; Fast. 2.741-3). As wool-making was an activity that represented a traditional symbol ‘of the virtuous Roman matrona par-excellence’, this is sufficient for Livy to declare Lucretia the winner of the contest (Muliebris certaminis laus penes Lucretiam fuit – 1.57.9). Whereas for Livy, it may be true that ‘the connexion of female virtue and wool-making owes nothing to any play or poem’, for Ovid such an activity had previously been equated with elegiac females in Propertius and...
Recalling Propertius' Arethusa in particular, Ovid expands on Livy’s portrait of the wool-working Lucretia – she makes clothes for her absent husband (*lacerna – Fast. 2.746; Prop. 4.3.18*) – and by doing so he amplifies her matronly virtues as expressed by the historian, but also casts her in decidedly elegiac terms. In allowing Lucretia to speak at this point, Ovid differs from Livy, who only has his heroine talk after her assault by Sextus (1.57.7-10). Ovid could be seen to be ‘filling in’ the gaps of the historian’s account by developing the more emotive aspects of the story through Lucretia’s speech here, as well as using this speech to further strengthen her elegiac credentials. Together with the timbre of her voice (*tenui ... sono – 2.744*), Lucretia’s speech firmly identifies her as an ‘elegiac woman’, since she refers to her husband as her master (*domino – 2.745*), speaks of Ardea ‘not as a city but as a rival for her husband’s affection’ (*melioribus, Ardea, restas, / improba, quae nostros cogis abesse uiros – 2.749-50*) and faints at the thought of her spouse in battle there (*mens abit, et morior – 2.753*).

50 Wyke (1987:154) also notes that in Propertius 3.12 there is an elegiac woman who is, like Lucretia, ‘a loving wife abandoned at Rome by her campaigning husband’. Robinson (2011:477) notes that in having Lucretia stay at home and not mixing with the crowd, as indicated by her request to her maids as to what news they have of the war in Ardea (*quid tamen auditis? nam plura audire potestis: / quantum de bello dicitur esse super? – 2.747-8*), Lucretia may act ‘like the ideal Roman wife that she is’, but ‘in this regard she is unlike the more inquisitive Arethusa, who has familiarised herself with the geography and ethnography of Lucotas’ location’ (Prop. 4.3.35-40). Hejduk (2011:26) nevertheless notes the ‘epic seriousness’ of Ovid’s narration of Lucretia’s rape, with Lucretia also ‘assimilated to the paradigmatic wife of an epic warrior, Andromache in the *Iliad*’. Chiu (2016:54-8) also discusses Ovid’s casting of Lucretia as an elegiac woman.
51 Robinson 2011:473. Ovid also points out Lucretia’s thriftiness (*lumen ad exiguum – 2.743*): Robinson (2011:476) remarks that the adjective *exigus* denotes both the frugality of a traditional virtuous Roman wife and an association with the genre of elegy itself; Robinson (2011:60) further notes Propertius’ use of *exigus* (*2.1.72, 13.33; 3.1.31, 9.36; 4.1.59*) ‘to evoke the Callimachean aesthetic (or the Roman conception of it, at least)’. See also Hor. *Ars.* 77; *Ovid Fast.* 6.22; *Trist.* 2.330. At the beginning of *Fasti* book two, Ovid describes his poetry up until this point as *exiguum ... opus* (2.4). Robinson adds that ‘Ovid, as Propertius has done before him, extends the adjective to cover all things associated with elegy: *Am.* 3.1.40, 1.67; *Fast.* 3.274, 6.22; *Trist.* 2.431. See also Börmer 1958:ii.79; and Newlands 1995:171.
52 Newlands (1995:171-2) notes that weaving was also ‘a common metaphor for poetic activity’.
53 Am. 3.1.9; Virg. *Ecl.* 6.8. Lee (1953:112) notes that Ovid’s whole spinning scene is reminiscent of love elegy. Newlands (1995:172) goes as far as to suggest that as ‘her virtues are identical with the stylistic graces of love elegy’, Lucretia represents this poetic genre itself.
55 Ovid *Am.* 3.7.11; *Her.* 8.8, 15.145; *Ars* 1.313-4.
56 Robinson 2011:478; Robinson also notes that the adjective *improba* ‘is not out of place in the emotional outbursts of lovers’: Ovid *Ars.* 1.655; Prop. 1.3.39; Virg. *Aen.* 4.386. Wyke (1987:160) notes that in common with Propertius’ Arethusa (4.3, for the elegiac Lucretia ‘warfare becomes not a glorious but a sorrowful affair’). Newlands (1995:150) adds that ‘although Ovid’s Lucretia is a married Roman woman, she shows a physical passion and abhorrence of war more usually associated with the elegiac mistress than with the Roman wife’.
57 Am. 3.14.37-8; Prop. 4.3.5-10; *ll.* 22.466. On ending her lament, Robinson (2011:479) notes that Lucretia also assumes ‘the classic posture of a woman who feels *pudor*’ by collapsing into tears, dropping her wool and burying her face in her lap (2.755-6; *Am.* 1.8.37, 2.4.11-12, 3.6.67; *Her.* 11.35, 21.113). Ovid explicitly
There is considerable discussion amongst critics in relation to the disparity between the poet and the historian in their treatment of Lucretia’s dialogue, with many commenting in particular on the stark contrast between the rhetorical style of her dialogue after she has been raped by Sextus in Livy and her relative post-assault silence in the Fasti. However, it is worth noting at this point that, despite its rhetorical qualities, Lucretia’s speech in Livy still ‘employs the plain language of the Elegists’, with phrases such as uvestigia ... lecto (1.58.7), uiri alieni (1.58.7), mors testis erit (1.58.7) and hostis pro hospite (1.58.8). Ovid, then, could have been influenced by Livy in his narration of Lucretia’s elegiac speech at Fast. 2.745-54.

Ovid further seizes on the elegiac potential of Livy’s account in his description of Sextus’ desire for Lucretia. After being invited by Collatinus to dine at his home that they have just been spying on, Livy reports that Ibi Sex. Tarquinium mala libido Lucretiae per uim stuprandae capit; cum forma tum spectata castitas incitat (1.57.10). Ovid then expands on the exact details of Lucretia’s forma that so inflamed Sextus’ passion in a way that concurs with elegiac ideals of feminine beauty: her pale skin (niueus ... color – 2.763), blonde hair (flau ... capilli – 2.763) and words and voice are as attractive to the prince quite as much as – like in Livy – her chastity (uerba placent et uox, et quod corrumpere non est – 2.765).

Just as Ovid builds on the generic potential of Livy in his ‘elegising’ of Lucretia, he also seems to have an eye on the historian for any epic elements in relation to Sextus. When Livy’s Sextus proceeds to carry out his attack on Lucretia, he approaches his sleeping prey with sword in hand and commands her to be quiet: ‘Tace, Lucretia,’ inquit; ‘Sex. Tarquinius...
sum; ferrum in manu est; moriere, si emiseris uocem (1.58.2). Ovid closely follows Livy in his corresponding speech (‘ferrum, Lucretia, mecum est’ / natus ait regis, ‘Tarquiniusque loquor!’ – 2.795-6); Sextus’ use of the first person loquor conveys his control of the situation and emulates that most eminent of epic heroes, Aeneas.  

Although Ovid may have been attracted to the elegiac adaptability of Livy’s account of Sextus’ attempted seduction of Lucretia, any sense of the assailant being a typical elegiac lover is quickly dispelled through a subsequent contrast with the historian. In Livy, Sextus ‘speaks with the fervent directness of an Ovid or a Propertius to his mistress’, as he both implores and threatens Lucretia to sleep with him (tum Tarquinius fateri amorem, orare, miscere precibus minas, uersare in omnes partes muliebrem animum - 1.58.3-4). His ‘flurry of historic infinitives in asyndeton (fateri, orare, miscere, uersare) [is] well suited to the passionate nature of the occasion’. Ovid follows his source closely (instat amans hostis precibus pretioque minisque: / nec prece nec pretio nec mouet ille minis - 2.805-6); his addition of pretium perhaps suggests that ‘Tarquinius is not so completely ignorant of the ways of elegiac love’. Sextus’ brush with elegy in his attempts at seduction are, however, somewhat deflated by Ovid’s description of him as amans hostis (2.805); here Ovid turns Livy’s Tarquinius fateri amorem (1.58.3) into a ‘pleasing oxymoron’, and in doing so, provides another illustration of the opposition between epic and elegy in this passage.
Through the symbolism of her wool-working and its juxtaposition with the banqueting royal daughters-in-law, Livy’s Lucretia is introduced as nothing more or less than the stereotypical virtuous Roman matron. Ovid then takes Livy’s image of Lucretia and adapts it in line with the generic convention of the Fasti; not only does this serve to expand on the morality of the Livian Lucretia, but it also enables Ovid to develop her into an ‘elegiac fantasy’ of the sort desired by Tibullus (1.3.83-92) and Propertius (3.6.9-18).

**Dominant themes**

The above examination of the rape of Lucretia demonstrates that Ovid is engaging extensively with Livy in his account of this ‘historical’ episode. What it also illustrates is the conventional ways in which scholars interpret this engagement; in the case of the rape of Lucretia, Ovid’s intertextuality with Livy is mainly analysed in terms of generic convention. Genre also pervades the analysis of many other ‘historical’ events in the Fasti, together with a number of other dominant themes, for example politics, Ovid’s pro- or anti-Augustan stance, gender and Virgilian and Propertian intertextuality. This generally leads to the conclusion that the poet’s presentation of ‘historical’ events lacks gravity. Where any serious historical commentary by Ovid is detected, such commentary is largely confined to contemporary concerns and how Ovid uses ‘historical’ episodes like the rape of Lucretia as a commentary on the Augustan regime (as noted above).

This focus on such dominant themes has overshadowed other issues that can be discerned in the poet’s engagement with Livy in the Fasti. Firstly, as noted above, although scholars do acknowledge Ovid’s engagement with Livy in a number of other historical events in the Fasti, the full extent of this engagement has not been realised. One of the major barriers to realising the broad extent of this engagement has been the failure to comprehend the degree to which historical events are awarded serious coverage in the Fasti. Furthermore, and as a result of this failure, historical events in the Fasti have often been viewed in isolation, or at

---

76 Robinson 2011:462.
77 Newlands (1995:149) argues that in contrast to Livy, Ovid individualises Lucretia and invites the reader to see her as a person rather than an ideal type; it is this that in part transforms her into an ‘elegiac woman’.
78 The question of Ovid’s pro-/anti-Augustan stance in the Fasti is undoubtedly important, especially in terms of how the poem can be read as providing a commentary on contemporary social and political issues. While this thesis will occasionally note such issues, it will not systematically engage with this question since it ultimately has other concerns.
least, only in relation to other events that share similar themes – and not in the context of the comprehensive range of historical references in the poem overall. Secondly, although Ovid’s relationship with Livy through ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality has been explored to some extent in previous scholarship, the extent of the poet’s ‘thematic’ intertextuality with the historian has not been fully realised (this facet will receive further attention in Chapter Two). It is the ultimate argument of this thesis that, rather than just using Livy as a ‘factual’ source (for critics then to discern similarities and differences between Ovid and the historian’s account), Ovid can be seen to be engaging in a direct and sustained dialogue with Livy. It is through this dialogue with Livy that another set of themes and concerns in the Fasti begins to emerge. Not only does Ovid’s engagement with Livy reveal a more comprehensive and serious commentary on Rome’s past in the Fasti than has been previously acknowledged, but it also reveals a relatively coherent focus on the more ‘rustic’ and ‘plebeian’ aspects of the history of Rome.

Before examining Ovid’s relationship with Livy more closely, it is important to grasp the extent of history in the Fasti.

**Ovid’s ‘history of Rome’**

There is a general acknowledgement that Roman history is central in some sense to the Fasti, and that the poem is concerned with historical events to an extent significantly in advance of (e.g.) the Amores, Heroides or the bulk of the Metamorphoses. Despite this however, the sheer range and extent of historical narration that Ovid includes within the poem, as suggested above, has been somewhat neglected. More than 1,800 lines – roughly equivalent to two books of the poem – deal with events in Rome’s history (1,803 lines out of a total of 4,976 lines). Although events are not narrated in chronological order, Ovid places particular emphasis on the pre-foundation period and the regal period, deploying 534 (approximately thirty percent of the 1,799 total) and 669 lines (approximately thirty-seven percent) respectively. A fragmented historical record is sustained by the poet through the Republican period, up to the civil wars of 49 BC, featuring a relatively significant total of 408 lines (twenty-two percent). A further 192 lines (ten percent) is dedicated to the era of the Caesars after 49 BC. A tabular presentation\(^\text{80}\) of the 1,803 lines that Ovid devotes to the history of Rome reveals the following impressive picture of his ‘history of Rome’:

\(^{80}\) Adapted from Wiseman and Wiseman 2013:xxiv-xxvii with additions and revisions.
### Before the Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formation of the universe</td>
<td>1.105-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturn comes to Rome</td>
<td>1.233-40, 5.625-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janus rules Rome</td>
<td>1.241-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evander and Carmentis come to Rome</td>
<td>1.469-542, 2.271-82, 4.65, 5.91-102,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.643-4, 6.501-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules comes to Rome and kills Cacus</td>
<td>1.543-84, 4.66, 5.629-32, 5.645-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Trojan dynasty</td>
<td>4.29-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeneas and Troy</td>
<td>4.37-8, 4.799-800, 6.419-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeneas comes to Italy</td>
<td>4.249-54, 2.543-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeneas at Lavinium</td>
<td>3.601-56, 4.879-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alban dynasty</td>
<td>4.39-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The youth of king Proca</td>
<td>6.131-68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romulus and Remus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conceived and exposed</td>
<td>3.9-58, 4.55-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romulus and Remus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suckled by the she-wolf</td>
<td>2.383-422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romulus and Remus as young men</td>
<td>2.359-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fall of Amulius</td>
<td>3.59-68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Kings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The foundation of Rome</td>
<td>2.133-4, 3.69-78, 4.809-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The death of Remus</td>
<td>2.143, 4.837-58, 5.151-2, 5.451-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romulus’ asylum</td>
<td>2.140, 3.431-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rape of the Sabine women</td>
<td>2.139, 2.429-34, 3.181-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romulus’ war with the Sabines</td>
<td>1.259-74, 2.135, 3.201-34, 6.793-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romulus’ legislation</td>
<td>1.27-42, 3.97-8, 3.127-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deification of Romulus</td>
<td>2.144, 2.475-512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reign of Numa

The reign of Ancus Marcius

The conception and youth of Servius Tullius

Servius and Fortuna

The murder of Servius

Tarquin takes Gabii

The rape of Lucretia

The Republic

The first secession of the plebs (494 BC)

The Fabii defeated at the Cremera (477 BC)

The Decemvirs’ law-code (450 BC)

War with the Volsci and Aequi (431 BC)

The conquest of Veii by Camillus (396 BC)

The Battle of the Allia (390 BC)

The Capitol besieged by the Gauls (390 BC)

Secession of the plebs and Camillus’ temple of Concordia (367 BC)

Battle against the Aurunci and Camillus’ temple of Juno Moneta (345 BC)

Exile and return of the flute players (312 BC)

War with the Etruscans (296 BC)

War with Pyrrhus (281-75 BC)

The First Punic War (264-41 BC)

Temple of Vesta burnt down (241 BC)

Destruction of Falerii (241 BC)

Landowners fined, games of Flora founded (241-238 BC)
The Second Punic War (218-201 BC) 1.593, 2.241-2, 3.148, 4.873-4, 6.241-8, 6.765-70
Magna Mater brought to Rome (204 BC) 4.247-348
Matron’s privileges restored (195 BC) 1.621-6
Flora’s privileges restored (173 BC) 5.295-330
The Numantine war (140-133 BC) 1.596
Conquest of Galicia (137 BC) 6.461-2
The Jugurthine war (111-105 BC) 1.595
The war of the Allies (90-89 BC) 6.563-8
Conquest of Isauria (78 BC) 1.593-4
Conquest of Crete (67 BC) 1.593-4
The defeat of Crassus at Carrhae (53 BC) 5.583-6, 6.463-8

The Caesars

Caesar’s civil wars (49-46 BC) 1.603-4, 4.379-84
The assassination of Caesar (44 BC) 3.697-704
The young Caesar’s first campaign (43 BC) 4.627-8, 4.673-6
Caesar Deified as Divus Iulius (42 BC) 2.144
Caesar avenged at Philippi (41 BC) 3.705-10, 5.569-78
The end of the civil wars at the
Battle of Actium (31 BC) 1.711-12
The young Caesar receives the name
‘Augustus’ (27 BC) 1.587-616
Augustus recaptures standards from
the Parthians (20 BC) 5.579-94, 6.467-8
Augustus destroys the house of
Vedius Pollio (15 BC) 6.637-48
Augustus elected pontifex maximus
(12 BC) 3.419-20
Drusus’ conquest of Germany (12-9 BC) 1.597-8
The A Ara Pacis dedicated (9 BC) 1.711-22
Augustus hailed as pater patriae (2 BC) 2.119-32
Temple of Mars Ultor founded (2 BC) 5.549-98
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temple of Castor founded by Tiberius</td>
<td>6 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple of Concord founded by Tiberius</td>
<td>10 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accession of Tiberius</td>
<td>14 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanicus’ triumph</td>
<td>17 AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chronologically, as can be seen from this chart, ‘history’ in the *Fasti* begins with Janus’ explanation of the formation of the universe, from its initial state of chaos and transformation into the four elements of fire, air, water and earth (1.105-10): the two-faced narrator himself notes the extent to which his explanation looks far back into the past (*aspice, quam longi temporis acta canam* – 1.104). Ovid then turns to pre-foundation Rome, charting the age of Saturn and Janus’ rule. This is followed by the arrival of Evander and his mother in Rome and their hospitality to Hercules, who then goes on to slay Cacus. Ovid focuses much more attention on Evander and the Arcadians than he does on Aeneas and the Trojans: the longest narrative relating to Aeneas (3.601-56) concerns his encounter with Anna Perenna rather than his more famous exploits.

Out of all other characters in Ovid’s historical coverage, Romulus and Remus receive the most attention (a total of 377 lines). Events relating to their lives – from their conception through to their founding of Rome, on to Remus’ death and Romulus’ apotheosis – span the poet’s narration of both the pre-foundation and regal period of Roman history. Romulus’ successors Numa (179 lines) and Servius Tullius (seventy lines) bulk the largest in Ovid’s history of the regal period, with the rape of Lucretia (comprising 142 lines) dominating the narrative of the house of Tarquin (166 lines).

A wide range of events is covered from the Republican era, although Ovid’s interest seems to wane for the late Republican period. In terms of chronology, Ovid begins his narration of the Republic with the festival of Anna Perenna, followed by an unusually extended version of a battle – that of the Fabii at the Cremera.

Various other battles from the Republican period receive notice, albeit briefly. While the First Punic War receives a mere three lines, the period of the Second Punic War is given much more emphasis, with a relatively lengthy narration awarded to the festival of Flora and the journey of the Magna Mater to Rome.

Coverage of the modern era in the *Fasti* starts with the civil wars of 49-46 BC and ends with Germanicus’ triumph in 17 AD. Ovid dedicates the least space to the narration of this
phase of Roman history. As Wiseman observes, while Ovid does pay ‘proper attention to the main Augustan dates ... he does not go over the top’.  

*The Fasti’s unconventional presentation of Rome’s history*

As already noted above, one of the main obstacles to grasping the extent of historical coverage in the *Fasti* – as laid out in the table above – is quite simply its ‘unconventional’ presentation. Firstly, as the table demonstrates, Ovid’s historical narrative is not linear, and related stories are widely scattered over different books in an unpredictable order, with no immediate or apparent coherence between chronology and narrative placement. There is an obvious contrast here with the *Metamorphoses*, written by Ovid in the same period, which likewise covers ‘history’ *ab origine mundi / ad mea ... tempora* (Met. 1.3-4), but does so in a more conventional narrative and chronological order. In the *Fasti*, forward movement in time is calendrical, with the result that events are treated in a cyclical and repetitive fashion, rather than in the chronological order beloved of epic. At any rate, in the *Fasti*, Romulus’ war with the Sabines is first dealt with at 1.259-74, well before any mention that he has even been born (Romulus’ and Remus’ conception, birth and exposure is not dealt with until later at 3.9-58 and 4.55-60). Similarly, although Aeneas should in terms of time appear near the

---

81 Wiseman and Wiseman 2013:xxiii. Wiseman and Wiseman also note that less than five-percent of the entire poem is given over to Augustan matters; in comparison, they claim it is likely that the calendar composed by Verrius probably dedicated about twenty percent to Augustan dates.


83 Despite promises in the *Metamorphoses* of coverage of time from the first origin of the universe down to ‘my times’, Ovid finds ways of subverting expectations here too. The poem is loosely divided into the age of gods, then heroes (Met. 6.419ff.), and finally ‘history’ (Met. 11.194ff.) after the introduction of Troy. But as Feeney (1999:18) has shown, Ovid effectively ‘subverts the canonical reference points that no account of history could totally ignore’. In the *Metamorphoses*, the key historical moment of the fall of Troy is already over before it is even narrated. Ovid fails to mention another key universal history marker – the return of the Heracleidae – and makes Olympiads valueless as a marker by dating their inception four centuries before the commonly agreed era. He also glosses over the date of the foundation of Rome, and the only historical synchronic date he provides – the meeting between Numa and Pythagoras – is the one that earlier Roman scholarship had definitively proven impossible.
very beginning of the poem, the earliest mention of him is not until 2.543-6, with most subsequent stories relating to Aeneas not occurring until books three, four and six.

Secondly, and again as can be seen from the table above, Ovid’s treatment of historical events is not conventionally proportional, since he is inclined to focus on events that might be considered marginal by others and only briefly alludes to other rather more significant historical events.84 The First Punic War for example – a major event in the history of Rome - receives just three lines in total (1.595 and 6.193-4); whereas the seemingly minor story of the exile and return of the flute-players (6.649-92) receives forty-four lines. Similarly, as noted earlier, the festival of Anna Perenna takes up 174 lines (3.523-696), whereas the assassination of Julius Caesar (3.697-704) – a momentous event in Roman history, on any account, and one that occurred on the same day as the Anna Perenna festival – is narrated in a mere eight lines. The middle to late Republican period (172-50 BC) is covered in just twenty-two lines (1.593-6, 5.583-6, 6.461-8 6.563-8).

Thirdly, the poet’s coverage of historical events is frequently compressed or discontinuous and in need of serious supplementation and explication from the reader. The compression of such narratives however, does not necessarily mean they are unimportant, and this is where one important aspect of Ovid’s engagement with Livy can be seen. For example, by comparison with Livy, Ovid provides a precise but succinct account of Tarquin’s capture of Gabii (Fast. 2.685-10; Liv. 1.53.1-54.10).85 After introducing Tarquin as the last king of Rome (2.687-8), Ovid sums up the background to the king’s defeat of Gabii in a mere two lines (ceperat hic alias, alias euerterat urbes, / et Gabios turpi fecerat arte suos – 2.689-90). Turn to Livy, and it becomes apparent that, not only had Tarquin waged a war on the Aequi and Volsci that was subsequently to last 200 years, but he had also captured the town of

---

84 Fox (1996:212) interprets Ovid’s lengthy treatment of the rape of Lucretia - in comparison to the poet’s ‘compression’ of other historical events - as demonstrating his ‘concern for the kinds of historical events that lend themselves to an elegiac treatment and a deliberate neglect of historical contexts and the intricacies of the historical cohesion of events’. Wiseman and Wiseman (2013:xxvii) note that ‘tales of glorious conquest are conspicuous by their absence’ in the Fasti. Similar compression and omission can be seen in the Metamorphoses with, for instance, some episodes had been treated extensively in Virgil’s Aeneid now barely receiving a mention in Ovid’s ‘mini Aeneid’ (Met. 13.623-14.582); other brief, incomplete and seemingly misplaced Virgilian narratives draw the poet’s attention to ‘eventually become the kernal of his main epic narrative’ (Papaioannou 2005:10). For example, the ‘Sicilian tales’ (Met. 13.730-14.74) are not found in Virgil; Dido and Turnus also treated summarily; but Anius, Achaemenides and Circe – who retain only an allusive presence in Virgil – are given more attention by Ovid. For an examination of how Ovid’s selectivity not only suits the wider themes of the Metamorphoses but also facilitates the poet’s intertextual and generic engagement with Virgil, see Papaioannou 2005. See also Galinsky 1975; Solodow 1988; and Otis 1970.

85 Together with the rape of Lucretia (2.711-852), Ovid’s account of Tarquin’s defeat of Gabii and the Delphic oracle are included in his aition for the Regifugium (2.685-852). For Tarquin’s role in the murder of king Servius see Chapter Five.
Suea Pometia (1.53.2-3). The historian adds that the war with Gabii was both long and tedious and the king only resorted to trickery and deception when a prior assault and siege had failed (1.53.4). The gaps which Ovid signals in his account are filled by reading Livy.

Ovid, moving on swiftly, provides only a summary account of the deception Sextus employed in a bid to infiltrate enemy ranks, with the poet reporting that the Gabini quickly accepted Sextus onto their side after he had shown them the physical scars of a beating from his cruel father (2.692-99). Once again, it is to Livy’s more comprehensive account that the reader must turn to in order the learn the full details of this incident. In fact, Livy’s Gabini are much less easily convinced than Ovid’s, and Sextus is only installed as leader after a relatively lengthy process of negotiation (1.53.5-54.5). Both authors then proceed to relate Tarquin’s enigmatic message involving him decapitating the flowers in his garden, resulting in the destruction of Gabii (Fast. 2.701-10; Liv. 1.54.5-10).

Ovid’s subsequent account of the Delphic oracle (2.711-20) is similarly compressed, with the result that it is difficult to comprehend fully without the aid of prior knowledge. Ovid provides just the essential details: his account seems like little more than a bullet-point list of individual incidents. The poet again invites the reader to consult Livy (1.56.4-13) through frequent verbal echoes to supplement the details that are absent from his account, such as

---

86 While the story of Tarquin’s capture of Gabii was well-known and included in many different sources, Ovid specifically directs the reader to Livy through many instances of both ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality. For example, Ovid verbally echoes Livy in describing how Tarquin captured Gabii by foul play (turpi ... arte – Fast. 2.690; minime arte Romana, fraudae ac dolo, adgressus est – Liv. 1.53.4), whilst also engaging ‘thematically’ with the historian in sharing Livy’s ‘distaste for such trickery’ (Robinson 2011:440). Ovid follows Livy closely in describing Tarquin’s sons (trium minimus, proles manifesta Superbi – Fast. 2.691; Sextus filius eius, qui minimus ex tribus erat, transfugit ... Gabios – Liv. 1.53.5). The poet also verbally echoes Livy as both relate that Sextus was installed as leader of the Gabini, with Ovid adding that Sextus sent a messenger to his father for advice on what action to take next (iamque potens missio genitorem appellat amico – Fast. 2.701; ut non pater Tarquinius potentior Romae quam filius Gabii esset – Liv. 1.54.4). See Robinson 2011:433ff. See also Fox 1996:210; and Murgatroyd 2005:187-90.

87 Ovid’s compression of this event means he does not have to include any details that disclose any sense of the military prowess of the Gabini, as shown in Livy (Robinson 2011:439). This enables the poet to cast the Gabini in appropriate generic terms, depicting them as ‘delicate, elegiac figures who weep otherwise unattested tears on hearing Tarquinius’ fictitious complaints’ (Robinson 2011:439). Their delicacy is reinforced as Ovid replaces the traditional poppies (Liv. 1.54.6) that Tarquin decapitates in the message to his son to slay the Gabini with lilies (Fast. 2.706; Robinson 2011:450). The contrast between the elegiac Gabini and the aggressive Sextus foreshadows Ovid’s treatment of Sextus in his rape of Lucretia narrative (2.711-852), as examined earlier.

88 Robinson (2011:454) states that Ovid invites the reader to refer back to Livy in particular with frequent verbal echoes. For example, Ovid’s opening line of the narrative in which he reports the appearance of the portentous snake: ecce, nefas uisus, medii altaribus anguis (2.711), closely follows that of Livy: Haec agenti portentum terribile uisum: anguis ex columna lignea elapsus (1.56.4); Ovid’s report of the group kissing their mothers in response to the oracle: oscula quisque suae matri properata tulerunt (2.715) echoes the words of Livy’s oracle: osculum matri tulerit (1.56.10); and in explaining how Brutus fell and kissed mother earth after hearing the oracle Brutus erat stulti sapiens imitator, ut esset / tutus ab insidiis (2.717-8), Ovid also follows
when, where and to whom the prodigy was revealed. The length of some of Ovid’s ‘historical’ narratives therefore, can be misleading as to their character and potential significance – reinforced in this instance by the importance of oracles in general as a motif in ancient historiography; the reader needs to have prior knowledge about such events (from Livy) in order to make sense of them.

Some important events in Rome’s history are omitted altogether in the Fasti. The most notable omissions include Julius Caesar’s victory at Munda in 45 BC, Octavian’s assumption of imperium in January 43 BC, plus the Dea Dia, the iudicatiu Saeculares, the three closures of Janus’ temple and the adoption of Tiberius in June 4 AD. This seemingly erratic temporal placement of past events, and the poet’s ‘unbalanced’ emphasis on major and minor historical episodes, can make it difficult to initially perceive any sense of coherent historical narrative within the Fasti. However, despite this non-linear presentation and unconventional treatment, the extensive narration of history in the Fasti that the above chart demonstrates cannot be ignored. It is difficult to agree with critics who claim that the poem exhibits little or no ‘historical consciousness’. Labelling Ovid as ‘among the least historically minded of “Augustan” poets’, Farrell states that ‘direct references to historical events in Ovid’s poetry are vanishingly few. Most references that there are concern contemporary history and have little direct bearing on Ovid’s memory of the past, whether recent or distant’. As discussed above in relation to Tarquin’s capture of Gabii for example (as will be demonstrated throughout this thesis), when the Fasti is read in conjunction with Livy, the full extent of Ovid’s ‘historical consciousness’ becomes evident. As will also become manifest throughout this thesis, is that through Ovid’s engagement with Livy, the poet uses this ‘consciousness’ to illustrate his own particular perspective on the history of Rome.

---

Livy closely: contemptuque tutus (1.56.7) and Ergo ex industria factus ad imitationem stultitiae (1.56.8). See Robinson 2011:453ff.

89 See Miller 2002b for a discussion of possible reasons for this omission.

90 Syme (1978:35) sees this omission as one example of the unsuitability of the calendar for versification.

91 See Syme (1978:21-36) and Herbert-Brown (1994:119-21, 215-33) for analysis of potential reasons as to why certain historical events may not have been mentioned by Ovid.

92 Farrell 2013:57.

93 Farrell 2013:88.

94 Farrell 2013:57. However, Farrell (2013:57-88) does detect some ‘historical consciousness’ in the passage concerning the Aedes Concordiae Augustae (1.637-50). Herbert-Brown (1994:vii) accepts the inclusion of a wide range of Julian anniversaries in the Fasti but claims the poem still provides no ‘narrative history’. Newlands (2006:368) judges the Fasti as having no ‘sort of canonical or authoritative view of the Roman past such as we find in Vergil’s Aeneid’. See also Johnson 1978:10-12.
 Needless to say, there are a number of factors that may have influenced both Ovid’s structuring of history in the Fasti, and his choice of which events to include, not to mention the extent to which these events should be highlighted or downplayed. Critics are not wrong in citing various reasons – the form of the calendar itself, wider themes in the poem, genre, the prevailing political atmosphere at Rome, the influence of Hellenistic poetry\textsuperscript{95} – for Ovid’s choice of what to include and what to omit. However, as suggested earlier, the scholarly focus on such motivating factors has often subsumed the examination of ‘history’ in the Fasti in its own right, or led to this ‘history’ being used merely as a tool to explore these same factors.

For example, as is evident from the discussion of the rape of Lucretia above, generic convention or generic potential have often been understood as major factors in Ovid’s decision to emphasise or downplay certain historical characters in the Fasti. Certainly, it is only through reference to other texts, in this case Livy, that such differences in characterisation as are facilitated by generic convention, become evident (see especially Chapter Four). But it is not purely the display of generic convention that these differences facilitate: as will be seen in this thesis, Ovid, precisely through engagement with Livy, is able to assert his own poetic independence\textsuperscript{96} and authority in the world-view he presents in his poetic calendar.\textsuperscript{97}

Furthermore, as also hinted above, there is a marked tendency to understand historical events narrated (or alluded to) within the Fasti as wholly or largely concerned with offering a commentary on aspects of Augustan ideology. It cannot be denied that much of this historical narration does engage with a wide range of other themes and issues in the poem and is designed to offer a commentary on contemporary Rome and Augustan ideology. As the longest extant poem after Virgil’s Aeneid to offer a contemporary perspective on the Augustan regime,\textsuperscript{98} it is also not surprising that modern scholarship has utilised it to such an extent in this way. However, such an ‘historical’ reading inevitably leads to the poem being

\textsuperscript{95} In writing the Fasti, Ovid’s debt to Hellenistic poetry – especially Callimachus’ Aetia – has been well established (see Chapter Two). This influence would undoubtedly have had some impact on the way Ovid chose to present history in the Fasti and which historical events to prioritise. For example, Hutchinson (1988:24), notes the ‘interplay between serious and unserious’ in Hellenistic poetry, the obscurity of stories told in the Aetia and the opposition between bizarre and mundane elements within those stories (43). See also Littlewood 2001:922.

\textsuperscript{96} Fantham 1992a:157. Fantham also sees Ovid’s choice of heroes ‘as an echo of Livy’s early chapters’.

\textsuperscript{97} Robinson 2011:12; and Wiseman and Wiseman 2013:xxiv.

interpreted solely or predominately in contemporary political terms. Herbert-Brown goes so far as to declare the Fasti as Ovid’s ‘first “political” poem’. Perhaps this is also understandable in view of the subject matter of the Fasti – the calendar – which is inherently ‘a construction of immense social and political impact … Any work on the calendar is therefore by its nature highly political’, especially considering the calendar’s contemporary connections to the emperor. Central to modern analysis of the political nature of the Fasti is debate as to whether Ovid is taking a pro- or anti-Augustan stance in the poem. Ovid’s own declaration of the Fasti as his militia (2.9) and munera (2.17) to Caesar Augustus has led some scholars to see the poem as Ovid’s political service in favour of the emperor, while others view it as ‘agonistic’.

Within such discussions of how Ovid engages with Augustan discourse, critics routinely focus on historical events narrated within the poem. But inevitably they treat in any depth only a small selection of the many episodes that Ovid includes. Favourite events include events Evander and Carmentis’ arrival in Rome (1.469-542), the rape of Lucretia (2.711-852), the establishment of the temple of Mars Ultor (5.549-98), the festival of Anna Perenna and Julius Caesar’s assassination (3.523-704) and various other events connected with the imperial family (1.711-2, 6.637-48, 2.119-32). But a good number of the historical events outlined in the chart above go routinely unexamined.

In sum, as well as concentrating their attention on a (relatively) restricted number of historical episodes in the Fasti – particularly those that lend themselves easily to seeing how Ovid engages with Augustan ideology through his narration of events form the past – critics also tend to restrict their treatment of this issue to the exploration of how Ovid presents historical events in terms of a (limited) range of well-established themes, such as genre, intertextuality and Ovid’s pro- or anti-Augustan stance.

---

99 Miller (2002b:168-9) states that ‘the poem’s “political” stance has dominated recent criticism’ and that many ‘contemporary scholars take imperial ideology to be the principal focus of the Fasti’. Fox (1996:219 and 225-6) sees the dominance of the Augustan present in Ovid’s aetiology and views the Fasti’s historical content as mainly devaluing the past in order to praise the present. See also Pasco-Pranger 2000:285.

100 Herbert-Brown 1994:viii.


103 Miller 2002a:169. McKeown (1984:179) maintains a more ‘middle of the road’ viewpoint, suggesting that despite Ovid’s imperial dedication of the poem, there is no reason to think that he necessarily had any commitment to imperial political principles. See also Green 2004b.

104 Miller (2002b:181) states that besides its orientation towards the princeps, no other feature of the Fasti has aroused such intense interest as its generic identity.
Ovid and Livy

History is much more prevalent in the Fasti than is generally credited, and hence potentially much more important than previously thought. Furthermore, as this thesis will seek to demonstrate, within Ovid’s ‘history of Rome’ in the Fasti, a relationship with Livy has a particular prominence. Building on the recognition of Ovid’s engagement with Livy in the rape of Lucretia episode, this thesis will develop a more general argument that this engagement is widespread throughout the Fasti. Moreover, it will propose that it is only through analysing Ovid’s relationship with Livy that the quality and character of the significance of ‘history’ in the Fasti becomes clear and that other emphases – namely a ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme – come to the fore.

By the time of the ‘publication’ of the Fasti, Livy’s AUC had become the standard history of Rome: Ogilvie notes that ‘Livy’s history became at once a classic that relegated its predecessors to oblivion’. Likewise, Littlewood suggests that since the AUC was begun around three decades before the Fasti, it would have been a more obvious and attractive source for Ovid than other works, such as Cicero’s older de Re Publica or Dionysius’ Greek history of Rome, the Antiquitatis Romanae, which also ‘offered positive analysis of Rome’s archaic and regal period’. Bömer claims that Livy would have been the most accessible history to Ovid and furthermore, ‘in dem Ovid insbesondere die Quellen über die Vorzeit in der für die augusteische Zeit verpflichtenden Deutung vereinigt fand’. If Ovid’s Fasti contains within itself a lengthy – if unconventionally arranged and non-conventionally proportionate – history of Rome, then it might be reasonable to expect Ovid’s ‘history of Rome’ to engage in some depth with Livy.

The next chapter will explore some of the ways in which Ovid engages with Livy and in doing so, explores the more ‘plebeian’ aspects of Roman history through the development of a ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme in the Fasti.

105 Wiseman and Wiseman (2013:xii) do suggest that ‘it is possible that Ovid’s original purpose was to draw attention to the particularly historical nature of the poem’.
106 Ogilvie 1965:7; and Cornell 1995:4. Howard (1906:162) notes that Livy supplanted the history of Valerius Antias, which until the publication of AUC ‘was undoubtedly the best known and most popular history of Rome’.
107 Littlewood 2006:lxv.
CHAPTER TWO

Methodology

In the first chapter we established an example of Ovid’s direct engagement with Livy, and sought to increase awareness of the potential for the vastly greater width and depth of that engagement with Livy by taking seriously the extent to which the *Fasti* provides its own detailed, if idiosyncratic, ‘history of Rome’. Later chapters in the thesis will establish the details of that engagement with Livy, from Romulus to the Gallic siege. The present chapter reviews the sources for the history of Rome available to Ovid, including Livy, and argues that our identification of Ovid’s engagement with Livy must take ‘thematic’ intertextuality quite as seriously as ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality. It ends with a preview of the potential coherence of Ovid’s engagement with Livy, whereby Ovid with some consistency, brings out the ‘rustic’ and ‘plebeian’ elements that are potential or implicit in Livy’s history of Rome.

The sources

Scholars believe that Fabius Pictor¹ and L. Cincius Alimentus² were the first native authors of histories of Rome in the third century BC; subsequent writers of Roman histories include A. Postumius Albinus (second century BC), Cato (third – second century BC), L. Cassius Hemina, L. Calpurnius Piso, Cn. Gellius (second century BC), C. Acilius,³ C. Licinius Macer (second to first century BC), Valerius Antias⁴ and Q. Aelius Tubero (first century BC).⁵ While none of these histories has come down to us intact, fragments from all of them survive in varying quantities and modes of transmission.⁶ As will be seen throughout this thesis, a number of other ancient authors also provided accounts of certain aspects of Roman history within their works, most notably Cicero and Varro.⁷ Ennius was the first to write a

---

¹ Ogilvie 1965:178; Wiseman 1998:75; Forsythe 2005:60; Bispham and Cornell *FRHist.*:i.163.
² Wiseman 1998:75; Forsythe 2005:60; Briscoe and Cornell (*FRHist.*:i.180) states that the attested fragments of L. Cincius Alimentus extend from the legendary foundation of Rome to the beginning of the Hannibalic War in 218 BC.
⁴ Howard 1906:162.
⁵ Ogilvie 1965:7-17; Forsythe 2005:63; and Cornell 2013.i = vol. 1.
⁶ *FRHist.*:i-iii. Cicero (*Leg.* 1.6; *Att.* 12.3.1) also mentions a history by Vennonius but Northwood (*FRHist.*:i.250) believes the survival of only two fragments from Vennonius suggests he ‘had little impact’ on subsequent authors.
⁷ Ogilvie (1965:6) claims that Livy did not consult Varro except perhaps for book seven. Luce (1977:160) suggests Livy did not use Varro at all.
comprehensive poetic Latin narrative of Roman history in his *Annales*, although scholars generally agree that Ennius was not used extensively as a source either by Ovid in composing the *Fasti*, nor Livy’s *AUC*. Two Greek writers of Roman history whose accounts will be important to this thesis are Dionysius of Halicarnassus (as indicated in the previous chapter) and to a lesser extent, Diodorus Siculus.

Twice in the *Fasti*, Ovid seems to make ‘a claim to serious antiquarian research’\(^\text{10}\) (*sacra recognosces annalibus eruta priscis* - 1.7; *tempora cum causis annalibus eruta priscis / lapsaque sub terras ortaque signo cano* – 4.11-12).\(^\text{11}\) Despite this, he does not directly name any literary sources, mentioning only various Roman and foreign calendars (1.289, 657-8; 3.87-96; 6.59-63) and an inscription (3.844); his only other named sources are his divine and human informants.\(^\text{12}\)

Ovid’s debt to his poetic predecessors – particularly Callimachus, Propertius and Virgil - in writing the *Fasti* is well established.\(^\text{13}\) Wiseman also suggests that stage plays figured among Ovid’s sources for the *Fasti*.\(^\text{14}\) However, in general, Ovid’s bibliographic ‘casualness’, together with the scarcity of extant earlier annalistic accounts of Roman history, make it very difficult to determine which non-Livian ‘historical’ sources he may have utilised. Most scholars believe that it is probable that Ovid would at least have consulted works from the

---

8 Forsythe 2005:61. Naevius’ *Bellum Poenicum* preceded Ennius, but as Skutsch (1985:6) states, there is no known epic poem prior to Ennius’ *Annales* that covers ‘the history of a nation from its beginnings to the poet’s own day’.

9 Miller (1983a:288-9) admits that the *Fasti* shares some of the *Annales*’ topics – Egeria (Fast. 3.261ff.; Ann. 113 Sk.) and Romulus and Remus (Fast. 2.365ff; Ann. 69-71 Sk.) – and once quotes a whole line of Ennius (Fast. 2.487; Ann. 54 Sk.), but otherwise Ennian echoes are few and mostly just concern phraseology. Barchiesi (1997:144) suggests that as with Livy, Ovid has a largely ‘programmatic’ relationship with Ennius’ *Annales*. Walsh (1961:136) suggests that the - at times - semi-poetic quality of Livy’s work has led to the assumption that Ennius was a major source for Livy particularly in the first decade; however, ‘nowhere can any extensive dependence on Ennius be demonstrated’.

10 Green 2004a:35.

11 Green (2004a:35) suggests *annalibus* might refer to specific sources such as Ennius’ *Annales*, Accius’ *Annales* or, as in Livy (annalibus priscis – 4.7.10), the *Annales Maximi*; alternatively, Green suggests, Ovid may have been borrowing a rhetorical trick from Cicero, who uses the phrase *ex annalium uetustate eruenda* (*Mur. 16*) to emphasise the nobility of Servius Sulpicius, in an attempt ‘to serve a suitably solemn and erudite tone to his work’. Pasco-Pranger (2000:279) notes the debt to Callimachus’ *Aetia* of ‘the persona of the *Fasti*’s narrator as researcher’. See also Miller 1991:10; and Herbert-Brown 2009:127.

12 Frazer 1929:ix; Miller 1991:10; Pasco-Pranger 2000:279; and Green 2004a:35. Pasco-Pranger (2000:279 n.16) further notes two other incidences where Ovid implies he has consulted the calendar at 2.55-8 and 6.649.


14 Wiseman 1998:23. Wiseman (23ff) suggests Accius’ *Brutus* as a possible source for Ovid’s narration of the reign of Servius Tullius (6.573-624); Laberius’ *Anna Perenna* for his story of Mars and Minerva’s encounter at 3.675-96; as well as unknown plays for Numa (3.261-392), the Magna Mater (4.247-348), and mimes for some of his more comedic episodes. See also Wiseman 2015:16.
early Roman historians,\textsuperscript{15} however, as seen in the previous chapter, the scholarly consensus is that it is only Livy that he is using systematically (although this consensus has not moved beyond accounts of Lucretia and Romulus and Remus). Even when Ovid does seem to use an alternative ‘historical’ source – for instance Valerius Antias in his narration of the reign of Numa – signs of a deliberate response to Livy can be detected, with the poet appearing to ‘fill in’ the mythical gaps of Livy’s account (see Chapter Four).

Livy most certainly would have consulted many of the Roman annalistic sources identified above. Scholars identify Livy’s chief sources as (variously) Fabius Pictor, Piso, Macer, Valerius Antias, Tubero, Coelius Antipater\textsuperscript{16} and Q. Claudius Quadrigarius.\textsuperscript{17} There is disagreement about the extent to which Livy may have used Tubero,\textsuperscript{18} and Claudius – who started his history with the Gallic invasion and occupation of Rome in 390 BC\textsuperscript{19} – could not have been a source for Livy’s first four books.\textsuperscript{20}

Livy’s alleged lack of proficiency in the Greek language has led some scholars to doubt whether he consulted Fabius Pictor directly, despite citing him several times.\textsuperscript{21} Similarly, it is thought that Livy did not directly consult either Piso or Gellius, since they largely acted to provide major material for two of his main sources – respectively Valerius Antias and Macer.\textsuperscript{22} Scholars also note Livy’s use of Polybius, but only from the third decade.\textsuperscript{23}

Although Livy and Dionysius were contemporaries, most critics agree that it was unlikely that Livy used Dionysius’ \textit{Roman Antiquities} as a source; chronology would suggest that

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15} Frazer 1929:i.xi-xii.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Coelius Antipater’s work only covered the Hannibalic War (Briscoe \textit{FRHist.}.i.257), therefore he is not included in the list of Roman history writers.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Briscoe and Rich \textit{FRHist.}.i.84; Ogilvie 1963:7; and Walsh 1961:115 & 124. Oakley (1997:i.18) and Luce (1977:163-4) also note Livy’s direct use of Cato in later books. For a list of direct citations of earlier historians see Briscoe and Rich \textit{FRHist.}.i.84.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Ogilvie (1965:17) does not think that Livy used Tubero that extensively whereas Walsh (1961:116-7) suggests that Tubero was frequently used by Ovid as his main source for the first decade; Oakley \textit{FRHist.}.i.365 claims Livy may have used Tubero extensively although it is impossible to be certain of this.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Briscoe \textit{FRHist.}.i.289; Forsythe 2005:63.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Briscoe and Rich \textit{FRHist.}.i.85.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Ogilvie 1965:7, 178. Both Luce (1977:161) and Briscoe and Rich \textit{FRHist.}.i.84, table 6) dispute this, with Briscoe and Rich noting that Livy cites Fabius Pictor six times in the first 25 books.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Ogilvie (1965:7) believes there was no need for Livy to consult Piso as he was Valerius Antias’ main source; Walsh (1961:115-6) also believes that rather than consulting some of his sources – Pictor, Piso and Claudius – directly, Livy most likely ‘found citations from them in the late annalists’. However, Oakley (1997:i.17-8) dismisses the theory that Livy did not consult Pictor and Piso directly as he often refers to them in the early books. Luce (1977:161) and Briscoe and Rich (\textit{FRHist.}.i.84-5) dispute that Livy did not directly consult Piso, the latter noting six direct citations of him. Briscoe and Rich (\textit{FRHist.}.i.85) concur with Forsythe (2005:63) that it is unlikely he used Gellius directly.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Walsh 1961:124-6; Ogilvie 1965:5; Levene 2010:162; Briscoe and Rich \textit{FRHist.}.i.85-6; Champion 2015:195; and Oakley 1997:i.13.
\end{itemize}
such borrowing was impossible for Livy’s account of the regal period. Conversely, while Livy is not directly cited by Dionysius as a source, Dionysius’ work does contain many possible references to Livy. Scholars are yet to be convinced that Ovid used Dionysius as a source, despite the availability of the historian’s work.

What is generally agreed is that both Livy and Dionysius used the same sources (although not all the same sources) overall for their respective historical works. At the beginning of book one, Dionysius provides a discussion of his sources (1.6.1-7.4) in which he cites many of those also used by Livy (directly or indirectly), including Fabius Pictor, Alimentus (1.6.2), Cato, Fabius Maximus, Valerius Antias, Macer, Tubero, Gellius and Piso (1.7.3).

The use of common sources means that there is often a close resemblance in terms of ‘facts’ between Livy and Dionysius’ accounts of Roman history, although ‘their treatments of individual events often diverge markedly’. This similarity has led critics to conclude that there was an established tradition (or set of traditions) relating to many aspects of Rome’s past. In relation to the regal period, it is agreed that Fabius Pictor’s history offered traditions that were already well developed and largely resemble what is found in Livy. In terms of the most complete narratives of Rome’s regal period, a comparison of Livy and Dionysius, together with Cicero (De Rep.), reveals a remarkable ‘stability of general data’. When examined in conjunction with the albeit fractional extant previous historiography, it

24 Cornell 1995:2. Luce (1965:238) claims that Livy’s first pentad was completed by 27 BC (see for a full discussion of the dating of books 1-5), with his final book published possibly as late as 17 AD, according to Forsythe (2005:66). Dionysius’ history began to appear in 7 BC, twenty years later than the completion of Livy’s first five books (Cornell 1995:2; Forsythe 2005:66; and Martin 2015:259). If Ogilvie’s suggestion that Livy lacked proficiency in the Greek language (1965:7) is correct, this would also make Dionysius an unlikely source.


26 Bömer (1957:i.29) claims the extent to which Ovid used Dionysius is not apparent and needs further investigation. Littlewood (2006:xI) notes that Dionysius’ works would have been available in the library complex in the precinct of Palatine Apollo and that at the Porticus Octaviae where Ovid is likely to have undertaken research. Neel (2015:146) suggests that Ovid and Dionysius would probably have used the same sources, ‘but almost certainly not each other’s works’.

27 Gabba 1991:20; Forsythe 2005:67-8; and Martin 2015:259. Gabba (1991:10) also claims that ‘Dionysius is more faithful to his sources than ... Livy’.

28 Northwood (FRHist.:i.62) notes citations of Cato, Tuditanus, Fabius Pictor, Cincius, Acilius, Piso, Tubero, Vennonius, Gellius, Valerius Antias, Macer and Varro in his history overall.

29 Forsythe 2005:67-8. Cornell (1995:2) states that agreement between Livy and Dionysius in terms of detail is due to their use of common sources rather than direct contact. He adds that although Dionysius and Livy differ in their aims, methods and approach, ‘their accounts complement each other’. Neel (2015:142) states that while Livy and Dionysius differ substantially in terms of context and content, ‘The similarities of their accounts are also considerable enough to merit examining them together’. See also Thomsen 1980:9; and Gabba 1991:20-2.

30 Oakley 1997:i.15-6 & 22.


32 Martin 2015:259. Neel (2015:141) states that Livy and Dionysius offer the fullest extant accounts of the foundation of Rome.
becomes evident ‘that the main lines of the traditional narrative concerning the regal period were fixed and that the spirit that has given birth to it was unchanged’. Due to their replication of an established tradition, and because of the scarcity of prior sources, Dionysius acts as a good yardstick by which to judge Livy’s own innovations in his account of Roman history, whether in terms of the details of an event or his nuanced treatment of it. This in turn enables us to further measure Ovid’s engagement with Livy, which serves to both reinforce this engagement where the poet concurs with the historian’s innovations, and allow (to some extent) an analysis of the objectives behind Ovid’s own nuances where he deviates from Livy.

**Intertextuality**

Having suggested that Livy is Ovid’s main ‘historical’ source for the *Fasti* (a proposition that will be bolstered in more detail in the following chapters), it is now important to establish the ways in which the poet expresses his relationship with the historian. As demonstrated with the rape of Lucretia in the previous chapter, one of the ways in which Ovid engages with Livy is through ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality, and critics identify such engagement in numerous other passages throughout the *Fasti*. However, there are also a significant number of passages which – while not offering conventional evidence of intertextuality – demonstrate clear engagement with the historian in a number of ways. For this type of engagement I use the broad term ‘thematic’ intertextuality (see below). Nevertheless, before going further, it is important to state that the level and intensity of Ovid’s ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality with Livy is not consistent across all episodes reviewed. That intensity is found at its strongest in episodes such as the rape of Lucretia, Servius and the Gallic siege, but is rather ‘softer’ in other cases such as Romulus and Remus and Anna Perenna. As a rule, there will be less ‘direct verbal’ and more ‘thematic’ intertextuality in instances where Ovid’s engagement with Livy is of the ‘softer’ variety.

Ovid’s interaction with Livy through ‘thematic’ intertextuality is demonstrated in two ways: first, there are a number of passages in the *Fasti* which, while displaying no specific

33 Martin 2015:259.
34 The ancient writers themselves bemoan a lack of source material for the regal period, with Cicero stating *temporum illorum tantum fere regnum illustrata sunt nomina* (*De Rep.* 2.33) and Dionysius claiming that ‘the earliest Roman historiography had treated the history of the city, after its foundation, rather summarily’ (*1.6.1-2*).
examples of ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality, closely follow Livy in terms of detail or sentiment. For example (as will be demonstrated in Chapter Four), Ovid concurs with Livy more than any other extant source in his characterisation of Numa as a peaceful, just, pious and wise king. The second way in which ‘thematic’ intertextuality with Livy can be seen in the *Fasti* is in passages that cannot be fully understood without a detailed knowledge by the reader of events in Rome’s history. The brevity of the narration of some historical episodes in the *Fasti* (for example – as noted in the previous chapter – Ovid’s reference to the capture of Gabii – *Fast*. 2.687-710), can disguise the importance of the event and the considerable knowledge of history required from the reader to elucidate the *Fasti* passage and its significance. The knowledge of that history would be most fully and authoritatively be available to the reader in Livy’s *AUC* which, as noted in Chapter One, was certainly the standard history of Rome at the time of the *Fasti*’s composition. Furthermore, a knowledge of Livy often helps to bring out something very particular in Ovid’s handing of events (see below).

Such ‘thematic’, rather than ‘direct verbal’, intertextuality has occasionally been noted by critics in the *Fasti*. Ovidian ‘thematic’ intertextuality with prose texts is, in fact, a well-established phenomenon: in the *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid makes extensive reference to, and use of, the content of Cicero’s *De Officiis*, without deploying particularly marked or sustained references to the language of the Ciceronian work. Nevertheless, in the *Fasti*, the majority of discussion has focussed on individual, and generally more ‘important’, passages in the *Fasti* where definite ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality with Livy can also be identified. This is probably mostly because those passages that offer evidence of ‘thematic’ intertextuality with Livy are not so easily identifiable: their relative brevity and the fact they are often included as part of other extended narratives, rather than as stand-alone events, makes them easy to overlook without grasping the close reference to Livy. Moreover, it is often only through a knowledge of Livy that the historical significance of some passages is discovered in the first place.

---

35 Fox 1996:211. Fantham (1992a:39) quotes Seneca in illius uersu suum sensum inuenit (*Contr*. 7.1.27) to illustrate her idea of ‘competitive allusion’ in which Ovid modifies ‘another man’s phrase to discover a new meaning’. Murgatroyd (2013:69-85) suggests the idea that Ovid invites the reader to remember more history than he actually narrates (in this case in relation to the temple of Concord), but he does not suggest that the reader would obtain this information from Livy.

36 For Ovid’s references to and use of Cicero’s *De Officiis* in the *Ars Amatoria*, particularly its third book, see Gibson 2007: 119-29,143-7, building on the work of Labate 1984.
The obvious way to deal with this ‘situation’ is to adopt a twin track ‘author focussed’ approach and ‘reader-focussed’ approach. That is to say: we use the first approach in cases where intertextuality is certain (or arguable), and the second approach where intertextuality is not certain. In the latter case, we ask: what would a reader who had read the most widely available history of Rome make of Ovid’s ‘history of Rome’? As will be seen in the following chapters of this thesis, some consistent patterns emerge from reading Ovid against Livy in those instances where interaction while likely, cannot be proven. This consistency can itself be taken as a pointer towards the fact that we are indeed meant to read Ovid against Livy.

Once these passages have been identified, a reading of them in conjunction with Livy not only enables the extent of ‘history’ covered in the Fasti to be realised (something which, as suggested in the previous chapter has been under-estimated by modern critics), but also brings to light a range of themes and issues in the poem which have received little, if any, attention in modern scholarship. This thesis will argue that a sustained ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ focus can be detected throughout the Fasti through a parallel reading of the poem’s historical narratives and Livy. This focus becomes apparent in historical episodes in the Fasti that display evidence of both ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality.

Genre

As discussed in Chapter One, genre forms one of the dominant themes within which modern critics frame their examination of Ovid’s relationship with Livy. However, as suggested earlier, this is often restricted to using generic convention to explain the similarities and differences between the two authors. While the elegiac principles of the Fasti undoubtedly enable Ovid to put the poetry back into Livy’s more ‘sober’ account, it is for more than just artistic reasons: by ‘reclaiming myths and legends for verse,’ Ovid is able to engage in a direct dialogue with Livy. The generic differences are not inert features of the texts, but guarantees of close engagement by Ovid with his predecessor. By enabling Ovid to ‘fill in’ the mythical gaps of Livy’s account, they do more than simply allow the poet to add colour to the historian’s more monochrome account; rather, they enable Ovid to ‘correct’ Livy’s

---

38 Murgatroyd 2005:171.
39 In his preface, Livy has states that he will pay more attention to serious matters regarding Rome’s history than to less important supernatural ones (Sed haec et his similia utcumque animaduersa aut existimata erunt, haud in magno equidem ponam discrimine - Praef. 8-9)
version of events, by challenging any scepticism the historian shows towards the mythical aspects of the events he narrates. (Ovid achieves something similar with Lucretius in the *Metamorphoses*).\(^{40}\) Furthermore, it is through such engagement with Livy that Ovid is able to develop his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme.

It is well established that pastoral imagery is an inherent aspect of elegiac generic convention; moreover, the association between pastoral imagery and the ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ aspects of the *Fasti* has been noted by modern commentators to a degree. For example (as discussed in Chapter Six), in providing a suitable *mise-en-scène* for the ‘popular’ festival of Anna Perenna (3.523-42), Ovid’s use of pastoral imagery in the *Fasti* has formed part of the discussion as to how generic convention could have motivated him to prioritise this generically-suitable festival over the generically-‘unsuitable’ issue of Julius Caesar’s murder (3.697-704).\(^{41}\) However, as will be demonstrated later in this thesis, a much wider and more sustained association between pastoral imagery and Ovid’s ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ motif can be read in the *Fasti*. The poet routinely places his more ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ characters in a bucolic environment, making them more apposite to the generic conventions of the *Fasti* than their more ‘militaristic’ counterparts. This will prove especially important to Ovid’s casting of a particularly bellicose Romulus in opposition to the more ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ Remus and Numa (see Chapters Three and Four), and will continue throughout the poet’s ‘historical’ narrative. Once again, the identification of this dichotomy relies on a synchronous reading of the *Fasti* with Livy.

**Ovid’s plebeian theme**

Modern critics have noted certain ‘plebeian’ aspects in the *Fasti*: Wiseman and Wiseman note that some episodes treated at length ‘show a markedly popular point of view, with Anna Perenna feeding the plebeians on the Mons Sacer (3.663); Flora gaining her temple and games by the action of the plebeian aediles against the rich (5.285); the Great Mother justifying Quinta Claudia against the disapproval of the strict old men (4.310)’.\(^{42}\) The Wisemans further note that imperial gods like Mars and Apollo are side-lined in favour of

---

\(^{40}\) In the Pythagorean section of *Met*. 15, Ovid follows Lucretius closely, but also contradicts him, with the effect that mythical content is recast as being factual. See Segal 2001:63-101.

\(^{41}\) Horsfall 1974:196-7; Mckeown 1984; Newlands 1995:60-2; Barchiesi 1997:123-9; and Miller 2002b.

\(^{42}\) Wiseman and Wiseman 2013:xxvii. Wiseman (1995:110) proposes the possibility of Remus as being a representative of the plebeian cause; however his study is based on a wide range of texts with limited analysis of the *Fasti*. 
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more ancient popular deities Janus, Priapus, Flora, Mercury, Carna, Fortuna, Anna Perenna and Mater Matuta.  

However, even where ‘plebeian’ aspects are identified, they are often only examined in relation to other dominant themes and issues in the poem (as outlined in the previous chapter). Newlands for example, notes the popular, as well as the imperial, side of the goddess Vesta in the Fasti, but limits her exploration of this to mainly to generic and contemporary social issues: ‘Within the one figure of Vesta, Ovid compresses generic and social tensions between urbanitas and gravitas, amor and Roma, popular and Augustan cult’. Similarly, Herbert-Brown notes the plebeian aspects of a number of festivals in the Fasti, but uses them mainly to challenge views that Ovid was deliberately attempting to undermine Augustus in his narration of the more vulgar aspects of some popular festivals. The ‘plebeian’ aspects of the Fasti have still received relatively little attention generally and – more importantly – have not been explored at length in relation to either individual historical events or in terms of an overall narrative ‘history of Rome’ in the Fasti. This thesis will propose that this ‘plebeian’ focus is not only much wider and more sustained in the Fasti than has been previously recognised, but that this focus is best appreciated through Ovid’s engagement with Livy.

One way to see how Ovid’s engagement with Livy reveals a strong ‘plebeian’ focus in the Fasti, is to look at how the poet’s treatment of history overall compares to that of the historian. Through such a comparison, we begin to get a sense of what Ovid finds worthy of inclusion in his narrative of events from Rome’s past from a broader history of Rome. As highlighted in the previous chapter, scholars ascribe the structure of the calendar, the genre and overall themes of the Fasti, and the prevailing political atmosphere at Rome as potential reasons for why Ovid chooses to prioritise some aspects of Rome’s past over others. However, as this thesis will attempt to show, such emphases could also be motivated by Ovid’s wish to elucidate a ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme.

For example, both authors cover the same aspects and events of the lives of Romulus and Remus, with the twins forming a significant part of Ovid’s history (Fast. 1.27-42, 1.259-74, 2.133-5, 2.139-40, 2.143-4, 2.359-80, 2.383-422, 2.429-34, 2.475-512, 3.9-78, 3.97-8, 3.127-34, 3.181-234, 3.431-4, 4.55-60, 4.89-58, 5.151-2, 5.451-84, 6.793-4; Liv. 1.4.1-16.8), before moving on to Numa (Fast. 1.43-4; 3.151-4, 261-392; 4.641-72; 6.257-643; Liv.
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43 Wiseman and Wiseman 2013:xxvii.
44 Newlands 1995:139.
45 Newlands 1995:140.
1.18.1-21.5). Unlike Livy however, Ovid then omits any detail regarding the subsequent kings (only mentioning Ancus Marcius in passing - 6.803) until the reign of Servius Tullius (*Fast.* 6.627-36, 573-80, 581-624; Liv. 1.39-48). Apart from a brief narration of the capture of Gabii (2.687-710): examined in Chapter One), the majority of Ovid’s coverage of the reign of Rome’s last king, Tarquinius Superbus (Liv. 1.49-60), focuses on the rape of Lucretia (2.711-852: see Chapter One also). Ovid’s keener interest in Numa and Servius is likely motivated by their adaptability in opposition to Livy's portrayal of Romulus (at least in his early manifestation in *AUC*) as part of the *Fasti*’s more general juxtaposition of more ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ characters to those with a more bellicose temperament (see Chapters Four and Five). This is a position that will be argued in more detail in the body of the thesis.

Likewise, Ovid’s criteria in choosing what historical events to relate from the Republican period also seems to be governed (to some extent) by their relevance to a ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme (as will be developed further in this thesis). Ovid begins his ‘account’ of the Republic with a specifically ‘plebeian’ event – Anna Perenna and the secession of the plebs in 494 BC (3.663-74) and continues to highlight the ‘plebeian’ significance of subsequent events including the defeat of the Fabii at the battle of the Cremera (2.195-242), the Gallic siege (1.453, 6.185-90, 6.349-94), the games of Flora (5.279-330), the exile and return of the flute-players (6.649-92) and Magna Mater’s journey to Rome (4.247-348). Comparison with Livy’s accounts of these events is also crucial in determining that Ovid’s motivation for including particular historical episodes is not to be attributed without further reflection to other aspects of the poem – like genre – to the detriment of the overall importance of history in the *Fasti* overall. For example, generic convention cannot be the only motivation for Ovid’s narration of the exile and return of the flute-players if Livy is anything to go by. Despite his protestations to the contrary (*rem dictu paruam praeterirem, ni ad religionem uisa esset pertinere* – 9.30.5), the fact that Livy’s devotes a relatively large amount of space to this event (9.30.5-10) illustrates its historical weight (see Chapter Seven).

Perhaps surprisingly, considering Ovid’s seeming intention to include major historic events, he continues his historical narrative with only a fleeting mention of the First Punic War (1.595, 6.193-4). Ovid makes several – albeit brief – references to military engagements in the Second Punic War (1.593, 2.241-2, 3.148, 4.873-4, 6.241-8, 6.765-70), their brevity made all the more conspicuous by Livy’s protracted coverage of this war, which encompasses a total of ten books (21-30). By far the most coverage of this period is given over to two events – the journey of the Magna Mater to Rome (4.247-348) and the festival of Flora (5.279-330). While not wholly unconnected to the Second Punic War, Ovid’s
prioritising of these events during the time of one of the most important wars in Rome’s history is interesting, especially as both can be related to a ‘plebeian’ motif (explored in Chapter Seven). Ovid continues to note the major conflicts of the remaining republican era before moving on to the time of the Caesars, an era for which Livy’s account does not survive.

This comparison between Ovid and Livy not only reveals the extent of historical narration in the Fasti, but it also demonstrates how an interest in historical events that have a ‘plebeian’ focus is sustained in the poem. A closer comparative study of the ways in which both Ovid and Livy treat these historical events also reveals a difference in emphasis between the two authors which will be eventually shown to be emblematic for relations between the Fasti and AUC. Ovid, as we shall see, displays a more sustained and more positive interest in the ‘plebeian’ aspects of Roman history than does Livy. And it is only through such comparison with Livy, this thesis will argue, that this ‘plebeian’ interest on behalf of the poet comes to light.
CHAPTER THREE
Romulus and Remus

Introduction

In the preceding chapters of general introduction, Ovid’s broad engagement with Livy in the *Fasti* was examined, and evidence of a sustained dialogue between the texts began to emerge. The present chapter takes a single conspicuous shared event – the lives of Romulus and Remus (told over several episodes in the *Fasti*) – and subjects it to intense scrutiny, as an example of the potential that the study of Livy and the *Fasti* offers.

In the course of the chapter we learn that it is only by reading the *Fasti* in conjunction with Livy, that Ovid’s own specific representation of these historical characters and the events related to their lives, can be fully comprehended. In particular, by uncovering an Ovidian dichotomy between the characters of the two brothers, we discover the beginnings (chronologically in terms of the parameters of this thesis) of the poet’s emphasis on the more ‘rustic’ and ‘plebeian’ aspects of Roman ‘history’ in the poem. Also brought to light is the vivacity of Ovid’s engagement with Livy as he both interrogates and challenges the historian’s version of events.

Ovid’s account of the lives of Romulus and Remus differs from that of Livy both in terms of some details of certain events (for example, who killed Remus), and in terms of the events he chooses to prioritise (for example, Ovid gives a much longer account of the rape of Silvia, which leads to her conception of the twins). However (as with the rape of Lucretia in Chapter One), Ovid still signals that he wishes his account to be read against Livy through various instances and forms of intertextuality. Even where it could be said that Ovid is reacting to the ‘canonical’ versions of events, it is this ‘canonical’ version as related by Livy that Ovid is using as his reference point. It is therefore, only by a parallel reading of the two accounts that the meaning of their differences can be ascertained. Likewise, even where Ovid can be seen to be using an alternative annalistic source, various forms of engagement with Livy indicate that these differences are part of Ovid’s way of making a response to Livy: Ovid designates Livy as the touchstone against which he wants us to read his ‘history of Rome’.

Some of the variations between Ovid’s account and that of Livy appear to be the product of generic convention; however (as discussed in Chapters One and Two), rather than viewing them just as a by-product of genre, we can see Ovid actively using these differences as an
aid to his colloquy with the historian. It is only through this dialectic with Livy that Ovid’s very specific portrait of Romulus and Remus can be both realised by the poet and discerned by the reader.

The opening section of this chapter looks at the structure of Ovid’s narration of the lives of Romulus and Remus from their conception and birth through to Romulus’ death and apotheosis. It then moves on to give a summary of the extant sources available for this part of Roman history. Ovid’s engagement with Livy is discussed next, with examination of both ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality used to show that it is *AUC* that Ovid is using as his primary source and reference point.

In the second part of this chapter, the differing versions provided by Ovid and Livy of the conception and birth of Romulus and Remus are analysed. Some differences between their accounts undoubtedly can be ascribed to the separate genres in which the two authors are writing. In particular, poetry allows an emphasis on, and gives a role to mythical elements of the tradition that are not considered generically appropriate by Livy. However, as will be seen, it is precisely this difference in genre that allows Ovid to not only question the historical veracity of Livy’s account, but also to begin to develop his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme. It is only by a synchronous reading of Ovid and Livy that the greater prominence that poet gives to low-status characters in the story of Romulus and Remus really comes to the fore. These rustic figures are allotted a positive moral value by Ovid which stands in stark contrast to the negative actions of the royal characters in his version of events. This ‘rustic’-‘regal’ dichotomy will eventually evolve into an opposition between the ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ and more bellicose figures that Ovid develops after the founding of Rome. As will be seen later, this is Ovid’s way of displaying a more sustained and more positive interest in the plebeian aspects of Roman history than does Livy. Furthermore, since both poet and historian initially depict Romulus and Remus as themselves having been substantially influenced by the pastoral environment that informs the morality of other low-status figures, Ovid is able, through his opposition, to set the foundation for an interrogation of Livy’s subsequent, and potentially contradictory, portrayal of Romulus.

The third part of the chapter moves on to Romulus and Remus as young adults. Here the differences between the accounts of Livy and Ovid are complex, albeit clear, although their full significance will not be apparent until the next stage in the development of the story. In Livy’s account, the discovery by the pair of their royal lineage becomes – retrospectively – an important moment in their development. Romulus and Remus are transformed from shepherds into military leaders, and their killing of Amulius – who had deposed Numitor
(the grandfather of the pair) as king of Alba Longa – presages events which culminate in the death of Remus: a second argument over who is rightful king of a city. Ovid grants much less prominence to the discovery of royal lineage, and does not, at this point, indicate an increasingly militaristic zeal in the brothers. Rather, the murder of Amulius is portrayed as an impulsive act by Romulus alone, at a point in the narrative where the twins have just learnt that the war-god Mars is their father. Romulus and Remus then go on to initiate the founding of Rome in a spirit of brotherly unity. Crucially, these two accounts offer diverging portraits of the characters of the pair. In Livy, the initial capture of Remus by cattle-rustlers (before Amulius is killed) insinuates the suggestion that this twin is weaker than his brother, who had successfully evaded capture. As such, it provides prospective justification for his murder by Romulus (in a version of the ‘survival of the fittest’). Ovid structures his account rather differently, so as to allow the conclusion that it is Romulus alone who has inherited his divine father’s propensity to violence. Moreover, Ovid supplies a role for Remus as victor in the confrontations with the cattle-thieves, which allows the conclusion that Remus is in no sense the ‘weaker’ of the pair. In sum, Ovid is providing warning signs about the character of Romulus, while Livy has almost started his redemption of Romulus before it is strictly necessary.

The final part of the chapter progresses to the most obvious difference between the accounts of Ovid and Livy: who killed Remus? In Livy’s account there are two versions of the murder, both of which ultimately imply or assert that it is Romulus who is guilty and that Remus’ death is a perpetuation of events in their royal lineage (see above). This initiates a lengthy process of redemption for Livy’s Romulus, beginning almost the moment after the killing of Remus, when Romulus reverts to a style of religious ceremony that had been characteristic of Evander’s more idyllic city on the site of Rome. Livy’s Romulus, after the death of Remus, now displays a character that manages to combine the best parts of his rustic upbringing with his royal heritage. Furthermore, any excessive or aggressive acts are now tempered by an unselfish disposition that is determined to act for the greater good. In Ovid, by contrast, Romulus is absolved from any responsibility for the murder of Remus: a signal difference from the narrative of Livy. Nevertheless, as soon as Remus is dead, there is an observable shift in the character of Ovid’s Romulus. It is at this point that Romulus’ divinely inherited temperament – which has so far existed equitably with his ‘rustic’ character – begins to emerge. In particular, Ovid portrays a thoroughly militaristic Romulus quite beyond anything found in Livy. In addition, the funeral of Remus seems to mark the disappearance from Romulus of any positive ‘rustic’ traits; when the apparition of Remus
returns seeking correct posthumous commemoration, his speech is addressed solely to his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ foster-parents.

The differing emphases given to their accounts by Ovid and Livy are highly significant. By implying some responsibility for the death of Remus to Romulus, Livy effectively creates a character who is in need of redemption. Such rehabilitation results in the more rounded statesmanlike character who emerges in Livy once sole power has been achieved. Conversely in Ovid, Romulus stands in no need of redemption. This seems to free the poet’s hand to give a different colouring to his version: a Romulus who becomes increasingly violent – and even tyrannical – once sole power has been achieved. That Romulus is tyrannical emerges only retrospectively in Ovid’s account. Mars is the main narrator of Romulus’ story after the latter has achieved sole power: such a narrator is unlikely to see overweening behaviour as problematic in any way. However, when Ovid himself returns as narrator to the career of Romulus at a later stage in the Fasti, it emerges that the senators may have had good reason to consider murdering Romulus. In retrospect, Ovid writes us a license to read Romulus as a tyrant (by contrast with Livy who virtually denies that the senators had any such due cause to kill Romulus).

**Ovid’s narration of the lives of Romulus and Remus**

Romulus and Remus receive more coverage than any other historical characters or episodes in the Fasti, with a total of 377 lines dedicated to a range of events in their lives from conception to death.\(^1\) References to them occur in all six books of the Fasti, with the longest narratives reserved for books two and three (113 and 138 lines respectively). The placement of narratives relating to the different episodes in their lives seems largely determined by the structure of the calendar and is not apparently influenced by the chronological order of events in their lives. In terms of chronology, coverage of the twins’ lives begins in book three, with Ovid providing a potted biography of the brothers from their conception and birth up to the cessation of the war with the Sabines; this biography occurs mainly in the first 234 lines of book three with a few relatively brief excursuses. After inviting Mars to preside over the narration of events in his month (3.1-8), Ovid recounts the god’s rape of Silvia and various events in the brothers’ lives up to the founding of Rome (3.9-78). With Romulus as sole ruler of the city (3.73), Ovid proceeds to explain the ancient nature of worship of the

war-god (3.79-86). This is followed by an account of the development of the Roman Calendar (3.87-134), Ovid noting that it was Romulus who originally named the first month of the year after Mars (3.97-8), and a number of other legislative measures (3.127-34) introduced by Rome’s first king; Romulus’ intercalation is also mentioned at the beginning of the Fasti (1.27-42). Following an excursus on Caesar’s calendar reform (3.135-66), the poet proceeds to recount the rape of the Sabine women (3.181-200) and the Sabine war (3.201-234), following his invitation to Mars to explain why women celebrate the Matronalia (3.167-80). There is also a brief allusion to the rape of the Sabine women in book two (2.429-34), and the war with the Sabines is mentioned in book one, where Janus gives his version of the story of Tarpeia (1.259-74).

While Ovid briefly alludes to Romulus and Remus’ suckling by the she-wolf within their biography in book three (3.53-4), he provides a more detailed account in book two as part of his explanation of the Lupercalia (2.383-422). Just prior to this narration of the she-wolf episode, and also as part of his explanation of the Lupercalia, Ovid tells the story of Romulus and Remus as young men tackling cattle-rustlers (2.359-80). The foundation of Rome is included in the poet’s account of the Parilia at the end of book four and includes the death and funeral of Remus (4.809-58). In book five, Ovid relates how a ghostly Remus visits his foster-parents Faustulus and Larentia, to appeal for correct posthumous commemoration, which leads to the establishment of the Lemuria festival (5.451-84). There is also a brief allusion to Romulus and Remus’ augury contest earlier in book five (5.151-2). Ovid tells the story of Romulus’ death and apotheosis as part of his narration of the Quirinal in book two (2.475-512). In addition, Ovid makes brief allusions to the twins’ conception and birth in his Alban dynasty (4.55-60), Romulus’ creation of an asylum (3.431-4) and to the Sabine war (6.793-4); there are also some fleeting references to a number of events relating to Romulus – including the foundation of the city, the rape of the Sabine women, the Sabine war, the death of Remus, Romulus’ asylum and his deification – as part of the poet’s celebration of Augustus’ receipt of the title pater patriae (2.133-5, 2.139-40, 2.143-4).

While the episodes related to the lives of Romulus and Remus are scattered over all six books of the Fasti, the bulk of their biography (nearly seventy percent) is collocated in two relatively concentrated blocks in contiguous books (books two and three).
The sources

As discussed in Chapter One, Fabius Pictor and Cincius are thought to have been the first native Romans to write histories of Rome, with the few surviving fragments of Fabius Pictor suggesting that the traditions of the regal period were already well developed and resemble what is found in Livy.\(^2\) Six fragments relating to the early lives of Romulus and Remus from their conception to the slaying of Amulius can be ascribed to Fabius (\textit{FRHist.} fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5; Fabius \textit{FRHist.} fr. 4b, 4c = Vennonius fr.1; Fabius \textit{FRHist.} fr. 4d, 4e, 29).\(^3\) The two most comprehensive Fabian fragments, i.e. \textit{FRHist.} fr. 4a and 4b, are found in Dionysius (1.75.4-84.1)\(^4\) and Plutarch (\textit{Rom.} 3-4, 6-8),\(^5\) with Dionysius also stating that it was Fabius whom Cincius, Cato, Piso and the majority of other historians followed (1.79.4). While variations between Dionysius and Plutarch are relatively ‘trivial’, they are substantial enough for Cornell to conclude that neither was relying exclusively on Fabius Pictor: it is likely that ‘both are offering versions of a composite vulgate containing later elaborations of Fabius’ basic story’.\(^6\) Other extant sources covering various aspects of the early lives of the twins, as well as offering some variant versions, come from Naevius (Servius commentary on \textit{Aen.} 1.273), Ennius (\textit{Ann.} 34-71 Sk.), Valerius Antias (\textit{FRHist.} fr.1, 2), Macer (\textit{FRHist.} fr.1 = M. Octavius fr.2; Macer \textit{FRHist.} fr.12), Tubero (\textit{FRHist.} fr.3) and Cicero (\textit{De Rep.} 2.4-5).\(^7\)

Few comprehensive sources for the later lives of Romulus and Remus survive either. Apart from citing Cincius and Fabius in his discussion of the date of the foundation of Rome (1.74.1), Dionysius does not acknowledge any individual source for his account of the founding of the city and the death of Remus; rather, he claims he has compiled the most believable version from all the Greek and Roman historians (1.89.1).\(^8\) It is however, to Fabius and Cincius he returns for his narration of Tarpeia’s treachery, adding a variant version from Piso (2.38.2-40.2 = Fabius \textit{FRHist.} fr.1 = Cincius Alimentus fr.2 = Piso fr.7). Again, Dionysius offers few clues as to his specific sources in the rest of his account about
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\(^2\) Forsythe 2005:61.

\(^3\) Bispham and Cornell (\textit{FRHist.:iii.}15-16) state that fr.29 cannot definitively be attributed to Fabius Pictor.

\(^4\) Dionysius 1.75.4-84.1 = Fabius \textit{FRHist.} fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5.

\(^5\) Plutarch \textit{Rom.} 3-4, 6-8 = Fabius \textit{FRHist.} fr.4b; Plutarch cites Fabius Pictor and Diocles as his main sources.

\(^6\) Bispham and Cornell \textit{FRHist.:iii.}20.

\(^7\) Rich (\textit{FRHist.:iii.}9) is cautious as to the source of a potential fragment from the \textit{Annales Maximi} (\textit{FRHist.} fr.7).

\(^8\) Other generic references to his sources occur at 1.75.4, 1.77.2, 1.79.1-3, 1.87.4.
the lives of the brothers. Other surviving sources relating to the later lives of Romulus and Remus are both relatively few in number and brief in extent.

As noted in Chapter One, next to Livy, Dionysius provides the nearest contemporaneous and comprehensive surviving account of Rome’s history that – as far as we can tell – often reproduces the ‘canonical’ tradition. In light of the scarcity of surviving pre-Livian sources, it is Dionysius therefore, who provides a crucial benchmark against which Livy’s nuanced version of Rome’s history can be judged. As will be seen below, it is through such a comparison that Ovid’s engagement with Livy can also be measured and defined, since the poet can frequently be seen reacting directly and specifically to Livy’s interpretation of the established and standard tradition, rather than that of previous authors.

**Ovid and Livy**

Scholars suggest that Livy is generally following a Fabian account in his narration of the lives of Romulus and Remus, with Macer, Antias and Tubero also used as sources.

Similarly, Ovid’s version of events relating to the lives of the twins, in terms of the broad outline of individual episodes, mainly resembles this ‘canonical’ Fabian version as found in Livy. However, a number of instances of both ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality with Livy indicate that it is the historian’s version that Ovid is specifically using as his direct source and reference point. Although this ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality is relatively small scale and scattered, its cumulative demonstration of an engagement between Ovid and Livy is convincing in the aggregate. Even in those episodes where no intertextuality of either variety can be detected with Livy, and even when Ovid turns to another source, his close engagement with the historian can still be discerned.

Ovid indicates his engagement with Livy from the chronological beginning of his narration of the lives of Romulus and Remus. As part of his *aition* of the Lupercalia festival, Ovid makes a brief reference to the birth of the twins:
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9 Dionysius’ main narration of the lives of Romulus and Remus occurs 1.73.1-2.65.4, with a few other minor allusions in various parts of his work.

10 *Annales Maximi FRHist.* fr.4; *Ennius Ann.* 72-112 Sk.; *Fabius Pictor FRHist.* fr.7 = *Cincius Alimentus* fr.3 = *Piso fr.7; Cato FRHist.* t.8, fr.16; *Hemina FRHist.* fr.21 = *Tuditanus* fr.1 = *Valerius Antias* fr.7 = *Macer* fr.11; *Piso FRHist.* fr.8, 9, 10; *Valerius Antias FRHist.* fr.3, 4, 5; *Macer FRHist.* fr.2, 3, 9; *Cicero De Rep.* 1.25, 1.64. 2.10-25, 3.47, 6.24; *De Leg.* 1.3, 2.33; *N.D.* 3.39; *Off.* 3.40-1; *Galba FRHist.* fr.1; *Fenestella FRHist.* fr.8.

11 Forsythe 2005:63; and Ogilvie 1965:7-14, 47-8, 50, 64.
Siluia Vestalis caelestia semina partu
ediderat patruo regna tenente suo (2.383-4).

In his narration of the birth of Romulus and Remus, Livy states that Silvia claims she was raped by Mars, but declines to confirm or deny the truth of this:

\[
\text{Vi compressa Vestalis cum geminum partum edidisset, seu ita rata seu quia deus auctor}
\text{culpae honestior erat, Martem incertae stirpis patrem nuncupat. Sed nec dii nec homines}
\text{aut ipsam aut stirpem a crudelitate regia uindicant (1.4.2-3).}
\]

While acknowledging that partu edo is a common phrase, Robinson argues that Ovid provides a direct allusion to Livy’s cum partum edidisset (1.3.2) here. In doing so, Ovid could be seen to be reflecting Livy’s scepticism as to Silvia’s claim.\(^\text{12}\) However, Ovid provides a further, more detailed account of the divine conception and birth of Romulus and Remus later in the Fasti (3.9-58). Even though the poet must turn to another source — most probably Fabius (FRHist. fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5; Fabius FRHist. fr.4c = Vennonius fr.1)\(^\text{13}\) — for his version of this event, the ‘direct verbal’ intertext above still demonstrates that Ovid is responding directly to Livy. In allowing Ovid to ‘fill in’ the mythical gaps of the historian’s account (as discussed in Chapters One and Two), his use of another source could even be seen as a deliberate act of engagement with Livy. In addition, by presenting the divine paternity of the twins as ‘fact’ and therefore resolving any ambiguity he may have expressed in book two, Ovid goes as far as to ‘correct’ Livy’s doubtful account. Ovid’s modification of Livy is further cemented later in the poet’s biography of the twins by his further use of edo when the brothers themselves learn of their divine heritage (ut genus audierunt, animos pater editus auget – 3.65).

In their narrations of the exposure of the infant Romulus and Remus by the banks of the river Tiber, both Ovid and Livy refer to a fig-tree — the historian claiming this was the point

\(^{12}\) Robinson (2011:265) explains that ‘Ovid’s allusion to Livy’s cum partum edidisset here invites another reading of caelestia semina ediderat that reflects Livy’s scepticism, namely “and at the birth she made it known that the semina were caelestia”’. Bömer (1958:ii.111) also notes the specific intertext with Livy at Fast. 2.383. See also Murgatroyd 2005:171.

\(^{13}\) Robinson (2011:265) claims that Ovid combines the traditions of Fabius Pictor and Ennius (Ann. 1.29 Sk.) in his account of Silvia’s rape at 3.9-24. After narrating that Silvia was raped by Mars in her sleep (3.17-22), Ovid has the Vestal Virgin recount her dream, in which she predicts the future birth of her sons Romulus and Remus (3.23-42). Similarly, Ennius recounts Silvia’s dream, signifying her rape by Mars. While Ovid could be following Ennius in having Silvia raped whilst asleep, Skutsch (1985:194) claims that Ovid’s version of Silvia’s dream is ‘wholly different from that of Ennius, and invented by Ovid with Herod. 1.108 in mind’.
where the servants abandoned the tub containing the twins in the river (1.4.5-6), the poet stating this is where the vessel ended up after floating down the river (2.409-12). Both authors present a rare shared etymology in their mention of the fig-tree: 14 arbor erat: remanent vestigia, quaeque uocatur / Rumina nunc ficus, ficus Romula (Fast. 2.412); nunc ficus Ruminalis est - Romularem uocatam ferunt – pueros exponunt (Liv. 1.4.5). While other extant sources for this episode, none present this etymology: the OGR refers to it merely as arborem fici (OGR 20 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4c = Vennonius fr.1) and Plutarch notes that the Romans were in the habit of calling the tree Ruminalis (Plut. Rom. 4.1 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4b). While some scholars believe Ennius refers to the ficus ruminalis in his account (fici dulciferae lactantes ubere toto – Ann. 1.448 sedis incertae Sk.), he does not specifically note this. 15

‘Thematically’, Ovid also seems to follow Livy most closely in his narration of the exposure of the infant Romulus and Remus on the banks of the river Tiber (Fast. 2.385-411; Liv. 1.4.3-6). The two authors concur in having the tub carrying the boys coming to a stop on the bank when the water finally recedes (Fast. 2.409-10; Liv. 1.4.6); in contrast, Dionysius claims that as the water recedes, the tub overturns when it hits a rock and throws the babies out (D.H. 1.79.5 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5) and the OGR suggests it gets stuck against the fig-tree (OGR 20 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4c = Vennonius fr.1). The tub the babies are placed in before being cast in the river also figures more prominently later in the accounts given by Dionysius and Plutarch, as it forms an important part of their accounts of Romulus and Remus’ recognition as members of the royal household (D.H. 1.83.1 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5; Plut. Rom. 7.8, 8.1 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4b). In Livy and Ovid, it does not feature in this part of the story of the twins’ lives.

The few surviving lines of Ennius, appear to present a slightly different version of events, in which Amulius orders that both the twins and Ilia be thrown into the river Tiber. After reassuring Ilia that the twins will be rescued, Venus betroths Ilia to the river god (Ann. 1.57-63 Sk.). The fluvial fate of Ilia and her sons is prefigured in her dream as she recalls the war-

14 Frazer 1929:ii.367-9; Bömer 1958:ii.112-3; and Robinson 2011:273.
15 Skutsch 1985:605. Skutsch also attaches fici with lactantes. Frazer (1929:ii.367) claims that from the evidence of Varro, et al, ‘we gather that the proper name of this fig-tree was Ruminalis, not Romula or Romularis, the alternative names mentioned by Ovid and Livy’. Wiseman (1995:77) claims this etymology probably goes back to Varro. Varro Lat. Ling. 5.54: Germalum a germanis Romulo et Remo, quod ad ficum Ruminalem, et ilii inuenti, quo aqua hiberna Tiberis eos detulerat in aluelo expositos.
god telling her post ex fluuo fortuna resistet (Ann. 1.45 Sk.). Similarly, both Ovid and Livy note the role of fortune in the fact that the Tiber had flooded and thus hindered the servants in drowning the twins: Forte quadam diuinitus super ripas Tiberis effusus (Liv. 1.4.4); hibernis forte tumebat aquis (Fast. 2.390). Ovid’s explanation is more ‘rational’ in comparison to both Ennius and Livy; but it would seem likely that he is responding to Livy’s more suggestive one. In his story of the twins’ exposure by the banks of the river Tiber (2.383-412), Ovid also offers the first of two instances of his own innovation on the ‘canonical’ account of this event. Ovid assigns a significantly larger role to the servants tasked with the riverside abandonment of the infant Romulus and Remus than does Livy and the other extant sources. Once again however, it is specifically against Livy that Ovid signals his originality should be judged. Within his version of this episode, Ovid gestures towards Livy’s account with a possible ‘direct verbal’ intertext in the poet’s description of the servants preparing to carry out their grisly task. In following Amulius’ orders they geminos in loca iussa ferunt (2.388). Robinson notes how most manuscripts read sola against iussa; but that with the alternative reading of loca sola, there is ‘another glance back to Livy’s narrative’ and the place where the twins were exposed: Vastae tum in his locis solitudines erant (1.4.6). Robinson further suggests that it is the very divergence of the reaction of the servants charged with exposing the twins in Ovid and Livy that indicates the poet’s familiarity with the historian’s version. The wider implications of Ovid’s casting of these low-status characters in more central roles, as will be explored later, is central to the ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme that Ovid develops throughout his narration of the lives of Romulus and Remus.

Another Ovidian response to Livy’s narrative of the she-wolf episode can be detected in the speech of one of the servants charged with the exposure of the twins, related just prior to the

---

16 Skutsch 1985:197.
17 Robinson 2011:268.
18 Ovid also briefly alludes to this event at 3.49-52.
19 The servants play no major role in any of the other extant accounts of this event, other than following Amulius’ orders to abandon the twins on the banks of the river Tiber (D.H. 1.79.4-5 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Catulo fr.14 = Piso fr.5; Plut. Rom. 3.5 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4b; OGR 20 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4c = Vennonius fr.1; Cic. De Rep. 2.4). Skutsch (1985:206) claims that it is most likely that Ennius had Amulius ‘minions’ hurl the twins into the river (haec ecfatus, ibique latrones dicta facessunt - 1.57 Sk.). As noted below (footnote 51), Valerius Antias (FRHist. fr.2) and Macer (FRHist. fr.1 = M. Octavius fr.2; Macer FRHist. fr.12) offer different versions of Amulius’ plan to dispose of Romulus and Remus.
22 Robinson 2011:266.
story of their rescue by the animal. Demonstrating his reluctance towards the task in the *Fasti*, the servant states:

\[ at si quis uestræ deus esset originis auctor, \]
\[ in tam praecipiti tempore ferret opem (2.399-400). \]

While no ‘direct verbal’ intertext is evident, this statement contains obvious thematic’ echoes of Livy’s assertion following his account of the twins’ conception:

\[ Martem incertæ stirpis patrem nuncupat. Sed nec di nec homines aut ipsam aut stirpem a crudelitate regia uindicat (1.4.2-3). \]

Because Ovid unequivocally demonstrates the role of the divine in the brothers’ rescue by the she-wolf, 23 he perhaps further questions Livy’s scepticism as to the veracity of the existence of an actual wolf. 24

When it comes to narrating Remus’ death itself, Livy provides one version in which he quotes Romulus as stating ‘Sic deinde, quicumque alius transiliet moenia mea’ (1.7.2) 25 the moment his brother jumps over the city walls. Ovid similarly has Romulus state ‘sic’ que ‘meos muros transeat hostis’ (4.848) as he laments the demise of his twin. Despite this ‘direct verbal’ intertext however, Ovid offers, Ovid offers a version of Remus’ death not found in Livy, but most likely derived from Valerius Antias. 26 Livy presents two versions of

---

23 The divine aspect of this story is further emphasised by Ovid’s comment *Marte satos scires: timor afuit, ubera ducent / nec sibi promissi lactis aluntur ope* (2.419-20) and by the association with Mars of the wolf and wood-pecker at 3.53-4 (see below).

24 Ovid follows Livy closely in his version of the she-wolf story, both authors simply noting that the animal suckled the infant Romulus and Remus and licked them clean before they were discovered and taken home by Faustulus (*Fast.* 2.413-22, 3.53-58; *Liv.* 14.6-8). This is also the version provided by the *OGR* (20 = Fabius *FRHist.* fr.4c = Vennonius fr.1). The accounts of Plutarch (*Rom.* 4.2, 6.1 = Fabius *FRHist.* fr.4b) and Cicero (*De Rep.* 2.4) are similar, although neither mention the she-wolf cleaning the twins with her tongue. Dionysius also notes that the she-wolf both suckled and licked the baby Romulus and Remus, but he adds that when a nearby shepherd came across the scene, he called to his colleagues and they tried to scare the animal away by shouting (1.79.6-8 = Fabius *FRHist.* fr.4a = Cincinnus Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5). Ennius also reports the incident with the shepherds (*Ann.* 1.66-8 Sk.), Skutsch (1985:216-7) claiming that the strong resemblance between his and Dionysius’ account demonstrates that they are both following Fabius. Valerius Antias (*FRHist.* f2) and Macer (*FRHist.* f1 = M. Octavius fr.2; *Macer FRHist.* fr.12) provide different accounts that do not mention an actual she-wolf.

25 Barchiesi 1997:162; and Fantham 1998:251. Neel (2015:76) claims that Livy closely follows Homer (*Od.* 1.47) in this line, which was quoted by Scipio Aemilianus about the murder of Tiberius Gracchus (Plut. *Ti. Grac.* 21.7; *Diod.* 34.5/7.3). She suggests that the identification of Remus with Gracchus Tiberius therefore, could support the idea that Remus was associated with the *plebs*. See also Wiseman 1995:110-17.

26 Fantham 1998:249; and Rich *FRHist.*:iii.332.
Remus’ death: one in which Remus is killed in a general affray between the respective followers of each brother, and one in which he is killed by Romulus after jumping over the city walls (1.7.2). Again, Ovid’s consultation of another source could be seen as part of his conscious response to Livy in that it allows him to supplement the historian’s account – ‘plugging’ an ‘historical’ rather than mythical gap in this instance. What becomes particularly apparent through a parallel reading of Livy’s and Ovid’s versions of Remus’ death – as the poet signals is his intention with the ‘direct verbal’ intertext – is that, while both of the Livian alternatives ascribe at least some level of responsibility to Romulus, Ovid absolves Romulus of any blame of wielding the fatal blow to his brother by making his bodyguard Celer culpable. Although Ovid is following another source here, the ramification of the blameless position it leaves Romulus in, can only be fully realised when compared to the Livian version.

As will be examined later, Remus’ death also marks a turning point in the characterisation of Romulus by both Livy and Ovid; the poet creates a more one-sided, belligerent character in contrast to the more balanced Livian Romulus. As will also be seen in Chapter Four, Ovid uses the rape of the Sabine women and Sabine war (3.181-234) to develop his specific portrait of Mars’ son, reinforcing Romulus’ militarism through his opposition to his more peaceful regal successor Numa.

Despite offering a much more condensed account of the rape of the Sabine women (Fast. 3.181-200; Liv. 1.9.1-16) and the Sabine war (Fast. 3.201-34; Liv. 1.10.1-13.8) than Livy,27 Ovid continues to interact with the historian with further instances of both ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality.28 Just prior to his version, Livy explains that Romulus first set up an asylum in order to increase the size of the population (1.8.4-7). Although Ovid does not mention the asylum at this stage,29 his introduction to his account of the Sabine rape closely follows Livy ‘thematically’ at this point. In his narration of conditions that precipitated the rape of the Sabine women, Livy focuses on the Romans’ enforced celibacy more than any other extant account. Since Romulus’ asylum was made up of criminals and runaway slaves, neighbouring tribes were unwilling to form an alliance with the Romans (1.9.1-6).30 Ovid

27 Ovid also makes brief references to the rape of the Sabine women at 2.139 and 2.429-34, and to the Sabine war at 1.259-74, 2.135 and 6.793-4.
29 Ovid makes two brief references to Romulus’ asylum at 2.140 and 3.431-4.
30 Only a few short fragments relating to the rape of the Sabine women survive (Fabius FRHist. fr.6; Gellius FRHist. fr.1, 3; Valerius Antias FRHist. fr.5). Ennius appear to narrate a festival instituted by Romulus (Enn. Ann. I.II Sk. = Schol. Bern. Georg. 2.384 but critics are divided as to whether it is the Consualia that facilitated the rape of the Sabine women (Skutsch 1985:241-3). Unlike Livy, Cicero, Dionysius and Plutarch
corresponds with Livy most closely in highlighting the need for the early Romans to obtain wives (in order to expand the population) as motivation of the rape of the Sabine women (3.181-96). Although Ovid does not, as Livy does, explicitly highlight the asylum as part of the reason why the Romans’ neighbours were unwilling to marry them, he still displays both ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality with Livy in predicting the future greatness of the city (spernebant generos inopes uicinia diues - Fast. 3.189; uicinas ... magnas opes ... genus ... spernebant – Liv. 1.9.2-5). The need for population expansion as motivation for the rape of the Sabine women is reflected earlier in the Fasti when, as part of his Lupercalia aition, Ovid depicts Romulus lamenting the fact that the abducted females have not yet conceived (2.429-34).

Moving on to his account of the Sabine war (3.201-34), Ovid provides considerably less detail as to the background or progress of this conflict than Livy, concentrating mainly on how the Sabine women intervened to bring it to a peaceful conclusion. This intercession begins in the Fasti with a speech by Romulus’ wife Hersilia, to her fellow captive women, in which she states:

\[ eligite: hinc coniunx, hinc pater arma tenet. \]
\[ quaerendum est, uiduae fieri malitis an orbae (3.210-1). \]

In this speech, Ovid verbally echoes Livy, in a similar speech (although it is ascribed not specifically ascribed to Hersilia, but to the Sabine women in general), which expresses the same sentiment:

---

31 These verbal echoes are scattered over a number of lines in Livy. Both authors concur that the poverty of the Romans was part of the reason as to why neighbouring tribes were reluctant to marry the Romans, however Livy (1.9.2-3) is less explicit about this than Ovid (3.189). Livy also states that nearby tribes were averse to intermarriage with the Romans because they feared the growth of Rome’s power (1.9.5); although Ovid does not mention this, he does echo Livy’s assertion of Rome’s divine destiny (1.9.3-4) with Mars’ statement et male crederebant sanguinis auctor ego (3.190). See also Ursini 2008:232.

32 Livy reports an indirect speech of Hersilia earlier in the story when she appeals to her husband Romulus to allow the parents of the abducted women to enter Rome (1.11.2). Gellius (FRHist. fr.5) reports a speech by Hersilia in which she begs Titus Tatius for peace. Skutsch (1985:245-7) and Briscoe (FRHist.iii.230) believe that Gellius was probably following Ennius (Ann. 1.99 Sk.), although little of Ennius’ account of the Sabine rape overall survives (Ann. 1.98-101 Sk.). Dionysius has a slightly different story in which the women make a
‘melius peribimus quam sine alteris uestrum uiduae aut orbae uiuemus’
(1.13.3-4).

Although used in a different context, the *hinc coniunx, hinc pater* (3.210) of Hersilia’s speech in the *Fasti*, also emulates Livy’s description of the women as they enter the battlefield (*hinc patres, hinc uiros orantes, ne se sanguine nefando soceri generique respergerent – 1.13.2*), with further verbal echoes when Ovid later describes this event (*cum raptae ueniunt inter patresque uirosque – 3.217*).

Finally, the agreement between Ovid and Livy as to the location and conditions of Romulus’ apotheosis has led Frazer to suggest that the poet has the historian specifically in mind. Both Livy and Ovid place the site of Romulus’ apotheosis on the She-Goat’s Marsh (*Caprae palus - Fast. 2.491; Caprae paludem – Liv. 1.16.1, with the addition of *campus*); Dionysius only specifies that Romulus addressing his men ‘in the camp [epi stratopedou]’ (2.56.2), adding an alternative version that Romulus was murdered in the senate house (2.56.4); Plutarch locates this event to the Goat’s Marsh (aigos helos – *Rom. 27.6*). Other sources also claim Romulus’ apotheosis occurred during a solar eclipse (Cicero *De Rep.* 1.25, 6.24; Fenestella *FRHist.* fr.8; Plut. *Rom.* 27.7), rather than a storm as in the *Fasti* (2.493-5) and Livy (1.16.1). Although Ovid and Livy differ slightly in terms of the details of this event (as will be discussed later), there is clear ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality in the message that Proculus delivers to the masses after Romulus’ disappearance: ‘et patrias artes militiamque colant’ (*Fast. 2.508*); ‘rem militarem colant sciantque et ita posteris tradant nullas opes humanas armis Romanis resistere posse’ (*Liv. 1.16.7*).

**The birth and abandonment of Romulus and Remus**

As the above demonstrates, through a combination of both ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality, Ovid indicates that he wishes his account of the lives of Romulus and Remus to be read against Livy. Moreover, as maintained in Chapter One, Augustan readers were

---

33 Ursini (2008:257) notes that Ovid does on occasion employ expressions found in Livy in other moments of the narration, although they are related.
34 Frazer 1929:ii.408.
35 Dionysius (2.56.2) mentions both a solar eclipse (zophou) and a storm (cheimōnos megalou) as does Plutarch (*Num.* 2.1).
most likely to read the *Fasti* against Livy, since *AUC* had by this time established itself as the single most authoritative history of Rome. Thus, both authorial intertexts and probable audience response pointed in the same direction: Livy. However (as the previous chapters also demonstrated), it is not simply as a ‘factual’ source that the poet utilises the historian, but rather as a gauge against which his own specific characterisation of the twins can be measured. With Ovid’s interaction with Livy now established, this chapter will move on to examine exactly how the poet develops his version of Romulus and Remus and how this can only be fully understood when read in conjunction with Livy.

The differences between Ovid and Livy’s versions of the conception, birth and abandonment of Romulus and Remus are in part determined by the different genres within which each author is writing. However, as examined in the previous chapters, it is because of the differences between their generic conventions that the poet is able to engage in a direct dialogue with the historian. As befits the generic principles of the *Fasti*, Ovid’s prioritising of the mythical elements of the early lives of Romulus and Remus, in contrast to Livy’s indifference to them, enables the poet not only to supplement the historian’s version, but also to question its historical veracity. By doing so, Ovid also begins to establish a ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme that he continues to develop throughout the *Fasti*.

In accordance with his self-proclaimed annalistic standards, Livy appears open to scepticism as to the divine identity of the perpetrator of the rape of Silvia that leads to the conception and birth of Romulus and Remus (1.4.1-3). Although he neither explicitly confirms nor denies this version of events, he balances it by including an alternative tradition that suggests that the Vestal Virgin may have invented this story as a way of concealing an illicit human affair (1.4.2-3: quoted above).
Not only does Livy resist any efforts to clarify the truth or otherwise of Romulus’ and Remus’ divine ancestry, but his account of their conception also distances the twins from their royal heritage. Their illegitimacy and unknown father means that their link to the Latin kings and the dynasty of Aeneas, ... is a weak one at best through their unmarried mother to a ruler who has been deposed. As will be seen below, Livy’s detachment of the twins from their regal roots is stronger and more sustained than in other accounts.

Conversely, as befits poetic and elegiac convention, Ovid describes Silvia’s rape and the conception of the twins in some detail (3.9-42), verifying beyond doubt their divine paternity. After recounting how Silvia fell asleep whilst she was out collecting water for her Vestal duties, he makes a direct statement that Mars raped her (3.21-2). Rather than being deployed for purely aesthetic reasons, the different generic ‘rules’ available to Ovid enable him to augment the mythical aspects of Livy’s account. Furthermore, Ovid’s decisive declaration of Mars’ paternity serves to ‘modify’ Livy’s uncertainty as to the twins’ divine legacy; the ‘credibility’ of the poet’s account over that of the historian is further underlined – from Ovid’s perspective at least – by the fact that he has asked Mars himself to be present at his narration of this story (Bellice, depositis clipeo paulisper et hasta/Mars, ades et nitidas casside solue comas – 3.1-2), and at no point does the war-god interject with protest or amendment. Even though, in concordance with Livy, Ovid does not over-emphasise the twins’ royal ancestry, his assertion of Mars’ role in this event serves to definitively establish their celestial heritage:

---

40 Just prior to his narration of the birth of Romulus and Remus, Livy provides an account of the Alban dynasty from the death of Ascanius (1.3.6-11). The way Livy constructs this family tree also seems to distance Romulus and Remus from the royal family. Rather than name Numitor as the father of Rhea Silvia or, indeed, his sons, Livy just refers to them by their relationship to him (stirpem fratris uirilem interemit, fratris filiae Reae Siluiae - 1.3.11). In this way, the link between Romulus and Remus and the true king, their grandfather Numitor, becomes hazy. In his Alban dynasty, Livy does not name Numitor’s son whom Amulius kills (1.3.11), whereas Ovid names him as Lausus (Ilia cum Lauso de Numitore sati - 4.54). Fantham (1998:101) questions Ovid’s source for this name; whether it is the correct name or not, this could be seen as an example of Ovid attempting to ‘correct’ or even ‘out-do’ Livy by assuming superior knowledge of the story.

41 Miles 1995:142. Miles (1995:142) further notes how Romulus and Remus’ tenuous link to the royal family is further fractured when they are exposed on the banks of the Tiber in that they are separated from their only family tie – their mother.

42 The detail that Silvia was collecting ritual water when she was raped is not found in Livy but was likely to have been reported by Fabius Pictor (FRHist. fr.4 = Venonius fr.1; Fabius FRHist. fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5) and Macer (FRHist. fr.1 = M. Octavius fr.2).

43 Ovid makes further definitive assertions of Mars’ paternity of Romulus and Remus at 2.144, 3.233, 4.56.

44 For further discussion of narrators in the Fasti, see Miller 1983b; Harries 1989; Williams 1991; Newlands 2006; Boyd 2000; and Murgatroyd 2005.

45 Unlike Livy, Ovid’s account of the birth of Romulus and Remus does not follow on from an account of the Alban dynasty; Ovid’s Alban dynasty occurs later at 4.39-54 and his story of Amulius deposition of Numitor also comes after his account of the birth of twins at 3.59-68. A linear reading of the Fasti therefore, would mean that readers would not yet be familiar with the extent of Romulus and Remus’ royal heritage. Although
Both writers then mark the lowly beginnings of Romulus and Remus by setting a number of episodes of their early lives in a pastoral setting;\textsuperscript{46} Livy even goes so as far as to suggest that it was the rustic environment that made a major contribution to the brothers’ excellence of character (1.4.8-9). By emphasising the impact the bucolic milieu had on the young twins, together with their detachment from their royal ancestry, Livy goes further than any other extant account to highlight the ‘ordinariness’ of the brothers.\textsuperscript{47} In doing so, the historian seems to imply an unstated ‘rustic’/’regal’ opposition when it comes to the early formation of their personality traits. This ‘rustic’/’regal’ opposition is something that Ovid also picks up on, as he creates a moral opposition between the ‘ordinary’ and more ‘elite’ characters involved in the lives of Romulus and Remus.

\textsuperscript{46} As part of their narrations of the early lives of Romulus and Remus, both Ovid and Livy depict a pastoral landscape (\textit{Fast.} 2.389-2.409, 3.31-4; Liv. 1.4.6). The rustic past is also evoked as Livy uses a similar past-present motif to Ovid for the surviving Ruminal fig-tree (\textit{ubi nunc ficus Ruminalis est} – Liv. 1.4.5; \textit{abor erat: remenant vestigia} ... – \textit{Fast.} 2.411). Later in his narration of the discovery of the twins by the shepherd Faustulus, Livy notes their humbleness of their home by calling it a \textit{stabulum} (1.4.7) (Lewis and Short s.v.).

\textsuperscript{47} Although a number of other sources also noted the modest and rustic lifestyles of the early adulthood of Romulus and Remus, they also note their physical and mental characteristics that are incongruent with their environment. Before stating that Romulus and Remus lived like cattleherds in modest surroundings, Dionysius claims that ‘when they reached manhood, they became, in excellence of appearance and dignity of mind, not like swineherds or cowherds, but such as someone might expect those to be who were believed to be born of royal race and the seed of the gods’ (D.H. 1.79.11 = Fabius \textit{FRHist.} fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5). Plutarch’s description of the twins makes them stand apart from their fellow herdsmen, although he does not specifically ascribe this to their royal or divine ancestry; he states that the twins’ ‘physical excellence, even when they were infants, at once revealed their character through their size and appearance. And growing up, both were high-spirited and manly, and with courage in the face of what appeared terrifying, and wholly undaunted daring’ (Plut. \textit{Rom.} 6.3 = Fabius \textit{FRHist.} f4b). Cicero (\textit{De Rep.} 2.4) briefly notes that the twins were brought up living and working in the countryside, but he also states that in adulthood, Romulus was far superior in bodily strength and boldness of spirit to his companions. Miles (1995:137-8) suggests that Livy’s account ‘is distinct in its emphasis of Romulus as a hero who is characterized by self-sufficiency and whose essential character reflects the formative influence of his austere rustic upbringing. This emphasis is at odds with several traditional elements of the Romulus story and with other interpretations of it that focus rather on Romulus’ inherited qualifications as the son of a god and the representative of a line of heroic kings’.
For Livy, this ‘rustic’/‘regal’ opposition will ultimately prove unstable in his development of the twins: it will eventually lead to his creation of a Romulus who is in need of redemption (discussed later). While in the Fasti, Romulus and Remus’ regal ancestry will also be important, it is not as essential as the divine paternity that elegiac convention has allowed Ovid to establish. For Ovid, it is Romulus’ and Remus’ ‘rustic’-‘divine’ dual heritage that is important in facilitating his ultimate creation of an opposition between the twins. As will become clear later, this dual heritage will eventually fracture as Romulus becomes more influenced by his divine paternity than his rustic upbringing, in opposition to Remus, whom Ovid develops with more in common to other ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ figures in the Fasti. This combination of Romulus and Remus’ rustic upbringing and divine paternity is evident right from the (chronological) start of the twins’ lives, as the poet sets Silvia’s rape by the war-god against a bucolic backdrop:

\[\text{dum sedet, umbrosae salices uolucresque canorae}
\text{fecerunt somnos et leue murmur aquae.}
\text{blanda quies furtim uictis obrepsit ocellis,}
\text{et cadit a mento languida facta manus.}
\text{Mars uidet hanc uisamque cupit potiturque cupita}
\text{et sua diuina fufra fefellit ope. (3.17-22).}\]

Ovid maintains his association of low-status characters and the pastoral environment as he continues to narrate the lives of Romulus and Remus. Despite the ‘rustic’/‘regal’ opposition that Livy implies in terms of the young Romulus and Remus, it is unsurprising that he only assigns minor roles to other low-status figures in his version of events, considering both the genre of AUC and the similar treatment accorded them in his sources. It is only when read in conjunction with Livy, as the ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertexts invite us to do, that

48 Neel (2015:14-15) sees the general Roman depiction of Romulus and Remus as an example of ‘dyadic rivalry’, in which two characters initially share a single function and work towards the same ends but ultimately become rivals leading to the death or disappearance of one of them. She claims (23) that such ‘twosomes’ enabled Roman authors to explore ‘the tension between their ideals of shared power and value placed on individual ambition’.

49 Faustulus is the only ‘low status’ figure to have any kind of prominent role in other extant accounts. His role in the exposure of the infant twins on the banks of the Tiber varies (see below). In some accounts, he is also given a relatively large part in the recognition of Romulus and Remus’ royal heritage (D.H. 1.79.11 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5; Plut. Rom. 8.1-4 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4b). Faustulus’ only involvement in this episode in Livy, involves him finally being forced to reveal the twins’ regal ancestry after Remus has been captured and charged with raiding and pillaging Numitor’s land by Amulius (1.5.4-6); Ovid does not mention this event.
the primacy Ovid assigns to the ‘rustic’ figures in his account becomes obvious. Generic
convention therefore, rather than just being an inert feature of the Fasti, once again becomes
a tool of engagement with Livy, which Ovid uses to cultivate his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme.

Once Silvia has given birth to twins, both Livy and Ovid concur that under orders from
Amulius, the twins were left on the banks of the Tiber to drown.\textsuperscript{50} Livy provides a matter-of-
fact account of this event. His servants appear only briefly and discharge their task with an
air of unemotional pragmatism:

\begin{quote}
\textit{super ripas Tiberis effusus lenibus stagnis nec adiri usquam ad iusti cursum poterat
amnis et posse quamuis languida mergi aqua infantes spem ferentibus dabat. Ita uelut
defuncti regis imperio (1.4.4-5).}
\end{quote}

The muted reaction of Livy’s servants is in pointed contrast to the reluctance of Ovid’s
servants to carry out their orders and their grief in doing so (2.404-6). The faceless
practicality of Livy’s servants is perhaps reinforced by their hope that the twins, being
infants, might still be drowned in the shallow water (1.4.4-5). By contrast, Ovid’s servants
despair of their task and one of them expresses his anguish in nine lines of direct speech
(2.395-404). Far from being faceless as in Livy’s account, the last image of the servants in
the Fasti is with faces wet with tears, their emotion indicative of their recognition of the
immorality of this act that their royal master has instructed them to undertake. Their
comprehension of the iniquity of their duty is further emphasised by their perception of a
sense of the divine in the twins:

\begin{quote}
iussa recusantes peragunt lacrimosa ministri
(flent tamen) et geminos in loca iussa ferunt. (2.387-8)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{50} Ennius (\textit{Ann.} 1.57 Sk.) has Amulius order his underlings (\textit{latrones}) to throw either Ilia or the twins, or both,
into the Tiber. Dionysius (1.79.4 = Fabius \textit{FRHist.} fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5) and
Plutarch (\textit{Rom.} 3.5 = Fabius \textit{FRHist.} fr.4b) report that Amulius ordered the twins be drowned in the Tiber;
however, Plutarch proposes that this servant may have been Faustulus. Valerius Antias (\textit{FRHist.} fr.2) claims
that it was Faustulus whom Amulius ordered to kill the boys, but after being prevailed upon by Numitor not
to, he gives them to his girlfriend Larentia to rear. Macer (\textit{FRHist.} fr.1 = M. Octavius fr.2) reports that in order
to conceal the crime of his rape of Silvia, Amulius orders that both she and her babies are to be killed and
her babies to be brought to him, but Numitor substitutes the ‘real’ twins with another pair and gives Romulus and
Remus to Faustulus to rear; in another account, Macer (\textit{FRHist.} fr.12) claims that Silvia’s uncle hurls the infant
brothers into the woods. Cicero (\textit{De Rep.} 2.4) also has Amulius ordering the twins to be drowned in the Tiber.
...ex illis unus et alter ait:
“at quam sunt similes! at quam formosus uterque!
plus tamen ex illis iste uigoris habet.
si genus arguitur uoltu, nisi fallit imago,
nescio quem in uobis suspicor esse deum
at si quis uuestrae deus esset originis auctor,
in tam praeципiti tempore ferret opem:
ferret opem certe, si non ope mater egeret,
quaе facta est uno mater et orba die.
nata simul, moritura simul, simul ite sub undas
corporal” desierat deposuitque sinu.
uagierunt ambo pariter: sensisse putares (2.394-406)

By imbuing the low-status servants with a sense of morality that stands in contrast to that of Romulus and Remus’ royal uncle Amulius, Ovid creates a ‘rustic’/’regal’ dichotomy that is far more pronounced than its equivalent in Livy. Even the poet himself intervenes to question Amulius’ action, asking quid facis (2.386) after reporting Amulius’ order for the twins to be taken away and drowned in the river (2.385).

This ‘rustic’/’regal’ dichotomy ensues in the Fasti as Ovid proceeds to narrate the story of the brothers’ discovery and suckling by the she-wolf (2.413-22). In the poem, the animal is placed on the same narratological level as the servants and she, like them, in effect becomes a symbol of ‘rustic’ integrity. Even though she is only a mere beast, she demonstrates more humanity towards the twins than even their royal uncle does:

uenit ad expositos (mirum!) lupa feta gemellos:
quis credat pueris non nocuisse feram?
non nocuisse parum est, prodest quoque: quos lupa nutrit,
perdere cognatae sustinuere manus. (2.413-6)51

The wolf’s virtue is cemented at the end of this account as Ovid states that this area was named after the she-wolf in order to commemorate the enormous service she paid to the boys (2.421-2).52

51 Skutsch (1985:216) and Robinson (2011:274) note the intertext of feta (Fast. 2.413) with Ennius (Ann. 1.65 Sk.) and Virg. Aen. 8.630, suggesting Ovid had both in mind in this passage.
The ‘rustic’/‘regal’ opposition between the she-wolf and Amulius is underlined in potted biography of Romulus and Remus in the Fasti’s third book (3.37-8). In recounting the dream she had when Mars raped her (3.26-38), Silvia describes how two palm-trees – a metaphor for her unborn sons – sprang up from her dropped fillet and she was filled with terror when her uncle Amulius tried to cut them down (3.31-6). In direct contrast to the corrupt royal Amulius, the morally ‘rustic’ she-wolf, together with the woodpecker, save the trees from the axe (3.37-8). As both the wolf and the woodpecker were sacred to Mars, Ovid reminds the reader here that, in relation to Romulus and Remus, there is a further divine element to his ‘rustic’/‘regal’ polarity; this notion underlined by the poet’s suggestion that it was probably the twins’ divine heritage that resulted in their lack of fear of the she-wolf (2.419).

As would be expected, considering the stipulation of his genre, Livy labels the she-wolf story as *fabulae ac miraculo* (1.4.8) and provides a further ‘rationalizing explanation’ as to its origin. The historian proposes that the tale of the she-wolf arose from sexual proclivities of Larentia, the wife of the herdsman Faustulus, who rescued the twins from the wolf and brought them up. Livy claims that Larentia was a whore (*uulgato corpore* – 1.4.7) and hence – ‘on the basis of the colloquial use of *lupa* as a synonym for *meretrix*’ – she was called ‘wolf’ (*lupam* – 1.4.7) by the shepherds. In being told ‘without dramatic effects of literary touches’, the tone of Livy’s account of the shepherd couple adds a further sense of ‘rationality’ to his explanation:


*ab eo ad stabula Larentiae uxor educandos datos. Sunt qui Larentiam uulgato corpore lupam inter pastores uocatam putent: inde locum fabulae ac miraculo datum* (1.4.7-8).

---

52. The she-wolf’s virtue is also suggested by Remus, who in his posthumous speech to Faustulus and Larentia, comments on how merciful the wolf was in saving him and his brother by suckling them as babies (5.465-8).
53. This is a detail not mentioned by Livy and could come from Fabius Pictor (Plut. *Rom. 4.2* = Fabius *FRHist. fr.4b*; OGR 20 = Fabius *FRHist. fr.4c* = Vennonius fr.1; Fabius *FRHist. fr.4e*). Ovid states that the woodpecker was the bird of Mars (3.37), but does not mention that the wolf was sacred to the war-god, however this could be implied at 2.419 and in Ovid’s description of the she-wolf’s actions as *mirum* (2.413). However, Robinson notes (2011:273-4) this expression of wonder could be directed to Ovid’s own narrative, such expressions being frequent in his poems (*Met. 7.790f*; 11.5f; 1.400; *Fast. 2.113*). See also Frazer 1929:iii.7; Bömer 1958:ii.143-4; and Ursini 2008:98.
55. Ogilvie 1965:47. The link between *lupa* and prostitutes is also noted by Plutarch (*Rom. 4.4* = Fabius *FRHist. fr.4b*) and Valerius Antias (*FRHist. fr.2*). Macer (*FRHist. fr.12*) provides a different version in which the twins, having been abandoned in the woods by their grandfather, are found by local shepherdess and that such women were known as wolves.
Conversely, because he is writing poetry and not annalistic history, Ovid is able to present the she-wolf story as ‘fact’. Moreover, by asking *lacte quis infantes nescit creuisse ferino. / et picum expositis saepe tulisse cibos?* (3.53-4), Ovid could be seen to be directly challenging Livy’s sceptical attitude towards the reliability of this episode.\(^{57}\) As well as contesting Livy’s version, Ovid’s verification of the involvement of the she-wolf enables him to avoid any reference to Larentia’s possible prostitution; hence he is able to develop her along the same moralistic lines as he has already done with other low-status and ‘rustic’ figures. The conspicuousness of Ovid’s elevated depiction of Larentia is striking when compared to Livy’s perfunctory and disdainful reference, in which he basically calls her a ‘tart’.\(^{58}\) Not only does Ovid prioritise Larentia in his account - with ‘poor Faustulus’ (albeit acknowledged for the part he played) relegated to the status of helpmate to his wife (*uestras, Faustule pauper, opes* - 3.56) - but he also loftily declares her as *tantae nutrix Larentia gentis* (3.55).\(^{59}\) If that were not enough, he reveals that Larentia had a festival dedicated to her because of her esteemed role as foster-parent to the founder of Rome and that he will give due attention to this festival when he comes to write about December, the month within which it falls (3.57-8).

Moving forward in time, outside of a strict chronological framework, the next episode in which Larentia appears is when she attends Remus’ funeral together with her husband Faustulus. Building on the positive portrait of the couple in common with other ‘rustic’, low-status figures, the poet adds a sense of familial *pietas* to their established moral integrity through their display of grief at their foster-son’s death:

\(^{57}\) For those engaged in a linear reading of the *Fasti* of course, this story would already be familiar, since Ovid has previously provided an account at 2.413-22.

\(^{58}\) Cornell 1995:58. There is also the potential to detect a disparaging tone in Livy’s description of Larentia and Faustulus’ home as *stabula* (1.4.7). As well as denoting a humble dwelling, a *stabulum* could signify a brothel or pot-house where prostitutes plied their trade (Lewis and Short s.v.). According to Cato (*FRHist. fr.16*) Larentia was made rich from her prostitution and after leaving land to the people of Rome, she was rewarded with a magnificent tomb and an annual funerary cult. Macer (*FRHist. fr.2*) claims that Larentia became rich after marrying an Etruscan called Caritus during Romulus’ reign and she bequeathed her fortune to her foster-son on her death. It was in honour of this inheritance that Romulus instituted the Parentalia. However, like Cato, Valerius Antias (*FRHist. fr.3*) claims she amassed her substantial wealth from her profession as a prostitute and she left her fortune to either Romulus or the Roman people. This act led to her having a day named after her and an annual sacrifice performed in her honour.

\(^{59}\) Livy does imply some sense of virtue in the low-status Faustulus as he describes how Romulus and Remus’ foster-father was compelled to reveal their true identity as members of the royal household after fearing for their safety following the capture of Remus (1.5.5-6). Faustulus’ revelation is narrated in other sources, however they vary as to the details of the event (D.H. 1.80.3 = Fabius *FRHist. fr.4a* = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5; Plut. *Rom. 8.1-4* = Fabius *FRHist. fr.4b*).
Admittedly, it is not just they who grieve, since their other foster-son Romulus is also depicted shedding tears by the side of his brother’s bier (4.849-50). As previously noted (and as will be discussed below) however, it is Remus’ death that marks a turning point in the character of Romulus. While, up to this point, both brothers seem to have inherited the same sense of ‘rustic’ morality as their foster-parents and other low-status figures, after Remus’ demise, Romulus quickly goes on to develop more belligerent traits in common with his celestial father. At this point, it is sufficient to note that Larentia and Faustulus are the only two named attendants at the funeral (4.854). In highlighting their attendance at the funeral, Ovid reminds the reader of the link between this ‘rustic’-’plebeian’ couple and Romulus and Remus; when Romulus takes up the reins as sole ruler of Rome however, he becomes detached from his ‘rustic’ heritage (as will be seen later). On the other hand, Remus’ association with ‘rustic’ foster-parents in opposition to that of his brother, is confirmed when he makes a ghostly appearance to Faustulus and Larentia to request correct posthumous commemoration.

While the differences between Ovid’s and Livy’s accounts of the birth and abandonment of Romulus and Remus may be partly determined by generic convention, it is because of their different genres that the poet is able to engage in a direct discourse with the historian. By challenging Livy’s cynical presentation of supernatural events, Ovid raises questions as to the ‘veracity’ of Livy’s presentation of history. Ovid’s distinctly more optimistic presentation of the low-status players in these episodes only become perceptible when read alongside Livy.

---

Romulus is not referred to by name but simply as rex (4.845); Ovid also states that tum iuuenem nondum facti fleuere Quirites (4.855).

Fantham (1998:252) suggests that the main reason why Ovid highlights the presence of Faustulus and Larentia at Remus’ funeral is in order to prepare the reader for the appearance of Remus’ ghost to them (5.457-84).
Romulus and Remus as young adults

The rustic atmosphere of Romulus’ and Remus’ young lives is maintained into their early adulthood by both Ovid (2.361-80, 3.59-64) and Livy (1.4.8-5.4), with the grown-up twins occupying the same pastoral environment as in their childhood. However, on realising their familial lineage – royal in Livy and divine in the Fasti - the behaviour of the twins begins to change. While the brothers act together in killing Amulius and restoring their grandfather to the throne in Livy (1.5.6-6.2), it is Romulus alone who is responsible for the murder of his uncle in the Fasti (3.67-8). Whereas Livy’s Romulus and Remus seem to have both inherited traits from their royal ancestors, in the Fasti, it is apparently only Romulus who has been influenced by his divine parentage. The differences between the poet’s and the historian’s presentation of the brothers act prospectively in anticipating the variant way in which each writer will ultimately portray Romulus and Remus as they found the city of Rome and how Romulus develops as the city’s first king.

Both Ovid and Livy depict Romulus and Remus as young adults in a pastoral setting, living their lives amongst the herdsmen and shepherds (Fast. 2.361-80, 3.59-64; Liv. 1.4.8-9). Unlike other extant sources however, Livy (as noted above) goes to the extent of crediting the pastoral environment as being a major influence on the characters of the twins as young men, while at the same time disengaging them from their regal heritage. As Livy proceeds to narrate Romulus and Remus’ encounter with cattle-rustlers during their celebration of the Lupercalia, the rustic context of this period of the twins’ lives is brought into even sharper focus with his explanation of Arcadian Evander’s founding of this annual rite in honour of Lycaean Pan (1.5.2).  

Similarly, Ovid also depicts a bucolic scene in his narration of Romulus and Remus’ confrontation with the cattle-thieves, which forms part of his aition as to why participants in the Lupercalia run naked.63

---

62 Livy seems to follow Tubero (FRHist. fr.3) here, as his is the only other source to place the episode of the cattle-rustlers within the context of Romulus and Remus’ celebration of the Lupercalia. Ennius depicts the brothers at sport with their shepherd friends (Ann. 1.69-70 Sk.) but according to Skutsch (1985:218-9), it is impossible to say whether this describes habitual activities or a specific occasion. Valerius Antias (FRHist. fr.2) claims the brothers celebrated the festival following the death of Amulius. Dionysius (1.79.13 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.1.4 = Piso fr.5) notes that Romulus was away performing ancestral sacrifices at the time Remus was captured, but he does not specify any particular festival or rite. Similarly, Plutarch (Rom. 7.2 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4b) claims that a fight starts between Remus and the cattle-rustlers while Romulus is performing an unnamed sacrifice.

63 Barchiesi (1997:156) notes that his scene resembles that of the ‘simple and heroic era’ evoked in Virgil’s picture of Italy in the Georgics 2.530-4. See also Robinson 2011:255. However, the scene appears to have an additional military edge, Robinson (2011:257-8) claiming the type of sports the twins and their friends
cornipedi Fauno caesa de more capella
uenit ad exiguas turba uocata dapes.
dumque saerdotes ueribus transuta salingnis
exta parant, medias sole tenente uias,
Romulus et frater pastoralisque iuuentus
solibus et campo corpora nuda dabant;
uectibus et iaculis et misso pondere saxi
bracchia per lusus experienda dabant (2.361-8).

While both poet and historian evoke a comparable bucolic backdrop in their narration of this episode, their versions of this event differ and they conclude with the two brothers in very different positions to each other (Fasti. 2.369-72; Livy 1.5.3-4). Whereas in the Fasti, Remus comes out on top as the stronger of the two brothers (2.372), in Livy he ends up in a weaker position to his twin (1.5.4). Retrospectively, Romulus’ primacy over Remus at this stage in Livy is significant as it provides silent support for the idea that Romulus is the rightful founder of Rome. This is essential to the historian’s later depiction of Romulus who, having committed fratricide, will stand in need of redemption. Conversely, by giving Remus the upper hand in his version, Ovid perhaps questions in advance the validity of Romulus’ monarchy.64

In the Fasti, Romulus and Remus are in the midst of their exercise when a fellow shepherd sounds the alarm that the cattle are being stolen (2.370). The brothers leap into action in hot pursuit of the thieves, with their state of undress gifting Ovid his third aition for to the naked running at the Lupercalia festival (2.379-80). In a striking departure from other surviving accounts,65 Ovid gives unusual prominence to Remus, making him and not Romulus the victor in catching the thieves and recovering the pilfered animals. At this stage, it should be

64 Neel (2015:96-7) despite, unlike Livy and Dionysius, showing no competition between the twins in chasing the cattle-rustlers, Ovid ‘offers the clearest designation of Remus as the winner’. If, Neel adds, this means Ovid can be seen as relating ‘a tale in which the individual has become predominant’, this could reinforce the idea that Ovid is challenging the idea that it was Romulus who was the rightful first king of Rome.
noted that in Ovid’s account, it is Remus who rises to the top whilst engaging in pastoral activities within rustic surroundings:66

\[
pastor \ ab \ excelso \ ‘per \ deuia \ rura \ iuuencos, \\
Romule, \ praedones, \ et \ Reme,’ \ dixit \ ‘agunt.’ \\
longum \ erat \ armari: \ diuersis \ exit \ uterque \\
partibus; \ occursu \ praeda \ recepta \ Remi. (2.369-72).
\]

Livy’s story of the cattle-rustlers plies a different track to Ovid’s. As Romulus and Remus celebrate the Lupercalia, they are enticed into a chase by some cattle-thieves who, incensed at regularly having their illicit rustling thwarted, have set a trap for the twins. Rather than returning victorious after recovering the stolen cattle (as he does in the Fasti), Remus unwittingly falls into this trap and is captured by the brigands (1.5.3-4). While Romulus manages to evade capture due to his ability to defend himself, Remus is not so lucky and is handed over to Amulius on a charge of cattle-rustling:67

\[
Huic \ deditis \ ludicro \ cum \ sollemne \ notum \ esset \ insidiatos \ ob \ iram \ praedae \ amissae \\
latrones, \ cum \ Romulus \ ui \ se \ defendisset, \ Remum \ cepisse, \ captum \ regi \ Amulio \ tradidisse \\
ultro \ accusantes. \ Crimini \ maxime \ dabant \ in \ Numitoris \ agros \ ab \ iis \ impetus \ fieri; \ inde \ eos
\]

66 Ovid’s association with the patrician Fabii later in his narration of the cattle theft episode, could potentially undermine his association of Remus as a ‘plebeian’ figure (ut reddit, uribus stridentia detrabit exa / atque ait ‘haec certe non nisi uictor edet.’ / dicta facit Fabii simul - 2.373-5). However, as will be seen in Chapter Six, the poet also portrays the Fabii in the same guise as other ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ figures in the Fasti. Furthermore, Ovid does not ascribe any social status to the Fabii in the cattle-rustling account and at this stage, he may just be emphasising Remus’ superiority to Romulus. As Wiseman (1995:126) states: ‘It is obvious that this episode belongs to a stage in the development of the legend where Remus and Romulus are still joint founders, with Remus the senior partner, as the Fabiani were the senior group of Luperci’.

67 Livy’s version of this episode represents the general ‘tradition’ found in most other extant sources; although they vary in terms of some details, all prioritise Romulus over Remus in the sense that Remus is captured by the cattle-rustlers (D.H. 1.79.12-14 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5; Plut. Rom. 7.1-2 = Fabius FRHist. fr.4b; Tubero FRHist. fr.3). Ennius (Ann. 1.71 Sk.) is the only author who seems to have told a story similar to that in the Fasti (2.359-80), in which the twins recover animals stolen by the cattle-rustlers, however in Ennius’ version, it seems that it was Romulus and not Remus who was the victor (Skutsch 1985:220). Valerius Antias (FRHist. fr.2) does not report this incident but, after the killing of Amulius, he does explain that Romulus was so called because of the greatness of his strength, whereas Remus got his name from his slowness. Although Cicero does not mention this event either, he does prioritise Romulus in his brief biography of the twins (De Rep. 2.4-10), by only referring to Romulus in all events proceeding Amulius’ order for the twins to be abandoned on the banks of the river Tiber. Just prior to this account of the incident with the cattle-rustlers, Livy does note that Romulus and Remus would attack robbers and bring home to spoils to share among the shepherds, but he does not prioritise either twin in this activity (1.4.9). Commenting on the connotations of ‘delay’ in Remus’ name, Wiseman (1995:110) states ‘If the twins represent power-sharing equality, then Remus stands for the plebeians, whose share in the power was long delayed’.
Immediately following the incident involving the cattle-thieves, both authors go on (chronologically) to recount Romulus and Remus’ role in the death of Amulius and restoration of their grandfather Numitor to his rightful seat on the throne (Fast. 3.67-8; Liv. 1.5.5-6.2). Up until this point, it is the bucolic environment in both Ovid and Livy that has informed the twins’ conduct, as witnessed by their rustic activities. However, as the twins realise their royal heritage in Livy, and their divine ancestry in Ovid, they begin to display behaviour informed not by their rustic environment, but by their familial inheritance. As examined above, in the Fasti, the brothers’ divine legacy and pastoral environment has been equally highlighted since the start of Ovid’s narration of their lives. Livy however, has up until this point prioritised the brothers’ rustic background over their regal heritage as the main influence in informing the brothers’ characters. Therefore, it comes as something of a surprise when, on discovery of their royal ancestry, it emerges that the brothers were different from their fellow shepherds all along. Considering Livy seems to have gone against the ‘canonical’ tradition in his insistence in creating a separation between Romulus and Remus’ royal heritage and bucolic background, this revelation presents a potential inconsistency in his account. Furthermore, it is this inconsistency against which Ovid reacts in his subsequent development of the twins.

Livy tells how, as the incarcerated Remus awaits his punishment for alleged cattle-rustling, an alarmed Faustulus reveals his long-held suspicions to Romulus that the twins are of royal blood (1.4.5-6). At the same time, Numitor has been thinking about his lost grandsons and begins to suspect Romulus and Remus. Crucially, it is not just the boys’ age that confirms Numitor’s suspicions as to their royal blood, but it is also their ‘less than servile’ character (minime seruilem indolem - 1.5.6) that marks them out as different from their fellow shepherds (as their later behaviour demonstrates). It is not then, we now learn, the twins’ austere rustic upbringing that has informed their character, but their place in the royal bloodline. Their ‘regal’ traits are immediately in evidence, since the way in which the attack on Amulius’ garrison is carried out (1.5.7) suggests an innate sense of military

---

68 As discussed (footnote 48), unlike Livy who has downplayed the twins’ royal heritage until this point, other extant accounts set the twins as ‘different’ from their ‘rustic’ companions right from the start.
organisation within the twins.\textsuperscript{69} While the skills they developed during the rustic activity of chasing cattle-thieves may have helped prepare them for the physical demands of military combat, the leadership skills they display at the head of their respective troops in confronting Amulius, are hardly congruent with the bucolic scenes of their early lives where they shared a sense of equality with their shepherd friends (\textit{seria ac iocos celebrare} – 1.4.9).\textsuperscript{70} Most importantly, although Livy has previously prioritised Romulus over Remus, the brothers now work together in assaulting Amulius – both having equally inherited traits from their high-status predecessors. Amulius’ slaying is assigned to Romulus and Remus jointly and they then march side-by-side in military triumph as their grandfather is returned as king:\textsuperscript{71}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Romulus non cum globo iuuenum – nec enim erat ad uim apertam par – sed alis alio itinere iussis certo tempore ad regiam uenire pastoribus ad regem impetum facit; et a domo Numitoris alia comparata manu adiuuat Remus. Ita regem obturcunt} (1.5.7).\textsuperscript{72}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Iuuenes per medium contionem agmine ingressi cum auum regem salutassent, secuta ex omni multitudine consentiens uox ratum nomen imperiumque regi efficit} (1.6.2).
\end{quote}

Although Ovid briefly alludes to the royal ancestry of the twins through their mother (\textit{Iliadæ fratres} – 3.62), it is the revelation of their divine paternity (\textit{ut genus audierunt, animos pater editus auget} - 3.65) that marks a change in the twins’ behaviour. While this revelation raises the spirits of both brothers and causes them to feel shame at the small size of their community (3.65-6), crucially, it is only Romulus whose actions display inherited traits from this paternal legacy. In comparison to Livy, Ovid’s account of the murder of Amulius and restoration of Numitor to the throne is brief, occupying a mere two lines of an

\begin{footnotes}
\item[69] The accounts of Dionysius (1.83.3 = Fabius \textit{FRHist}. fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5) and Plutarch (Rom. 8.7-8 = Fabius \textit{FRHist}. fr.4b) also convey a sense of military organisation in the overthrow of Amulius. Cicero (\textit{De Rep.} 2.4) places Romulus in the position of a military leader by stating that the rural community was happy to be ruled by him and as leader of such forces, he overthrew Alba Longa and put Amulius to death.
\item[70] Ogilvie (1965:50-1) notes the rare use of the word \textit{celebrare}, denoting a sense of ‘togetherness’.
\item[71] Dionysius (1.83.3 = Fabius \textit{FRHist}. fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5) depicts a group killing; Plutarch (\textit{Rom.} 8.1 = Fabius \textit{FRHist}. fr.4b) does not identify a killer. Valerius Antias (\textit{FRHist.} fr.2) states names Romulus as the killer, together with his armed force of shepherds. Cicero (\textit{De Rep.} 2.4) states that Romulus killed Amulius with the assistance of his force of men.
\item[72] The manuscript and early printed tradition is divided between \textit{obtruncat} (Symmachean recension and Pap. Oxyrh. 1379) and \textit{obtruncant} (M., and various early printed editions according to Ogilvie). Since both Romulus and Remus are available as the subjects of \textit{obtruncat}, and in view of Livy’s use of \textit{ita} (which in context is most easily taken to highlight the joint military action of the twins), I join Bayet in the Budé edition in reading \textit{obtruncant}.
\end{footnotes}
account of Romulus and Remus’ life in *Fasti* book three. While the militaristic tone of this episode may have determined Ovid’s choice not to go into any detail in his elegiac poem, its brevity does not affect the stark contrast it offers to Livy’s account. Instead of citing the twins as joint killers of Amulius as Livy does (1.5.7), it is Romulus whom Ovid holds solely responsible for the slaying. Furthermore, rather than being the result of any sense of militaristic organisation (as in Livy), the murder is portrayed as a sudden and rash act:

_Romuleoque cadit trajectus Amulius ense,

regnaque longaeuo restituuntur auo._ *(3.67-8)*

Even though both Ovid (3.49) and Livy (1.6.1-2) justify the killing of Amulius as the righting of a previous wrong, the impulsiveness of Romulus’ actions and the complete non-involvement of Remus in the *Fasti* stands out markedly when read in conjunction with Livy. It is at this point that a fracture between the Ovidian characters of Romulus and Remus begins to develop. Having just learned of their paternal heritage it is Romulus who displays that it is he, and he alone, who has inherited the traits of his father Mars in his sole slaying of Amulius. Although this heritage may in itself may offer some sense of validation for the way he behaved, as we shall see later, his belligerent qualities become more prominent still later in the poem when Romulus finally emerges as sole ruler of Rome. As will also become clear later, Remus, it is suggested, has not necessarily inherited his father’s aggressive streak, being more influenced by his ‘rustic’ upbringing than his celestial lineage.

The fierceness of Romulus’ murderous act is further emphasised when considered in relation to the scene that immediately precedes it, in which the brothers are seen performing a customary diplomatic role, giving judgements to farmers and herdsmen (3.59-64); notably, there is no sense whatsoever of any autocratic motivation in Romulus and Remus’ adjudication, since they only offer their opinions when asked *(omnibus agricolis*

---

73 Ovid labels Amulius _contemptor ... aequi_ *(3.49)*; Dionysius (1.79.1 = Fabius *FRHist*. fr.4a = Cincius Alimentus fr.1 = Cato fr.14 = Piso fr.5) also states that Amulius ‘acted with great contempt for justice in all matters’. Livy highlights Amulius’ violence and profusion of crimes right from the beginning of his account *(1.3.10-11)*.

74 This is not mentioned by Livy. Ovid may possibly have turned to Fabius for this detail as Plutarch *(Rom. 6.3 = Fabius *FRHist*. fr.4b) states that Romulus had ‘dealings with his neighbours about grazing and hunting’; however, if Ovid is using Fabius (as presented by Plutarch) here, he inverts the incident, as in Plutarch these ‘dealings’ are done by Romulus alone. Furthermore, Plutarch *(Rom. 6.4 = Fabius *FRHist*. fr.4b) claims that Romulus excelled over his brother in terms of his judgement and political wisdom; it was this that made the twins ‘dear to their fellow slaves and those of humbler status, but they despised the royal overseers and officers and herdsmen as no better than themselves in valour’. Cicero *(De Rep. 2.4)* also depicts Romulus alone as the leader of his rural community.
The founding of the city and the death of Remus

While Ovid and Livy may differ as to who was responsible for Amulius’ death, they both concur as to the unity of Romulus and Remus as they stand on cusp of founding the city of Rome. Despite Romulus’ more violent act in the killing of Amulius in the Fasti, it does not interrupt the twins’ sense of egalitarianism fostered from their pastoral upbringing, as the city begins to rise (4.811-14). In Livy however, the influence of the rustic environment in which they were born and lived as young men, begins to be forgotten and their inherited regal traits begin to emerge, with disastrous consequences. Although Ovid and Livy may differ in their versions of the founding of the city of Rome, both agree in making Remus’ death a turning point. Equally, in both accounts, this turning point is precipitated by the recognition of the twins’ heritage (as discussed above); crucially, in Livy, it is a shared heritage, in Ovid it is not necessarily so.

On deciding to found a city, Livy narrates how a quarrel arose between the brothers as to who should govern the new settlement (1.6.3-7.3). The twins’ royal heritage rears its ugly head when Livy attributes to the twins the same jealousy and ambition that divided their grandfather and Amulius (1.6.4). History seems to be repeating itself, as the dispute ultimately leads to yet another royal death, this time that of Remus. The twins’ first appearance as fully recognised members of the royal clan saw them acting for noble ends in redressing a wrong committed by Amulius; now it seems that their regal temperament has led to envy, aspiration and murder (Interuenit deinde his cogitationibus auitum malum, regni cupid, atque inde foedum certamen coortum a satis miti principio – 1.6.4).

For Ovid, there are no such problems of regal malevolence, as the brothers continue to display the same sense of united diplomacy on the cusp of founding Rome as they did when they lived in the shepherd society. Although the brothers are unable to decide between them who should govern the new city, this is not the result of any conflict but rather some unspecified doubt – Ovid’s use of ambitur (4.812) shares none of the force of Livy’s foedum certamen (1.6.4); Romulus’ own statement, confirming there was no disagreement
between him and his twin in the Fasti (‘nil opus est’ dixit ‘certamine’ Romulus ‘ullo’ - 4.813), is perhaps a ‘deliberate reaction against Livy’.75 Similarly, while both authors concur that Romulus and Remus decided to use augury to determine who would preside over the new city, their reaction to the augural results are somewhat different.76 In the Fasti, Romulus and Remus’ fraternal harmony continues as they amicably accept the avian omen (pacto / statur - 4.817-8) and Romulus is accorded government of the city (4.818). Conversely, the Livian brothers come into conflict again (certamine irarum – 1.7.2) as they and their followers cannot agree on how to interpret the birds they have observed (1.7.1-2). This leads to the first of Livy’s two versions of Remus’ death, as the dispute between the brothers and their respective supporters becomes physical, and Remus is struck down in the affray (1.7.2). However, Livy also provides an alternative version of Remus’ demise, relating that the commoner story involved him being slain by his brother after he mockingly jumped over the new walls of Romulus’ city:

Inde cum altercatione congressi certamine irarum ad caedem uertuntur; ibi in turba ictus Remus cecidit. Volgatior fama est ludibrio fratris Remum nouos transiluisse muros; inde ab irato Romulo, cum uerbis quoque increpitans adieisset, ‘Sic deinde, quicumque alius transiliet moenia mea’, interflectum. Ita solus potitus imperio Romulus; condita urbs conditoris nomine appellata (1.7.2-3).

Scholars are divided as to which version of events Livy appears to favour and, consequently, the extent to which Romulus is held culpable for his brother’s murder. Livy’s labelling of the second version as a Volgatior fama (1.7.2), would seem to suggest that he is proposing this tradition as the more credible one. While accepting that ‘simple currency of popularity provides no guarantee of reliability’,77 Miles supports this view, adding that the second version is also more memorable, in terms of its length, detail and more vivid presentation.78 Miles adds, that by assigning to Romulus the exclamation ‘Sic deinde,
quicumque alius transiliet moenia mea’ (1.7.2-3), Livy explicitly identifies Romulus as a murderer.79 Although Stem also acknowledges that Livy’s second version of Remus’ death does emphatically identify Romulus as a killer, he suggests that Livy’s treatment of both versions leads to a more ambiguous picture of Romulus.80 Whichever perspective is correct, Romulus is at best implicated in Remus’ murder and at worst directly responsible for it.

Crucially for Ovid, he needs to show at least a modicum of belief in Romulus’ innocence in his brother’s murder in order to complete the foundation upon which he will develop Romulus in the rest of the Fasti.81 He therefore, selects another version of Remus’ death, not related by Livy, in which Romulus’ bodyguard Celer commits the murder (4.87-41).82 Once again, Ovid still signals his engagement with Livy even when using another source, especially when his version of Remus’ death is considered in relation to Romulus’ statement in the Fasti that there was no contest between him and his brother as to who should found the city (4.813: discussed above). By reinforcing this idea that the brothers were not at loggerheads over the founding of Rome by proceeding to give an account of Remus’ death that absolves Romulus of any blame, Ovid could be seen to be ‘correcting’ Livy’s version of events that implies at least some guilt on behalf of Rome’s first king.

Although in the Fasti, Romulus could be seen as partly responsible for his brother’s death in issuing a command to Celer to kill anyone who dares to jump over the walls, it is not he

79 Miles 1995:148. Ogilvie (1965:54) says that Livy accepts only the curse from the vulgate.
80 In the first version of his brother’s death, Stem (2007:445-6) notes that Livy does not assign any agency to Romulus in the deadly strike dealt to Remus. While in Livy’s second version, Romulus may have wielded the fatal blow, Stem claims Livy ‘does not provide the reader with the complete context in which to assess the moral validity of the killing’. So, either Romulus is not responsible for Remus’ murder as the first version posits, and even if he was, as the second version suggests, Livy ‘does not clarify justification for Romulus’ act of anger, hence Romulus may or may not have killed Remus and Remus may or may not have deserved it’ (Stem 2007:448). See also Wiseman 1995:9-11; and Neel 2015:142-9.
81 As part of his explanation of Augustus receiving the title pater patriae Ovid does seem to import some guilt for Remus’ death to Romulus by stating that te Remus incusat (2.143). Harries (1989:171) suggests that the incompatibility between the guilt expressed at 2.143 and its absence the account of Remus’ death at 4.807-62, can be attributed to the fact that Romulus himself is present in the latter passage. Robinson (2011:156) claims that this suggestion of Romulus’ fratricide potentially makes later absolutions of Romulus’ guilt (4.837-44, 5.467-74) seem unconvincing.
82 Ovid appears to be following Valerius Antias (FRHist. fr.4) here who, according to Rich (FRHist.:iii.332) and Fantham (1998:249), was most likely the originator of this version. Ogilvie (1965:54) and Wiseman (1995:11) claim that Macer was responsible for the ‘general affray’ version, although this does not survive. What little survives of Ennius’ account of Remus’ death depicts Romulus about to kill his brother for jumping the city walls (Ann. 1.92-3). Cato (FRHist. fr.3) reports that Romulus was a tyrant and therefore killed his brother. Cicero (Off. 3.41) claims Romulus thought it more expedient to rule alone so killed his brother, which was a crime whether he was a god or a human. Diodorus (8.6.1-3) reports that Remus was killed by Celer. Although Dionysius (1.87.4) relates the version in which Celer kills Remus, he claims that the most probable account is that in which Remus and Faustulus are killed in a general affray (1.87.1-4). Interestingly however, Dionysius does not report Romulus’ command to Celer to kill anyone who jumps over the city walls, and the bodyguard seems to act on his own initiative. Plutarch (Rom. 10.1-2) reports all three versions. See also Wiseman 1995:9-11; Barchiesi 1997: 159-64.
but Celer who deals the fatal blow (4.87-41). Deremetz suggests that, by choosing to have Celer kill Remus, Ovid rehabilitates the character of Romulus. However, considering that Ovid’s Romulus has up until this point behaved in an exemplary fashion, it is not he who needs rehabilitation; with the suggestion that he has committed fratricide, Livy’s Romulus, however, does require redemption.

Romulus’ innocence and his continued unity with his brother, is further underscored by Ovid as Rome’s new ruler reacts to his brother’s death (as examined above). On hearing of Remus’ demise, Romulus is consumed with anguish and a description of his grief is extended over four lines and repeated at the close of Ovid’s narration of Remus’ funeral, (a scene that is not included in Livy or any other extant source).

In stark contrast to the ‘ferocious threat’ that the Livian Romulus utters just before killing his brother (‘Sic deinde, quicumque alius transiliet moenia mea’ 1.7.2), Ovid’s innocent Romulus repeats these words in ‘the form of a retrospective comment’ (‘sic’ que ‘meos muros transeat hostis’ - 4.848):

haec ubi rex didicit, lacrimas introrsus obortas
deuorat et clausum pectore uolnus habet.
flere palam non uolt exemplaque fortia servat,
’sic’ que ‘meos muros transeat hostis’ ait.
dat tamen exsequias nec iam suspendere fletum
sustinet, et pietas dissimulata patet;
osculaque applicuit posito suprema feretro
atque ait ‘inuito frater adempte, uale!’

83 Deremetz 2013: 241. Harries (1989:170-1), Newlands (1995:69) and Fantham (1998:242) all note that Ovid’s choice as to which version of Remus’ death to narrate must be influenced by the fact he has called upon Quirinus - the deified Romulus – to assist him in telling this story (4.809). It is understandable that Romulus would be keen to oversee the presentation of a ‘self-exculpatory tale’ (Fantham 1998:249). Harries (1989:171) claims that by having Romulus narrate this episode, he presents him as ‘utterly unbelievable and untrustworthy’. However, it must be noted that Romulus is merely present at the narration of Celer’s killing of Remus, the event itself is told in the poet’s words.

84 Following Remus’ death, Deremetz (2013: 240-1) claims Romulus is shown as ‘behaving like a real king: he does not punish Celer and renews interdiction against crossing a border’. Similarly in Livy, Miles (1995:148) sees the murder of Remus as ‘the final affirmation of Romulus’ legitimacy. It completes Romulus’ movement toward self-sufficiency, establishes his capacity to defend his city, and marks complete personal identification with the city as a particular source of Rome’s strength’.

86 Neel 2015:163.
87 Barchiesi 1997:162.
88 Barchiesi 1997:162.
Arsurosque artus unxit... (4.845-53).

As noted above, Faustulus and Larentia, also appear at Remus’ funeral, their ‘rustic’ morality further evidenced in their mourning for their foster-son. In sharing their grief, it seems that Romulus too is displaying a similar sense of moral probity inspired by his pastoral up-bringing. However, as will shortly be seen, after Remus’ demise, the character of Romulus loses the influence of this early ‘rustic’ life and develops in accordance with the traits of his divine consanguinity.89

The purpose of Faustulus and Larentia’s appearance at Remus’ funeral seems, therefore, the creation of an association between these moral ‘rustic’ characters and Remus, against whom Romulus’ emerging belligerent nature can be judged. This bond between Remus and his foster-parents is consolidated when, having just returned from his funeral (5.451-6),90 Remus appears to them as a ghost, requesting correct posthumous commemoration (5.457-84). The anguish the couple display just prior to Remus’ spectral appearance not only links these two scenes together in series, but reinforces the sense of a shared ‘rustic’ morality between Faustulus and Larentia and their dearly departed foster-son:

Romulus ut tumulo fraternas condidit umbras,
et male ueloci iusta soluta Remo,
Faustulus infelix et passis Acca capillis
spargebant lacrimis ossa perusta suis.
inde domum redeunt sub prima crepuscula maesti,
utque erat, in duro procubuere toro (5.451-6).

As it is Romulus, and not Faustulus and Larentia, who has the power to grant Remus’ request, the only reason as to why Remus chooses to go to them and not his brother must be because of the character change that Romulus undergoes on becoming king. While his bellicose nature, inherited from his divine father Mars, has been simmering away throughout the Fasti, it is only after Remus’ death that it is brought to the boil. It seems that Romulus’ character was not informed by his pastoral upbringing after all and, without his brother to

89 Barchiesi (1997:161-4) detects a sense of duplicity in Romulus’ initial denial of his grief at his brother’s death (4.845-6) followed by his Catullan lament to his brother (68.19-20, 91-2); Barchiesi believes this demonstrates that Romulus’ ‘main characteristic is not archaic brutality’, but that his capacity for self-control rather reminding the reader of ‘the virtues of a modern Roman leader’. See also Harries 1989:170.
90 Littlewood (2001:927) notes that only Faustulus and Larentia’s grief is recorded here.
balance him, his true inherited nature comes to the surface. During his speech to his foster-parents (5.459-74), Remus states that his brother was devoted to him and gave him all he could. The fact that all he gave seems to be tears for Remus’ fate, however, potentially highlights the irony of Remus’ statement. Furthermore, if Romulus had given all he could, why did he not arrange for proper commemoration of his brother without Remus having to ask for it:

‘...noluit hoc frater, pietas aequalis in illo est:
quod potuit, lacrimas in mea fata dedit.
hunc uos per lacrimas, per uestra alimenta rogate,
ut celebrem nostro signet honore diem’. (5.471-4).

Through his association with the rustic part of early Roman society as represented by Faustulus and Larentia, Remus can be seen to embody the same sense of ‘rustic’ virtue embodied by them. In having no such bonds, Romulus perhaps, does not exhibit these ‘rustic’ qualities.

As the solitary Romulus now stands as king of Rome, he emerges as a very different character in the poet’s and the historian’s accounts. Livy addresses the problem he has created for himself through implicating Romulus in Remus’ murder, by smoothing over the morally ambiguous aspects of his nature to ultimately present him in a positive light. The lack of criminality in Ovid’s portrait of Romulus however, removes the need to redeem him or, more importantly, present him in Livy’s more favourable guise.

Livy begins his redemption of Romulus early, since the latter’s first act after having fortified Rome, is to perform the appropriate religious rites (1.7.3-4). While most other extant sources depict Romulus performing an appropriate foundation ritual at this point, Livy’s version differs in that he describes Romulus performing the rather particular custom of the *Ara Maxima* and provides an extended excursus as to the history of this cult (1.7.3-15). By recalling the origins of this cult through the story of Evander, Hercules and Cacus,

---

91 In Dionysius (1.87.3), it is a despondent Romulus whom Larentia entreats and comforts after Remus’ death. After listening to her, Romulus regains his lust for life and goes on to build the city.
93 Cato (FRHist. fr.66) refers to a similar custom, but its context is uncertain (Cornell FRHist.:iii.113-4). Both Dionysius (1.88.1-3) and Plutarch (Rom. 11.1-3) describe Romulus performing the rites of the Parilia including the ritual of the *pomerium* at this point. Ovid differs from the tradition in placing his account of the Parilia directly after Romulus and Remus’ city founding augural contest, but before Remus’ death (4.819-36).
Livy creates an atmosphere of ancient rustic piety – as he did through his reference to Evander and Lycaean Pan in the context of his cattle-rustler narrative (1.5.1-3; as discussed above) – reminiscent of Romulus’ pastoral upbringing as he stands on the cusp of his kingship.

As a king, Livy proceeds to portray Romulus as demonstrating a constructive combination of the qualities he developed during his rustic upbringing and his inherited qualities of royal leadership. Any potentially tyrannical behaviour is tempered by the suggestion that Romulus was acting not for personal gain but for the greater good. Following his performance of the appropriate religious rites after founding the city, the next act of Livy’s Romulus is the introduction of laws. Livy is quick to point out that Romulus’ adoption of the emblems of authority (1.8.1-2) and institution of the senate (1.8.7) was in no way motivated by Romulus’ own autocratic yearnings, but was done for the benefit of the populace and the state. The king’s statesmanlike qualities - evident in his appointment of senators – added ‘policy’ (consilium) to his measures to increase the city’s strength (1.8.7).

As Romulus steps into his new role as king of Rome in the Fasti, his link to his rustic roots continues to fade while he emerges as very much his (divine) father’s son. The legislative measures Romulus undertakes in the Fasti betray little of Livy’s sense of the king’s humanitarianism. While the calendrical assignment of setting the length of the year and naming its months given to Romulus by Ovid befits the themes and genre of the Fasti, it paradoxically functions to promote Romulus’ war-like nature. Ovid reveals that Romulus’ error in calculating only ten months in the year, was the direct result of his belligerent disposition:

\[
\begin{align*}
tempora & \ digeret \ cum \ conditor \ Urbis, \ in \ anno \\
& constituit \ menses \ quinque \ bis \ esse \ suo. \\
scilicet & \ arma \ magis \ quam \ sidera, \ Romule, \ noras, \\
& curaque \ finitimos \ uincerere \ maior \ erat. \ (1.27-30).
\end{align*}
\]

..................................................................................

\[
\begin{align*}
Romulus, & \ hos \ omnes \ ut \ uinceret \ ordine \ saltem, \\
& sanguinis \ auctori \ tempora \ prima \ dedit. \ (3.97-8).
\end{align*}
\]

provides an explanation of the cult of the Ara Maxima, which closely follows Livy (Ogilvie 1965:58), at 1.543-86 (see Chapter Seven).
Ovid’s Romulus also establishes the senate, but his grounds for doing this are somewhat different to those in Livy. Rather than being for the benefit of his newly founded society, Romulus’ figuration of the senate in the Fasti is based on his (incorrect) calculation of the length of the year. What is more, as soon as Romulus has completed the setting up of the senate, he moves straight on to the institution of military companies and tribes. As yet another indicator of his bellicose nature, it is perhaps no wonder that the ten-month length of Romulus’ year should coincide with the mourning period of a wife for her husband:

\[\textit{inde patres centum denos secreuit in orbes} \]
\[\textit{Romulus, hastatos instiuitque decem;}\]
\[\textit{et totidem princeps, totidem pilanus habebat} \]
\[\textit{corpora, legitimo quiqve merebat equo.} \]
\[\textit{quin etiam partes totidem Titiensibus ille,} \]
\[\textit{quosque uocant Ramnes, Luceribusque dedit.} \]
\[\textit{adsuetos igitur numeros seruauit in anno.} \]
\[\textit{hoc luget spatio femina maesta uirum.} \textit{(3.127-34).}\]

On obtaining sole rule of Rome, Livy’s Romulus develops in a statesmanlike way, displaying qualities developed during his rustic upbringing and inherited from his royal lineage. In the Fasti however, the kingly Romulus emerges as a more one-sided character, primarily influenced by the martial traits he inherited from his divine father. While these qualities came to the fore from time to time in Ovid’s depiction of Romulus’ early life, they begin to dominate on his assumption of power. The differences between Ovid’s and Livy’s representations of Romulus is further illustrated in their opposing versions of the rape of the Sabine women and consequent war with the Sabines.

Despite the brevity of Ovid’s account of the rape of the Sabine women at this point (the poet states he will give a full account when he deals with the Consualia festival later in the poem – 3.200), Ovid still uses this event to cultivate the bellicose nature of his version of Romulus. In Livy, the Sabine rape is presented very much as a last resort to solving the problem of the city’s lack of female citizens (1.9.1-16), Romulus’ decision to pursue this violent course of action only comes after all other diplomatic means have been thwarted

---

94 The majority of other sources generally concur with Livy in and unproblematic presentation of Romulus as both a military leader and political statesman (Cic. De Rep. 2.16, 3.47; D.H. 2.3.3-4, 2.26.1). That is not to say that authors are entirely uncritical of Romulus (Cic. De Rep. 2.25, Off. 3.40-1), but he does receive plenty of positive press. Some sources also acknowledge a sense of autocracy in the king later in his reign.
Although like Livy, Ovid admits that the rape was precipitated by the unwillingness of neighbouring tribes to wed the Romans (3.195-6), there is less of a sense of their unreasonableness than there is in Livy (1.9.4-5); instead it seems the rape is precipitated by Mars’ hurt pride at the inability of these surrounding communities to recognise their chance to be part of Rome’s magnificent destiny. The war-god thus commands his son to put his inherited temperament to good use and pick up his sword:

{spernebant generos inopes uicinia diues,  
et male credebar sanguinis auctor ego (3.189-90).
...........................................................}

{indolui patriamque dedi tibi Romule, mentem:  
‘tolle preces,’ dixi ‘quod petis arma dabunt.’
festa parat Conso ... (3.197-200).}

While Romulus could be afforded some amount of defence in that he was only obeying his father in instigating the rape of the Sabine women, his actions, nevertheless, explicitly reveal an important aspect of an inherited character from the god of war. The days when he and Remus acted as advisors to their shepherd peers (3.61-2), as discussed above, seem to be a thing of the past, and he displays the same sense of rash impulsiveness as when he killed Amulius (3.67).

As Ovid immediately proceeds to recount the consequent war with the Sabines, he concerns himself purely with the actions of the women, who ultimately bring about a cessation of hostilities. ‘Thematic’ intertextuality once again signals that it is Livy’s account of the Sabine war that Ovid follows. Both historian and poet have the women intervene on the battlefield, the women entering the affray with their hair loosened and wearing mourning dress: *parent crinesque resoluunt / maestaque funera corpora ueste tegunt* (3.213-4); *crinibus passis scissaque ueste* (1.13.1). Dionysius reports an alternative tradition in which the women direct their heartfelt pleas for peace to the senate; they then proceed to the Sabine

---

95 Pre-Livian sources for the Sabine war are scarce and the majority of them concern the treachery of Tarpeia (Fabius FRHist. fr.7 = Cincius Alimentus FRHist. fr.3 = Piso FRHist. fr.7; Cato FRHist. t.8; Piso FRHist. fr.8; Galba FRHist. fr.1).

96 Dionysius (2.45.4-5) also mentions the women’s mourning attire, but he does not mention their hair. Ogilvie (1965:78) notes that *crinibus passis* ‘is the normal state of hysterical women in epic’. Like Ovid and Livy, Plutarch (Rom. 19.1) does mention the women’s hair.
camp, dressed in mourning with some carrying their infant children, and there Hersilia gives a long speech to king, before all the women throw themselves at his feet (2.45.1-46.1). 97

In concentrating on this one aspect of the war and providing no background to the conflict, Ovid evades the need to recount any of the details that Livy does, particularly those that offer Romulus any sense of justification for his role in this conflict. Although Livy is not blind to the Sabine perspective – Mettius Curtius’ battle cry (1.12.8-9) perhaps reminds the reader of the Roman’s ‘crime’ – he still presents them in a largely negative light. 98 Not only does Livy make it clear that the Sabines were the ones to attack Rome, but they are also criticised by the historian for not correctly declaring war (1.11.5-6) and, in introducing the story of Tarpeia, they are accused of deception (1.11.6-9). 99 Furthermore, Romulus himself is further distanced from blame as his appeal to Jupiter for intervention in the war suggests a combination of divine assent for the conflict and its necessity in ensuring the future greatness of the city (1.12.4-7). This contrasts starkly with Mars’ more personally motivated intervention in the war in the Fasti as discussed above (3.189-90). Ultimately, the Livian Romulus plays a pivotal part in ending the war by agreeing a truce with the Sabine king Titus Tatius (1.13.5); in the Fasti, Romulus has no such role as it is the women who are credited with resolving the conflict (3.230-2).

Any defence granted to Romulus based on Mars’ involvement in the Sabine War in the Fasti is additionally weakened in Ovid’s account of the king’s apotheosis (2.475-509). Crucially in this instance, it is Ovid himself who narrates this story and Romulus is denied the protection afforded to him by the partisan perspective of his celestial father towards his aggressive behaviour as king. It is therefore much more difficult – at least from a chronological rather than a linear reading – to justify retrospectively Romulus’ involvement in such violent acts as the rape of the Sabines. As Romulus’ (mortal) life comes to end, his paternally inherited nature loses its impact as a validation of his violent kingship, which seems to have increasingly come to resemble a tyranny. Again, it is only through a

97 Ogilvie (1965:76) believes Livy omits the meeting with the Senate for ‘dramatic effect’. Livy also mentions the Sabine women’s intervention in the war at 34.5.7-8, claiming his source to be Cato.
98 Vasaly (2015:39) notes that Livy’s narrative of the Sabine war ‘sequentially mitigates and ultimately excuses its impropriety’. Stem (2007:458-9) also suggests that while criticism of Romulus is perceptible in Livy’s narration of the Sabine war, but it’s results ultimate vindicate him.
99 Ovid provides two versions of the treachery of Tarpeia as part of Janus’ explanation as to his temple between two fora. The first version briefly mentions Tarpeia’s betrayal of Rome for the golden armlets of the Sabine enemy (1.259-62), the second (1.263-74) provides a longer story in which Janus repels the Sabines with a sudden eruption of boiling water. Green (2004a:121-2) states that ‘Ovid is the first and only extant writer to combine the two myths’, motivated primarily by generic reasons.
synchronous reading with Livy’s account of Romulus’ apotheosis that the true nature of Ovid’s Romulus emerges.

Ovid’s portrait of a combative Romulus is reinforced at the very beginning of his account of the king’s apotheosis. Forming part of his *aition* of the Quirinal festival, Ovid explains that the day was dedicated to Quirinus – formerly Romulus – and provides three possible etymologies for the king’s divine name (2.475-89). The first and longest etymology suggests that the name came from the Sabine word *curis* (meaning spear): Romulus’ belligerent nature, as suggested by this etymology, is cemented as the poet adds that it was *bellicus a telo uenit in astra deus* (4.478). Ovid’s second etymology claims that the Quirites gave their own name to Romulus (*suum regi nomen posuere Quirites* – 2.479), the third recalls the Sabine war as the poet claims that the name originated because Romulus united the Cures to Rome (*Romanis iunxerat ille Cures* – 2.480). However, Ovid’s reference here is elusive and – since he provides no details as to the unification of the Romans and the Sabines here, and makes no mention of the truce between Romulus and Titus Tatius in the *Fasti* – it is perhaps to Livy that the reader must turn for the full context and background to this etymology. Furthermore, by referring to Livy, a very different emphasis regarding Ovid’s explanation of Romulus’ identification with Quirinus can be detected.

Livy provides a similar etymology, not about how Romulus became known as Quirinus, but about how the Romans became known as Quirites (1.13.5) – the historian relating how, following Romulus and Titus Tatius’ truce at the end of the Sabine war, the new combined population was named Quirites from the town of Cures. Whereas Livy stresses the *laeta ... pax* (1.13.6: also *pacem* – 1.13.4) that this name of Quirites brought, Ovid’s equation of the spear and Sabine war etymologies reinforces Romulus’ inherently truculent nature. This bellicosity continues as Mars, just prior to raising his son to heaven, admires the *multa ... bella* that his son has waged (2.482). Moreover, in terms of the *Fasti*’s ‘historical’ coverage,

---

100 According to Robinson (2011:303) Cicero (*De Rep.* 2.17-20) is ‘the first secure evidence we have’ for Romulus’ identification with Quirinus (also Cic. *Leg* 1.3, 2.19; *Off.* 3.40-1; *N.D.* 3.39). Ennius mentions Quirinus (*Ann.* 1.99-100 Sk.), but Skutsch (1985:245-7) believes he is not associated with Romulus as the occasion of the reference is likely to precede Romulus’ deification. Varro (*Lat. Ling.* 5.74) mentions the god Quirinus, but he does not associate him with Romulus. Dionysius (2.48.1-4) reports that Varro provided the spear etymology, but Dionysius himself claims that the name Quirinus was given to Enyalus, and it is uncertain whether he was Mars or some other martial deity. Plutarch (*Rom.* 29.1-2) notes a variety of reasons as to Romulus’ identification with Quirinus, emphasising his association with the name because he was distinguished in war.

101 Robinson 2011:305-6. Robinson further notes that ‘this was the commonly accepted reason in antiquity why the Romans were called Quirites’ (*D.H.* 2.46.2; Plut. *Rom.* 29.1), however, he adds that ‘it is rarely suggested as a reason why Romulus was named Quirinus’.

102 Ovid only makes a few brief references to Titus Tatius in the *Fasti* (1.260, 1.272, 2.135, 6.49).
when read in conjunction with Livy, this phrase although brief, offers at least some acknowledgement of the multiple conflicts waged between the fledgling city of Rome and its neighbours (Liv. 1.9.113.6).\textsuperscript{103}

While in narrating Romulus’ death and apotheosis (Liv. 1.16.1-8; Fast. 2.475-512) neither Ovid nor Livy categorically rule-out the possibility that the senators murdered Romulus, Ovid is more adamant than Livy in suggesting that the Roman people were less convinced of their innocence.\textsuperscript{104} Ovid’s initial assertion that the murder charge laid against the senate was false (falsaeque patres in crimine caedis, 2.497), is somewhat undermined by his following statement that suspicion would have stuck in people’s minds had it not been for Julius Proculus’ intervention (haesissetque animis forsitan illa fides; / sed Proculus Longa ueniebat Iulius Alba – 2.498-9). Whether the senators were actually guilty of Romulus’ murder or not, seems to be of secondary importance to the misgivings expressed by the populace,\textsuperscript{105} the fact that Proculus had to intervene to quell doubts as to the senators’ innocence, perhaps indicative that there was a common concern regarding Romulus’ kingship that would warrant them wanting him dead. Admittedly, the senate could be motivated to get rid of a king, whether good or bad, in order to satisfy its own individual or collective megalomania. What seems most important here though, is Ovid and Livy’s differing representations of how the ‘ordinary’ Romans react to the possibility that the senators were responsible for Romulus’ death.

Livy is reluctant to attribute more than a few dissenting voices to the ‘veiled’ idea that Rome’s founder was murdered by the Fathers, despite stating that Romulus was better loved by the commons than the senate and most loved by the army (1.16.4). Whether they were in reality guilty of murder or not, the soldiers readily accept the senators’ protestations of their innocence (etsi satis credebat patribus qui proximi steterant sublimem raptum procella – 1.16.2), suggesting that they would, in contrast to the citizens in the Fasti, find it hard to comprehend why anyone would want to kill their beloved leader. It was this very strength of

\textsuperscript{103} As well as the Sabines, Livy narrates conflict between the Romans and the inhabitants of Caenina, Crustumurium and Antemnae.

\textsuperscript{104} Little survives of Ennius’ account (Ann. 1.110-1 Sk.), but Skutsch (1985:260) believes he did narrate Romulus being taken up to heaven. Cicero (De Rep. 2.20-1) suggests that the senate put up Proculus to telling the people about Romulus’ apotheosis in order to free themselves from the suspicion of murder. Dionysius (2.56.1-5) notes the fabulous tales concerning Romulus’ death but favours the version where he was killed by the patricians as most plausible. Plutarch (Rom. 27.5) also reports that as the patricians were suspected of murder, Proculus gave a speech that he had seen Romulus who told him he had become the god Quirinus (Rom. 28.1-3).

\textsuperscript{105} Vasaly (2015:41) asserts that Livy is not really concerned with what actually happened to Romulus, but instead focuses ‘on the emotional reaction of the people to the king’s disappearance and, implicitly, on the need of the patres to control that reaction’.
feeling towards Romulus that Livy declares caused the rumours that he was murdered by the senate to be dismissed, in favour of his sudden disappearance being explained by his ascension to heaven:

_Fuisse credo tum quoque aliquos qui discerptum regem patrum manibus taciti arguerent; manauit enim haec quoque sed perobscura vara; illam alteram admiratio uiri et pauor praesens nobiletuit. Et consilio etiam unius hominis addita rei dicitur fides (1.16.4-5)._ 

In Livy, there is little sense that the soldiers had any reason to suspect that anyone would want to assassinate Romulus; in Ovid however, it seems the plebeians would take less persuading to believe that the senators would want to be rid of him. Considering the aggressive and tyrannical way in which Romulus has been portrayed in the _Fasti_ up to this point, it is perhaps no wonder that neither the senators nor the citizens were completely happy with their king.\(^{106}\)

It is perhaps the different reasons that Ovid and Livy supply as to why Romulus deserved his divinity that most illustrates the way in which they depict Rome’s founder. As well as founding the city of Rome, Ovid states that Mars called on Jupiter to give him back his son, after he had seen the amount of wars Romulus had waged. In contrast to the Sabine war (discussed above), the line _Romulea bella peracta manu_ (2.481-2) suggests that all these wars were instigated solely by Romulus’ with no sense of provocation:

_nam pater armipotens, postquam noua moenia uidit multaque Romulea bella peracta manu_ (2.481-2)

While Livy also presents Romulus’ engagement in military action as part of why he deserved to be made a god, he, unlike Ovid, balances Romulus’ militarism with his other deeds (1.15.6-8). Livy states that none of them were incompatible with the divinity that was

---

\(^{106}\) Robinson 2011:310. Cicero claims that is was Romulus’ merit (_De Rep_. 1.25), virtue and achievements as king (_De Rep_. 2.17) and his conspicuous ability (_De Rep_. 2.20) that led to the belief that he had become a god. However, Dionysius (2.56.2, 56.5) and Plutarch (_Rom_. 27.6) both convey a sense of Romulus’ autocracy in their accounts of Romulus’ death. Dionysius (2.56.3) claims that one reason why the patricians may have been responsible for Romulus’ death was because he had started to behave more like a tyrant than a king. Just prior to his account of Romulus’ demise, Plutarch (_Rom_. 26.1) claims Romulus was taking on a ‘haughtier bearing [baruterō phronēmati]’ and behaving as an arrogant king. Neel (2015:98) believes Livy also betrays a sense of tyranny in Romulus within his version of the king’s death, as does Dionysius 2.56.3-4.
ascribed to him after death (1.15.6) and it was these achievements that enabled Rome to enjoy peace for the next 40 years:

*non animus in regno auito recipiendo, non condendae urbis consilium, non bello ac pace firmandae. Ab illo enim profecto viribus datis tantum ualuit ut in quadraginta deinde annos tutam pacem haberet* (1.15.6-7).

While Romulus may be to blame for the slaying of Amulius in the *Fasti*, he is not culpable of the murder of Remus, unlike in Livy. In being guilty of fratricide, Livy creates Romulus as a character who needs redemption, and this redemption comes through the development of his double-sided nature, which combines ‘rustic’ virtue and effective kingship. Since Ovid’s Romulus is not guilty of Remus’ murder he does not need redemption and this frees Ovid to develop him in a very different way to the historian; as soon as Remus dies, the Ovidian Romulus is free to let the traits inherited from his war-god father to come to the fore. On his assumption of power, Romulus has lost the balancing effect on his parental inheritance of his brother Remus, who embodied their plebeian upbringing. Retrospectively, the potential tyranny of Romulus’ rule becomes apparent as Ovid presents his version of Romulus’ apotheosis. Whereas Livy’s Romulus is presented as a self-contained combination of both sets of qualities, power, it seems, has had a corrupting influence on Ovid’s Rome’s founder.
CHAPTER FOUR
Numa

Introduction

In Chapter Three, Ovid’s engagement with Livy was analysed in relation to his depiction of Romulus and Remus in the Fasti. That chapter argued that Ovid engages in a dialogue with Livy in order to create a very specific opposition between the two brothers. It demonstrated that generic differences between the two accounts enabled Ovid to interrogate and question some of the emphases and data evident in Livy’s version of the lives of Romulus and Remus. In doing so, Ovid can be seen to be creating a significant contrast between the characters of Romulus and Remus that reveals a more sustained and positive interest in the ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ aspects of Roman history than Livy does.

This chapter will subject Numa to the same level of enquiry afforded Romulus and Remus. In doing so will it demonstrate how Ovid’s engagement with Livy enriches our understanding of further themes and issues in the Fasti. The two parts of the present chapter will pay close attention to the ‘verbal’ and ‘thematic’ features of the text, accompanied by a necessarily detailed, and at times complex, argument on the nature of the Fasti’s relationship to AUC. However, the objective of the argument is clear: to demonstrate that Ovid is using Livy as a creative way to achieve a very particular effect.

The first part of this chapter will provide a brief examination of Ovid’s coverage of Numa in the Fasti, before moving on to survey the pre-Livian sources available for the reign of Rome’s second king. By exploring the extent of ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality with Livy, this chapter will show that Ovid is using the historian as his major source for his coverage of Numa. ‘Thematic’ intertextuality will prove particularly robust between Ovid and Livy, since both authors create a similar portrait of Numa. Each places more emphasis on his piety, justice, wisdom and peaceful nature than the other extant accounts. Even in those episodes where Ovid does not rely on Livy as a ‘factual’ source, an engagement between the poet and the historian can still be discerned. The prioritising of some episodes over others is partly due to differences in genre; but this chapter will argue that – as with Romulus and Remus in Chapter Three – it is these generic differences that allow Ovid to respond to Livy’s version of events.

The second part of this chapter will then go on to examine in greater depth Ovid’s engagement with Livy in his portrayal of Numa, with a particular emphasis on Fasti book
Critics recognise that Ovid creates an opposition between Rome’s first two kings; but they are usually content to use ‘genre’ as the main exploratory framework and explanatory tool for tackling this opposition. The difference between the two is then usually analysed by the same critics for any contemporary comment it might yield on Augustan society. This chapter will take a different, but complementary approach. The presence of the epic Romulus (the son of Mars) and elegiac Numa (associated with peace, learning and religion) in book three encapsulates the generic and thematic tensions evident in the *Fasti*. However, the incongruity of Romulus has not been fully appreciated: the majority of events involving Romulus in book three do not ‘calendrically’ demand to be told there, alongside the narrative of Numa; moreover, while Ovid manages to make Mars ‘fit in’ with the generic conventions of the poem to some extent, Romulus – as we shall see – is somewhat less easy to accommodate than he at first appears. Furthermore, Ovid concentrates two-thirds of his Romulus material – split more or less equally – in books two and three of the *Fasti*; over three quarters of his Numa material in the poem is concentrated in book three. It seems therefore, that Ovid has deliberately put together in book three the vast majority of his Numa material alongside some of the more violent episodes from Romulus’ life.

Livy helps to bring these issues into sharper focus and to enhance their understanding. As an annalistic historian, Livy has little choice other than to treat Numa directly after Romulus; moreover, Livy ultimately reconciles the contrast between the more brutish Romulus and equitable Numa by creating a complementary dyad of the characteristics of the two kings. Ovid however, is under no such chronological obligations. His choice to bring Numa and Romulus together appears motivated precisely by the desire to offer implicit comment on Livy’s more harmonious dyad. By developing Numa along the same lines as the ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ characters explored in Chapter Three, the poet presents the second king’s piety, justice, wisdom and pacifism as elements in opposition to Romulus’ militarism rather than as their complement. Not only is the extent of Ovid’s opposition between the two kings only fully comprehensible when read in conjunction with Livy, but a parallel reading also helps amplify the Livian ambiguities already detected in part by scholars.

Bringing Livy to the table, as it were, requires us to move beyond contentment with purely generic explanations, and to realize that genre may be only one aspect of larger phenomenon: Ovid’s engagement with the history of Rome. Ovid is not merely ‘playing’ with genre for literary effect, or in order to make contemporary comment on Augustus. He is also commenting on the history of Rome itself in its most authoritative version.
PART ONE

Ovid’s narration of Numa

The majority of Ovid’s account of the reign of Numa appears in book three of the Fasti; out of a total of 179 lines that Ovid devotes to Rome’s second king throughout the poem, 138 lines occur in book three (3.151-4, 3.259-392). Apart from a brief reference to Numa’s calendrical reforms (3.151-4), the majority of the narrative relating to Numa in book three occurs as part of the poet’s aitia for the rites of the Salii. Within this aitia, Ovid mainly focuses on the story of Numa’s expiation of Jupiter Elicius’ thunderbolts and his consequent reception of the heavenly shields of Mamurius (3.259-92). The result is a largely continuous and linear narration of two important episodes from the life of Numa.

In explaining the rites of the Salii, which took place in March,1 the inclusion of the story of Numa’s encounter with Jupiter in book three seems largely motivated by ‘calendrical chronology’. However, as suggested above and explored in depth in the second part of this chapter, Ovid’s placement of Numa within this book of the Fasti also appears to be part of a conscious attempt to forge a connection between Rome’s first and second kings. In doing so, Ovid is able to cultivate an opposition between the characters of Romulus and Numa that allows further development of the poet’s ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme.

The only other episode of any length relating to Numa in the Fasti appears in book four, in another ‘calendrical’ appropriate context: here Ovid recounts the king’s encounter with Faunus as part of his explanation for the Fordicidia festival celebrated in April (4.641-72).2 Numa is mentioned in three further comparatively brief references in the Fasti, playing a ‘supporting’ role in wider narratives that are not solely focussed on his reign. Earlier in book three, Ovid provides a brief reference to Numa’s intercalation of the calendar (3.151-4) as part of a discussion of the structure of the Roman year (3.79-166); this discussion occurs within the excursus that is the poet’s potted biography of Romulus and Remus in book three (as discussed in the previous chapter).3 The second king’s two-month addition to the year is also briefly alluded to in the proem to book one (1.43-4), where Ovid sets out the objectives of his calendrical poem. Brief mention of Numa is also made in book six (6.257-64), where

---

1 Frazer 1929:iii.61; and Scullard 1981:85-7.
3 Romulus is also briefly featured as part of this excursus (3.127-34).
Ovid places the contemporary temple of Vesta at the king’s former palace within his narration of the Vestalia.

**The sources**

The life and reign of Numa would undoubtedly have been included in the various historical accounts that pre-dated Livy – many surveyed in the previous chapters. However, few passages from any of these authors survive, and those that do generally amount to little more than a few lines. Cicero provides the most comprehensive surviving pre-Livian account of Numa (*De Rep.* 2.25-33); the only other extant fragment of any length comes from Valerius Antias (*FRHist.* fr.8) and concerns Numa’s expiation of Jupiter’s thunderbolts.

In the other pre-Livian sources, Numa’s institution of religious festivals, sacrificial rites and laws receive most attention (Hemina *FRHist.* fr. 16, 17; Piso *FRHist.* fr.11, 12, 15a, 47; Gellius *FRHist.* fr.21; Valerius Antias *FRHist.* fr.6). A good number of other fragments relate to Numa’s books (Hemina *FRHist.* fr.35 = Piso fr.14 = Tuditanus fr.3 = Antias fr.9a, 58; Piso *FRHist.* 15b; Antias *FRHist.* 9b, 57). There are also scattered references to the date of Numa’s reign (Clodius *FRHist.* fr.1), the king’s intercalation of the calendar (Hemina *FRHist.* fr.21 = Tuditanus fr.1 = Antias fr.7 = Macer fr. 11) and his death and descendants (Piso *FRHist.* fr.13; Gellius *FRHist.* fr.22; Marius Maximus *FRHist.* fr.10). Ennius also provided an account of the reign of Numa (2.113-19 Sk.), but very little survives. Many of the religious institutions of Numa recounted in the surviving sources are not mentioned by Ovid, and neither are the king’s books, death or descendants. However, as will be demonstrated below, Antias’ account of Jupiter and the thunderbolts and the fragments concerning Numa’s intercalation of the calendar will prove especially relevant to Ovid’s narration of Rome’s second king.

In providing the only extant sustained earlier narrative of Numa, Cicero will be particularly important in this chapter as a way of evaluating Livy’s particular interpretation of Rome’s second king. Due to the dearth of pre-Livian sources, Dionysius will also be necessarily important; as noted in Chapter Three, Dionysius provides the fullest and most

---

4 Cicero also mentions Numa at *De Rep.* 3.47, 5.3; *De Leg.* 1.4, 2.23, 29, 56; *Off.* 3.41; *N. D.* 3.39; *De Orat.* 2.154 and *Tusc.* 4.3.

5 Also noted by Fenestella *FRHist.* fr.7.

6 Although the fragmentary nature of Ennius’ surviving work makes it impossible to know the extent of his coverage of Numa, Skutsch (1985:266) believes that the structure of those fragments that are available indicate that ‘Ennius obviously gave only a very brief catalogue of the institutions of King Numa’. Therefore, it would seem unlikely that Ovid relied on Ennius to any great extent for his narration of the reign of Numa.
contemporaneous surviving account of Rome’s history next to Livy (as far as we know). By using the accounts of Cicero and Dionysius (and to a lesser extent Plutarch) as a measure against which to judge Livy’s specific portrait of Numa, the strength of Ovid’s ‘thematic’ engagement with Livy in relation to Rome’s second king will be ascertained.

Ovid and Livy

In focussing primarily on the story of Numa’s expiation of Jupiter’s thunderbolts, Ovid’s narration of the life and reign of Rome’s second king appears somewhat different to that of Livy. Many of the traditional events and material associated with Numa are omitted, as hinted earlier. Despite this, the poet still signals his engagement with the historian through a number of incidences of ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality. Ovid’s characterisation of Numa particularly recalls that of Livy,7 the two authors concur more than any other extant account in their specific interpretation of the traits of Rome’s second king. As will be explored more fully in part two of this chapter, both authors also present a contrast between Numa and Romulus. While for Livy, this contrast is used to counterbalance the potentially problematic militaristic characteristics of Rome’s first king, for Ovid the reverse is true. In Ovid, this juxtaposition becomes crucial in establishing a ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’/‘militaristic’ polarity between Numa and Romulus that we saw develop between Romulus and Remus in the previous chapter.8

Ovid signals his engagement with Livy at the very start of his narration of Numa in book three, in the description of Egeria’s grove. In the judgement of one scholar on Ovid’s est lacus (3.264): ‘la formulazione sembra inoltre risentire del passo di Livio dedicato agli incontri di Numa ed Egeria’ (lucus erat – Liv. 1.21.3).9 Just prior to his account of Numa’s expiation of Jupiter’s thunderbolts, Ovid asks Egeria – Numa’s nymph wife – to relate the

7 Fox 1996:202. See also Frazer 1929:iii.88. Littlewood (2002:176) states that ‘Ovid follows Virgil and Livy closely in casting Numa in his canonical role of founder of law and religion on the site of Rome’. However, Barchiesi (1997:175-6) claims that Virgil and Ovid’s attitude towards the king differ, with the latter demonstrating strong reservations about Numa and his peaceful reign. In his parade of kings’ speech, Anchises introduces Tullus Hostillus who will succeed Numa: cui deinde subibit / otia qui rumpet patriae, residesque mouebit / Tullus in arma uiros et iam desueta triumphis / agmina (Aen. 6.812-15). Barchiesi opines ‘Evidently this period of peace has turned out to be an overlong pause, and although rich in good legislation and religion, it could have a weakening effect on the state’.

8 For the tradition of Numa’s conversion of a warlike people to the ways of peace see Ovid Met. 15.483-4; Plut. Num. 4.1.3.

9 Ursini 2008:330. Ovid also uses lucos...lucum (3.430-1) in relation to Romulus’ asylum.
story of the rites of the Salii (3.259-62). After a brief description of the Arician vale that Egeria inhabits (3.263-76), the poet introduces Rome’s second king:

principio nimium promptos ad bella Quirites
molliri placuit iure deumque metu:
inde datae leges, ne firmior omnia posset,
coepaque sunt pure tradita sacra coli.
exuitur feritas, armisque potentius aequum est,
et cum ciue pudet conservisse manus;
atque aliquis, modo trux, uisa iam uertitur ara
uinaque dat tepidis farraque salsa focis (3.277-84).

Through framing Numa’s introduction of law and religion as a stratagem to becalm a warlike population, Ovid follows Livy ‘thematically’, since the historian also recounts that Numa undertook similar actions after he had been pronounced king; the ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality between Ovid’s feritas (3.281) and Livy’s efferari (1.19.1-2) signals Ovid’s engagement with Livy in this passage:

Qui regno ita potitus urbem nouam, conditam ui et armis, iure eam legibusque ac moribus de integro condere parat. Quibus cum inter bella adsuescere uideret non posse – quiemme effarari militia animos – mitigandum ferocem populum armorum desuetudine ratus (1.19.1-2).

As Livy continues to narrate Numa’s pacific activities, he explains how Numa sought to prevent a militaristic and uncivilized population falling into extravagance and idleness during a time of peace by imbuing them with a fear of heaven (1.19.3-5); again, the ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality between Ovid’s deumque metu (3.278) and Livy’s deorum metum (1.19.4) indicate the poet’s specific engagement with the historian:

positis externorum periculorum curis, ne luxuriarent otio animi quos metus hostium disciplinaque militaris continuaret, omnium primum, rem ad multitudinem imperitam et illis saeculis rudem efficacissimam, deorum metum iniciendum ratus est (1.19.4).

Frazer (1929:iii.88) suggests Ovid is drawing directly on Livy’s account here.
In a further direct textual engagement, Ovid seems to ‘correct’ Livy’s statement that it was merely Numa’s perception that the early Romans were militaristic by nature (uideret ... ratus - 1.19.2): Ovid states it as ‘fact’ (exuitur feritas - 3.281). Ovid’s assertion of verity here also serves to cement the fact of a just and peaceful king from the very beginning of his account. These are characteristics that are foremost for both poet and historian in their development not just of Numa himself, but as counterpoints to his regal predecessor Romulus.

Numa’s virtues

In cataloguing a range of rites and rituals established by Rome’s second king, the few pre-Livian sources that survive suggest that the portrayal of Numa as a pious ‘priest-king’ and the founder of many religious institutions was part of a long-held tradition. If, as suggested previously, Dionysius provides the closest available representation of the ‘canonical’ tradition next to Livy, this feature of Numa and his reign seems well established: the Greek historian expressly alludes to Numa’s piety, as well as his sagacity, justice and pacifism, on several of occasions (2.23.6, 2.58.3, 2.59.4, 2.60.2, 2.60.4, 2.62.5). However, while acknowledging these traits in Numa, the surviving pre-Livian sources present them in ways that are much less similar to Livy than Ovid is. Ovid seems to concur most directly with Livy, using author-focused ‘thematic’ intertextuality, in the way he specifically casts Numa as a pious, just, wise and peaceful king.

---

11 Ogilvie 1965:88. Deremetz (2013:233) notes that ‘Apart from the works of Ovid, Numa’s presence in Augustan poetry is limited, and is generally mentioned in a conventional manner: he is the old pious king who created laws and founded cults and rituals, especially that of the Salii’. See Virg. Aen. 6.808-16; Hor. Epist. 1.6.27, 2.1.86.

12 Ogilvie (1965:89) opines that ‘the picture of Numa as a great religious founder with many specific institutions to his name will have already taken shape by 400 BC’.

13 In the judgement of Ogilvie (1965:90), peace is the primary theme of Livy’s account of Numa and he subordinates the king’s other innovations to that theme. Ogilvie cites the prominence Livy gives to Janus (1.19.2-4) as demonstrating his prioritisation of the theme of peace. Ovid however, does not mention Numa’s foundation of the temple of Janus. Although Ovid makes a brief, albeit emphatic, link between Numa and Janus in his first reference to his correlation of Romulus’ calendar (1.43-4), he stops short of actually crediting Numa with Janus’ temple. This omission by Ovid is interesting considering the emphasis he places on Numa’s pacific character in his overall narration of the king’s reign. One reason could be that at this point, the peace that Janus represents is intertwined with the overall theme of the Fasti, and to bring Janus’ temple in here would add a too narrow a focus. As Green (2004a:120-1) points out, Janus himself alludes to his temple (potes) later at 1.253: here, ‘we should take pacem ... tuebar as a general statement of Janus’ affiliation with peace rather than as evidence of a conceptualisation of Janus as a physical guardian of Peace within his temple’. Furthermore, Janus’ description of his temple forms part of the god’s own biography, narrated in answer to Ovid’s question as to who the two-headed figure is on the back of a copper coin (1.229-30). By phrasing the question as he does, it enables Ovid (through Janus’ answer) to include the story of Tarpeia in the Fasti (perhaps this is the only place it fits), thus adding to the comprehensiveness of the historical coverage in the poem.
Ovid establishes Numa’s piety in his first reference to the king (in terms of the structure of the *Fasti*), since he notes that Numa did not overlook Janus and the ancestral shades by adding two months to the Roman year (1.43-4). Livy likewise confirms Numa’s great reputation for both piety and justice (*Inclita iustitia religioque ea tempestate Numae Pompili erat* – 1.18.1) from the start of his account of the king. As suggested earlier, both authors proceed to demonstrate the pious, just and peaceful nature of Numa through depicting his introduction of various laws and religious rites in an attempt to ‘soften’ a warlike population (1.19.1-2 as quoted above). Since both authors suggest that Numa inherited this militaristic nation from Romulus (*Fast. 3.277; Liv. 1.19.1*), they also implicitly establish a contrast between Romulus’ militarism and Numa’s pacifism (as will be explored below).

While the other surviving sources pre-dating Livy imply Numa’s piety through reference to the religious rites and institutions he introduced, none of them (as far as we can tell from what survives), makes any definite mention of his pious, just or pacific personal characteristics. In contrast to Ovid and Livy, Cicero does not specifically mention Numa’s piety – instead he cites *uirtutem et sapientiam regalem* (*De Rep.* 2.24-5) as the king’s pre-eminent qualities. Certainly Cicero implies Numa’s piety in his devout solicitude in establishing Roman religion (*adiunxitque praeterea flamines, Salios uirginesque Vestales omnisque partis religionis statuit sanctissime* – *De Rep.* 2.26); however, this quality seems to be slightly thinned by Cicero’s accompanying reference to a number of other measures the king instituted for this purpose, including land allocation, the introduction of farming, markets and entertainment (*De Rep.* 2.26-7). By contrast, Livy and Ovid both attribute the becalming of the bellicose early Romans purely to Numa’s introduction of religion and law. This contributes to the emergence of a far stronger opposition between Numa’s piety and justice and the militarism of Romulus – implied by the second king’s inheritance of an aggressive population from his predecessor – in *AUC* and *Fasti*.

By having Numa introduce religion as a way to ‘soften’ a warlike people, Cicero is similar to Livy and Ovid in a shared implication of Numa’s pacifism (*et animos propositis legibus his, quas in monumentis habemus, ardentis consuetudine et cupiditate bellandi religionum*

---

14 As noted above, Ennius appears to have provided a brief catalogue of the institutions of King Numa (*Ann. 2.114-18 Sk.*). Hemina notes Numa instituted the religious customs of worshipping the gods with corn and salt cake (*FRHist.* fr. 16), and the use of fish without scales for sacrifices (*FRHist.* fr. 17). Piso notes Numa’s appointment of the Vestal Virgins (*FRHist.* fr. 47), Gellius his introduction of the *fetiales* (*FRHist.* fr. 21) and Antias reports that Numa was the founder of the *Agonalia* (*FRHist.* fr. 6), as well as noting his intercalation of the calendar for ritual purposes (*FRHist.* fr. 7). Dionysius provides a lengthy account (albeit incomplete according to the author himself) of the religious institutions and laws Numa introduced, including the temples he built (2.63.1-67.1).
However, both Numa’s pacifism and the contrast with Romulus’ militarism are less pronounced in Cicero, since Numa only wishes to discourage the warlike nature of the populace to some slight extent:

*hominesque Romanos instituto Romuli bellicos studiis ut uidit incensos, existimauit eos paulum ab illa consuetudine esse reuocandos (De Rep. 2.25).*

Cicero’s citation of Numa’s ‘kingly wisdom’ (*De Rep. 2.24-5*) presents an additional contrast to Livy and Ovid, neither of whom focus on his majesty. Rather than emphasising his royal pedigree, Livy is explicit in asserting Numa’s immanent noble qualities (*suopte igitur ingenio temperatum animum uirtutibus fuisse opinor magis – 1.18.4*). Livy’s assertion of Numa’s inherent excellence concludes the historian’s review of why the king could not have been a student of Pythagoras. This discussion is framed by two references to Numa’s Sabine origins (1.18.1-4). Although not as pronounced as with Romulus and Remus (as discussed in Chapter Three), Livy thus insinuates that Numa’s character was in some way linked to the environment he inhabited in his formative years.

While Ovid does not explicitly attribute Numa’s qualities to the influence of his homeland, his reference to the king’s Sabine birth in the context of the source of his knowledge in realising the calendar was two months short, indirectly recalls Livy’s account; the poet offers Egeria, as well as Pythagoras, as the possible source of Numa’s learning:

---

15 Dionysius makes no mention of Numa inheriting a bellicose population from Romulus. He does allude to the wars fought during Romulus’ reign, but this forms part of a dispute between the patricians and the plebeians over citizenship rights and equality, which left the state in ‘a sea of confusion’ (2.62.1-4).
16 Dionysius also highlights Numa’s distinguished heritage by stating he was the son of Pompilius Pompon ‘a person of distinction’ and ‘full of royal dignity’ (2.58.2-3) and by stating that he was of royal birth and appearance (2.76.4). However, Numa has to be persuaded to take up the kingship as he despised sovereignty as ‘a paltry thing and unworthy of serious attention’ (2.60.2).
17 Dionysius makes no reference here to Numa’s learning being the result of his birthplace or any other cause: he simply states: ‘for he has been allowed by everybody to have been a wise man’ (2.59.4). Later however, he reports that the Romans related many ‘marvellous stories’ about Numa, and attributes ‘his human wisdom to the suggestions of the gods’, one of whom was Egeria (2.60.4-5). Plutarch (*Num. 3. 4-5*) states that Numa was inclined to every virtue by natural temperament and had increased this by study, discipline and enduring hardships.
18 Livy casts further doubt on Numa’s instruction by Pythagoras by branding Antias’ assertions that Numa’s books were Pythagorean as false (40.29.8). According to Skutsch (1985:263) it is unlikely that Ennius would have made Numa a pupil of Pythagoras. Cicero also dismisses Numa’s Pythagorean education (*De Rep. 2.28-9*; see also *De Orat. 2.154 and Tusc. 4.3*). Dionysius states that Numa’s great wisdom was the very reason that people (mistakenly) thought he was educated by Pythagorases (2.59.4).
19 Unlike Livy, Ovid neither definitively confirms nor denies that Numa was taught by Pythagoras. He may have been reluctant to agree with Livy here so as not to totally negate his assertion in the *Metamorphoses* (15.4ff) that he was. In his discussion regarding the influence of Empedocles in Ovid’s narration of Numa,
Even though Ovid does not make an intrinsic connection between Numa’s virtues and the environment, the bucolic image of the olive-growing Sabini anticipates the pastoral setting that Numa will inhabit throughout the later narration of his reign (3.295-60; 4.641-72). As will be seen in due course, this environment will prove significant for the poet’s development of Numa within the framework of his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme.

Ovid further concurs with Livy in using Numa’s intercalation of the calendar as evidence of the king’s wisdom. Numa’s intellectual capacity is immediately evident in Livy through the astronomical knowledge he displays in the intercalation of the calendar (1.19.6). In contrast to Livy, in his first reference to Numa (1.43-4) Ovid is not explicit in assigning any scientific basis to Numa’s calendrical reforms; if anything, the king’s correction of the calendar seems initially to reinforce Numa’s pious nature more than demonstrate his knowledge. As Green observes, ‘Numa’s reasons for adding to the calendar stem here from religious grounds – a desire to honour the supernatural forces in charge of beginnings and endings – rather than from mathematical/astronomical observations’.

However, as Ovid has already explained (1.27-42), Numa’s addition of two months to the year was a direct result of Romulus’ erroneous calculation of the year at just ten months, itself caused by the first king’s lack of astronomical knowledge and his bellicose temperament (scilicet arma magis quam sidera, Romule, noras, / curaque finitimos uincere maior erat – 1.29-30). The fact that Numa ‘gets it right’ then, must at least imply some degree of astronomical learning on the second king’s behalf as well as setting up an opposition between the characters of Rome’s first two kings (as will be evidenced later).

Ovid follows Livy by stating that Numa’s calendar replaced a previous one – the ten-month calendar incorrectly devised by Romulus (by implication according to Livy, and definitively according to Ovid). In terms of the details of the calendar, Ovid also appears to follow Livy

---

Garani (2014:136) claims that by describing the king as both deductus (3.151) and doctus (3.153) the poet establishes Numa as not just poetic, but also philosophical.

20 Virgil also uses oliufer to describe the region of Sabini (Aen. 7.711).

21 Green 2004a:51. Fox (1996:187 n.14) believes that ‘the primitive warlike ignorance of Romulus is not extended to imply scientific sophistication on the part of Numa in his introduction of the remaining two months. They are the result of piety, his respect for ancestral shades (February) and Janus (January)’.
most closely. While the accreditation of intercalation to Numa seems to have been a long-established tradition, some sources actually deny that Numa had any involvement in the reform of the calendar at all.22 Even those sources that do ascribe intercalation to Numa do not explicitly mention a particular number of months like Livy or Ovid.

**Numa’s expiation of Jupiter Elicius’ thunderbolts**

As noted above, the majority of Ovid’s account of the reign of Numa involves the story of the king’s expiation of Jupiter Elicius’ thunderbolts (3.285-354) as an explanation for the rites of the Salii.23 While Livy gives a brief account of Numa’s institution of the Salii (1.20.4), he does not cover the episode involving Jupiter Elicius:24 he simply explains how Numa dedicated an altar to the deity and used augury in order to elicit the knowledge of the god (ad ea elicienda ex mentibus diuinis Ioui Elicio aram in Auentino dicauit deumque consultuit auguriis, quae suscipienda essent – 1.20.7).25 As already acknowledged, generic and thematic concerns would undoubtedly play a key role in Ovid’s choice to include this

---

22 In the judgement of Rüpke (2011:38), ‘Roman tradition usually associated this transition [to the lunar calendar] with Numa’. Michels (1967:123-5) argues that the tradition of Numa’s intercalation of the calendar arose in 181 BC after the discovery of his books, however, Rich (FRHist.:iii.333) disagrees. The first extant reference to Numa’s intercalation is believed to occur in Ennius (Mensas constituit idemque ancilia – Ann. 2.114 Sk.): Skutsch (1985:266) states it is not inconceivable that mensas refers to Numa’s calendar. Hemina and Tuditanus ascribe the addition of two months to the year to the board of ten (Hemina FRHist. fr.21 = Tuditanus fr.1). According to Macer and Fenestella the Roman calendar year consisted of twelve months from the beginning (Macer FRHist. fr.10 = Fenestella fr. 5), with Macer assigning the origin of the practice to Romulus (FRHist. fr. 11). Antias notes that Numa intercalated the calendar for ritual purposes but provides no further detail (FRHist. fr.7). Junius claimed that Servius Tullius was the first to intercalate the calendar (Hemina FRHist. fr.21; Censorinus De Die Natali Cap. 20.4). According to Censorinus (De Die Natali Cap. 20.4) Fulvius reported that Numa created the twelve-month year. While Cicero could be implying that Numa’s calendar replaced a previous, shorter one (diligenter habenda ratio intercalandi est; quod institutum perite a Numa - De Leg 2.12.29), he does not openly refer to the number of months in the king’s reformed year like Livy and Ovid. In a passage explaining how the months got their names, Varro notes the insertion of January and February into the calendar, but does not mention the author of this (Lat. Ling. 6.34).

23 Although the Salii themselves were patrician, Ovid seems more interested in the aetiology of the religious rites rather than the family itself. For further information on the Salii see Cirilli 1913.

24 Livy does appear to make some concession to the ‘divine legend’ of Numa’s expiation of Jupiter’s thunderbolts later in AUC. Although he provides none of the details that Ovid or Antias do as to the origin of the rites of expiation, he does concede at least a link between this ritual and Numa. Livy narrates that when Tullus Hostilius became ill, he consulted the books of Numa, believing that he would be cured if he performed the rites to Jupiter Elicius. Rather than being saved however, Tullus ends up being killed by a thunderbolt after performing the rites incorrectly (1.31.5-8). Dionysius also relates this story (3.35.1-6).

25 Ovid does not explicitly mention the altar, but it could be implied at 3.327-8 – eliciunt caelo te, luppiter; unde minores / nunc quoque te celebrant Eliciumque vocant.
story and Livy’s decision to omit it.²⁶ It is these differences between poet and historian therefore, that serve to enable Ovid to respond to and complement Livy by ‘filling in’ the mythical gaps of the historian’s account (as demonstrated in Chapter Two). Due to the similarities in their accounts, it appears highly probable that Ovid turned to Valerius Antias (FRHist. fr. 8) as his source for the details of this incident (explored below).²⁷ As Antias was likely Livy’s main source for his overall account of Numa,²⁸ Ovid’s decision to spotlight one episode from Antias that Livy leaves out, could be further construed as a deliberate attempt at engagement with the historian.

Although unlike Ovid (3.275-6), Antias does not explicitly state Numa’s relationship with Egeria, he is the only extant pre-Livian source to definitively assert the nymph’s existence in relation to Numa (Numam illum regem, cum procurandi fulminis scientiam non haberet essetque illi cupiduo noscendi, Egeriae monitu – FRHist. fr. 8).²⁹ In contrast, while Livy acknowledges that Numa dedicated a grove to the Camenae (1.21.3), the historian casts doubt on the reality of Numa’s meetings with Egeria (1.19.5), whereas Ovid is emphatic about their veracity. By beginning his narration of Numa with a description of the Arician

---

²⁶ Forsythe (1999:90) cites Livy’s failure to include the story of Numa and Jupiter Elicius as indicative of his ‘cautious handling of the marvellous’. Ogilvie (1965:90) notes that in contrast to Antias’ lengthy and dramatic account of the institutions of the cult of Jupiter Elicius’, Livy merely records the ‘facts’.

²⁷ Forsythe (1994:200-1) suggests that Piso depicted Numa asking the divine a long series of questions that could be answered with either a straight yes or no. The king received answers in the form of lightning flashes at the altar of Jupiter Elicius. Forsythe (201) believes Antias’ story of Numa’s encounter with Jupiter Elicius was ‘a later amplification of Piso’s account’. Pasco-Pranger (2002b:304-8) understands Ovid’s source here as Varro. However, she seems to base this (by her own admission) on pure conjecture. Varro notes the etymology of ‘Elicius’ as ‘to lure forth’ (sic Elicii iovis ara in Auentino, ab eliciendo – Lat. Ling. 6.94), and, like Livy, explains the augur’s role in the rites at this altar (Lat. Ling. 6.95); but he assigns no role whatsoever to Numa in the history of this religious rite. Littlewood (2002:182) believes that the first half of the Salii episode in the Fasti is modelled on the end of Virgil’s Georgics 4. As will be obvious from the material above, my view differs. Pobjoy (FRHist.:iii.200) believes it is possible that Piso also provided an account of Numa calling down Jupiter to receive instruction about thunderbolts, but it does not survive. Rich (FRHist.:iii.333) suggests that Plutarch (Num. 15.3-10) may have used Antias as his source for his account of Jupiter Elicius, which is very similar to Ovid’s.

²⁸ Ogilvie 1965:90. In a table entitled ‘Citation distribution in Livy’, Briscoe and Rich (FRHist.:i.84) demonstrates that in the extant part of his work overall, the historian cites Antias thirty-five times – more than any other author.

²⁹ The first extant reference to Numa’s relationship with Egeria is Ennius (Olli respondit suavis sonus Egeriae – Ann. 2.13 Sk.). However, Skutsch (1985:265) judges it unlikely that Ennius – ‘the rationalist’ – would have made Egeria the wife or mistress of Numa. Furthermore, Skutsch suggests that Ennius probably placed Numa’s meeting with Egeria at the porta Capena, rather than at Arcia like Ovid does (3.263). While her worship at the porta Capena was thought to have been established by Numa, her cult at Arcia seems to be of a more recent date. Ovid could be drawing on Virgil here, who not only places Egeria’s cult at Arcia, but also – like Ovid (3.263-72) – narrates the story of Hippolytus and Diana’s grove at Nemi in relation to its history (Aen. 7.761-82). However, Virgil includes this narration in the context of the list of heroes (Aen. 7.657-817) and does not mention Egeria’s relationship with Numa. Cicero (De Leg. 1.1.4) casts doubt on Numa’s meetings with Egeria, as does Dionysius, although he does concede that the Romans believed it to be true (2.60.7-61.1-3). Pasco-Pranger (2002b:291) claims that the relationship between Numa and Egeria was most often depicted as a marriage, and was ‘clearly a standard piece of the Numan tradition by the Augustan period’.
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vale that Egeria inhabits (3.261-4; 3.273-5), Ovid immediately sets the king in a generically appropriate bucolic setting. The king’s association with the agrestis (3.315) deities Faunus and Picus (which is repeated in book four – 4.641-72: as will be seen later), further bolsters not just Numa’s generic credentials, but also his association with Ovid’s ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme (see below).

In narrating Egeria’s instructions to Numa to consult Faunus and Picus to teach him the ritual of expiation, Ovid generally concurs with Antias, albeit with some small differences. After luring the two woodland deities to their favourite drinking spot with bowls of wine, both authors relate that the pair are bound with chains after falling into a drunken stupor. When they finally awake, they concede the king’s request to reveal the correct procedure for drawing down Jupiter from heaven (3.295-325). In being non-specific about Numa’s companions (cumque suis antro conditus ipse latet – 3.302) and having the king himself bind Faunus and Picus (... gelido Numa prodit ab antro / uinclaque sopitas addit in arta manus – 3.305-6), Ovid diverges slightly from Antias, who has the king hide twelve chaste youths by the gods’ drinking spot in order to tie them up (Egeriae monitu castos duodecim iuuenes apud aquam celasse cum uinculis, ut, cum Faunus et Martius Picus ad id locorum uenissent haustum (nam illis aquandi sollemne iter hac fuit) inuaderent constringerent configarent – FRHist. fr. 8). Similarly, whereas Ovid has Numa persuade the constrained Faunus and Picus to draw down Jupiter, since it is a sin for humans to know this rite (emissi laqueis quid agant, quae carmina dicant, / quaque trahant superis sedibus arte Iouem, / scire nefas homini ... – 3.323-5), Antias has Numa himself call the god down to the earth after receiving instruction on how to do this by Faunus and Picus (et accepta regem scientia rem in Auentino fecisse duinam, exesisse ad terras Iouem ab eoque quaesisse ritum prourationis <et> morem - FRHist. fr. 8).

Ovid continues to follow Antias in relating how Numa tricked Jupiter into accepting a fish, onion and hair in place of a human sacrifice, and both agree that, impressed by Numa’s deceit, Jupiter decrees that this will be the way in future to avert the ill omen of thunderbolts.

---

30 Prop. 3.1 & 3.3; Am. 3.1.
31 For a full discussion of Ovid’s depiction of Faunus throughout the Fasti see Parker:1993. Numa’s encounter with Faunus in Ovid’s explanation of the Fordicidia at 4.641-72 shares many aspects of Numa’s meeting with Faunus and Picus and consequently his encounter with Jupiter Elicius, that all serve to reinforce his many positive character traits as well as his elegiac credentials and ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ association. Both have a bucolic setting (lucus Auentino suaberat niger ilicis umbra – 3.295; silua uetus nullaque diu violata securi / stabat – 4.649-50), both involve Numa performing a sacrifice before he meets Faunus (3.300; 4.652), both involve Egeria (3.289-93; 4.669-70) and both depict Numa interpreting the words of a god (3.336-46; 4.665-72).
(Fast. 3.337-44). Ovid then proceeds to narrate how Jupiter delivered the promised ancile as a pledge of empire (3.361-78), hence the tradition of the Salian priests’ dance with shields.

**Conclusion**

Through various instances of ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality, Ovid can be seen to be following Livy relatively closely in his characterisation of Numa. While the poet differs in terms of the ‘facts’ relating to the reign of Rome’s second king, he concurs with the historian more than any other extant source in casting Numa as a pious, just, wise and pacific king. Even when turning to another source for his narration of Numa’s expiation of Jupiter Elicius’ thunderbolts – an episode not covered by Livy – Ovid still signals his engagement with the historian by ‘filling in’ the mythical gaps of Livy’s account.

**PART TWO**

**Ovid’s dialogue with Livy**

With Livy established as a major source for Ovid’s coverage of Numa, we have the context for understanding a very particular engagement with the historian – namely Ovid’s initial development of Livy’s dyad of Romulus and Numa, but rejection of their ultimate reconciliation. However, in order to understand this, it is first necessary to look at Romulus and Mars in *Fasti* book three. Ovid makes this easy for us, since nearly all of his material on Numa, and half of his coverage of Romulus, is in book three.

As noted in Chapter Three, the majority of the narrative relating to Romulus in the *Fasti* occurs in books two and three: out of a total of 377 lines relating to Romulus in the whole poem, there are 113 lines dedicated to him in book two and 138 in book three. Although books two and three contain (nearly) the same amount of lines, the narrative is more concentrated in book three: it contains two accounts comprising sixty-one and fifty-four lines, and five further accounts of ten lines or less. The longest episode in book two is forty

---

32 Pasco-Pranger (2002b:297) and Garani (2014:135) claim that the connection between the story of the Salii and the ancile and the stories of the binding of Faunus and Picus and the summoning of Jupiter Elicius is Ovid’s own innovation. While no other surviving source makes this connection, the scarcity of extant sources make it impossible to know definitively whether this is the case.
lines, with a further account of thirty-eight lines, two of twenty-two and six references of one or two lines.

Out of the total of 179 lines that Ovid dedicates to Numa in the *Fasti*, 138 lines occur in book three (as noted earlier). The coverage of Numa is less fragmented than that of Romulus: 134 out of the 138 lines in book three dedicated to the king covers one story – Numa’s encounter with Jupiter during his reign (3.259-92). By dedicating exactly the same amount of lines to both Romulus and Numa in book three, Ovid can be understood as assigning them the same level of ‘importance’. Certainly, this equal distribution of lines would seem to suggest that Ovid was signalling to his readers that he was making a connection between the two kings.

In addition, Ovid appears to be indicating that he intends some sort of relationship to be understood between Numa and Romulus in book three not only by the equality of their coverage, but also by the appropriateness (or otherwise) of the ‘calendrical’ context within which he narrates episodes relating to their lives. In the broader narrative context of the rites of the Salii – which were performed on 1 March as part of the festival of Mars Gradivus – the events involving Numa are ‘calendrically’ appropriate for retelling in book three of the *Fasti*. Scholars seem unsurprised that Romulus is found in a book dedicated to his father Mars. But the majority of episodes relating to him do not obviously demand ‘calendrically’ to be told in connection with the month of March and its presiding deity Mars: the only exception is the story of how Romulus came to name the month after Mars and develop the calendar (3.72-98).

After opening book three with an invocation to Mars to disarm in the book about the month named after him (3.1-8), Ovid proceeds to give an example of one episode where the war-god did act ‘*inermis*’ – in the rape of Silvia (3.9-22). This action inevitably leads to the conception and birth of Romulus and Remus (3.23-42): events that, in turn, are part of a potted biography of the twins (3.9-234). In terms of appropriate ‘calendrical’ narration, there is no reason why the rape of Silvia or potted biography of Romulus and Remus need be included in book three, since they have no specific relationship with the month of March. This could also be said of the Sabine rape, which Mars mentions as part of his explanation of the Matronalia festival (3.187-200). Furthermore, many of these events are told, or could be

---

33 Frazer 1929:iii.61; and Scullard 1981:85-7.
34 Barchiesi 1997:64-5.
35 Fantham 2002b:30.
told, elsewhere in the *Fasti*, potentially with greater effect.\(^{36}\) For example, the story of Amulius’ orders to drown the twins and their rescue by a she-wolf in book three (3.49-54), has already been told as part of Ovid’s explanation of the Lupercal at 2.381-424; likewise, as part of his *aiitio* of the Lupercal at 2.359-80, Ovid depicts Romulus and Remus together with their fellow shepherds in a similar way to that at 3.59-64. Ovid’s promise to honour Larentia later in the *Fasti* (3.55-8) would perhaps have been more appropriate in the context of Remus’ funeral, since it would have bolstered both Larentia and Faustulus sense of dedication to their fosterlings, evident in the despair they display at Remus’ death (4.854; as discussed in Chapter Three).\(^{37}\)

Of course, an annalistic historian such as Livy has little choice other than to treat Numa directly after Romulus, whereas Ovid is under no such chronological obligations and is free to tell and retell stories in any order he wishes. However, it is also this chronological freedom that enables Ovid to create ‘thematic interconnections by bold juxtapositions of seemingly disparate material’.\(^{38}\) Ovid himself seems to draw attention to the idea that things are not necessarily ‘in the right place’ at the beginning of his narration of the rape of Silvia he asks: *Siliua Vestalis (quid enim uetat inde moueri?)* – 3.11). After mentioning Larentia within the potted biography of Romulus and Remus he also states that he will properly

---

\(^{36}\) Ovid’s more detailed story of the rape of Silvia could have been told as part of his *aiitio* of the Lupercalia, as an expansion of his brief reference to the birth of the twins at 2.383-6. By doing so, it would have provided an appropriate background to the proceeding account of Romulus and Remus’ abandonment on the banks of the river Tiber and subsequent rescue by the she-wolf (2.387-422). As discussed in Chapter Three however, Robinson (2011:265) detects a reflection of Livy’s scepticism about the divine paternity of Romulus and Remus in the ‘direct verbal’ intertextual relation between *caelestia semina ediderat* (*Fast*. 2.383-4) and *cum partum edidisset* (*Liv*. 1.4.2), as well as in the disbelief of the servants that if the twins are the sons of a god, their divine father has not rescued them (2.399-400). If Robinson is correct, this could provide one reason as to why Ovid did not tell the full story of Silvia’s rape within his narration of the Lupercalia in book two: since Ovid’s version of the twins’ conception at 3.9-24 relies on Silvia being raped by Mars, it would undermine the potential scepticism that Ovid displays as to Romulus and Remus’ heavenly paternity in book two. Frazer (1929:iii.4) sees the repetition of the story of Silvia’s rape in book three as ‘one of the indications that the poet did not finally revise the latter part of the work’. Ovid’s reference to the slaying of Amulius at 3.67-8, previews lengthier narration of the founding of the city and Remus’ death at 4.809-36, and would not have been out of place – in terms of ‘calendrical’ chronology - at the start of this episode in book four. However, it is Romulus himself that Ovid invokes to tell the story of the foundation of the city in book four (4.807-8), so it is probably no surprise that he wishes to brush over the violence of Romulus in this event, choosing to simply state: *iam luerat poenas frater Numitoris*... (4.809).

\(^{37}\) In terms of ‘calendrical’ chronology, Ovid’s reference to Larentia (3.55-8) would not be out of place at the end of his narration of the Lupercal (2.381-424), as the twins were discovered by Larentia and her shepherd husband Faustulus after they were saved by the she-wolf. However, as this episode is concerned with providing an *aiitio* for the Lupercal, it would be ‘thematically’ incongruous in book two.

\(^{38}\) Newlands 1995:17.
honour her in the month of her festival in December (3.57-8); and he says he will tell the full story of the Sabine rape when he tells of the rites of Consus (3.199-200).  

On its own, Ovid’s inclusion of material that does not demand to be told ‘calendrically’ in the book concerning the month of March is perhaps unremarkable considering the generic and thematic concerns of the poem; it becomes noteworthy however, when it forms part of a seemingly wider pattern of deliberate generic and thematic ‘misplacement’. As will be seen below, not only do the majority of events relating to Romulus in book three make him appear ‘calendrically’ out of place, but he is also made to be an uneasy fit generically through his consistent pugnacity (he is possibly even more pugnacious in book three than in book two, where he often appears alongside the less belligerent Remus, as noted in Chapter Three). Together with his deficit of generic suitability and the equal distribution of lines to Numa, Romulus’ ‘historical misplacement’ would seem to act as yet another signifier that Ovid is deliberately bringing together the two kings in book three. It is part of Ovid’s purpose therefore (as will be explored later) to bring a consistently violent Romulus together with an (appropriately) peaceful Numa precisely in order to offer implicit comment on the dyad which Livy makes of the pair in his histories. Ovid can only do this by putting together what the non-chronological scheme of his poem does not demand: placing Romulus and Numa – treated equally in terms of lines – within a month to which Romulus only has a limited connection.

**Romulus and Mars**

As well as being ‘calendrically’ out of place, Romulus is also difficult to accommodate in *Fasti* book three in terms of genre. To fully understand the generic challenge of Romulus in book three, we need to comprehend Mars. Mars’ portrayal in book three has been the subject of considerable debate amongst modern scholars in terms of how it exposes generic tensions both in book three and the *Fasti* as a whole. Although scholars have also highlighted the generic incongruity of Romulus both in book three and throughout the *Fasti* (as explored

---

39 Ovid offers another example of consciously ‘misplacing’ episodes in the *Fasti* in his statement relating to Augustus’ appropriation of the Lares: *quo feror? Augustus mensis mihi carminis huius / ius habet: interea Diua canenda Bona est – 5.147-8*. Other incidences of Ovid’s deliberate ‘misplacement’ of events have been noted at 2.195-242, where Wiseman and Wiseman (2013:xiii) suggest the appearance of the Fabii on 13th February is ‘deliberately misplaced here, it provides a tour de force of epic mannerisms’. In relation to Ovid’s appeal to Venus at 4.1-12, Barchiesi (1997:56) points out that ‘there are no great traditions of Venus-worship in April, and it could be argued that Ovid has forcibly carved out a place for her in the calendar’. Holzberg (2002:158) suggests that in placing the story of Arion at 1.79-118, ‘the poet also deliberately chose to place the astronomical legend preceding the panegyric to the *pater patriae* [1.119-44] where he did’.
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below), discussions relating to Mars and genre have often eclipsed the extent of generic tension that can be found in the figure of his son. Despite the difficulties of incorporating the war-god within the realms of an elegiac poem, Mars does appear to offer some generic compromise; Romulus however, is somewhat less easily accommodated in elegy. Just like his divine father, it is Romulus’ bellicosity that makes him an uncomfortable generic fit in *Fasti* book three. This discomfiture has been much discussed in terms of how Romulus presents a generic opposition to the much more elegiac Numa.\(^{40}\) However, it appears that Ovid is also creating a dichotomy between Romulus and Mars which serves to further emphasise Romulus’ belligerence and strengthen his contrast with Numa.

As has been discussed in Chapter One, much has been written about the generic identity of the *Fasti* overall. While ‘a combination of observance and creative transgression is characteristic of the way that most Augustan poems treat generic boundaries’,\(^{41}\) scholars have commented that in comparison with previous Augustan literature, Ovid’s takes such ‘generic experimentation’\(^{42}\) in the *Fasti* to new heights. Critics further assert that such generic experimentation does not, as previous studies (pre-1970s) suggest, demonstrate Ovid’s ‘lack of interest in distinctions between genres’;\(^{43}\) rather it represents a self-conscious ‘sharpening of generic sensibilities: Ovid insists on making the issue of its elegiac status absolutely central to a reading of the *Fasti*.\(^{44}\)

*Fasti* book three is cited by many critics as of particular interest in terms of the ‘self-conscious strain’\(^{45}\) Ovid places on genre in the poem overall. While Mars’ appearance in book three of the *Fasti* – the book dedicated to the month of March that is named after him – may be ‘thematically’ appropriate, the placement of the war-god in an elegiac poem is

\(^{40}\) Porte (1993:148) maintains that Numa is ‘le héroé étiologique par excellence’.

\(^{41}\) Hinds (1992:92) states that ‘it was always part of the dynamic of Augustan elegy that the poet should be interested in testing and exploring the boundaries between his own writing and the writing of his stereotypically conceived rival, the epicist’.

\(^{42}\) Hinds 1992:92. Hinds adds that the ‘quality of sheer virtuosity’ of the generic experimentation in the *Fasti*, distinguishes it from previous Augustan elegy.

\(^{43}\) Hinds 1992:85.

\(^{44}\) Hinds 1992:85. See also Herbert-Brown 1994:6-8; and Newlands 1995:12-14. Barchiesi (1997:65-6) similarly asserts Ovid’s Alexandrianism as an inadequate explanation for Ovid’s ‘Kreuzung derGattungen, the crossing of literary genres’. Barchiesi suggests that Ovid is self-consciously ‘playing’ with genre and blatantly drawing the reader’s attention to this: ‘Ovid is not “using” different literary genres to produce a new combination; he is “mentioning,” or quoting, the opposition between differing literary genres, and he is drawing our attention to the difficulty of creating a dialogue between them’. (Barchiesi is specifically referring to the proems of books three and four here).

especially problematic in terms of genre.\textsuperscript{46} By introducing Mars into the \textit{Fasti}, Ovid is forced ‘to face the world of war ... which cannot be separated from epic representation’.\textsuperscript{47}

Ovid offers a couple of solutions to Mars’ generic inappropriateness, one being the coupling of the proems of book three and book four – dedicated to Mars’ Lucretian opposite (\textsc{Drn.} 1.1-38): Venus.\textsuperscript{48} In the proem to book four (4.1-16), Ovid calls on the appropriately elegiac deity Venus and ‘asserts and protests that, despite appearances to the contrary, he has by no means abandoned his early roots in light of erotic elegy’.\textsuperscript{49}

The second solution Ovid offers to Mars’ generic inappropriateness is to ‘make him’ elegiac by asking him to disarm:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Bellice, depositis clipeo paulisper et hasta,}
\textit{Mars, ades et nitidas casside solue comas} (3.1-2).
\textsuperscript{50}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Palladis} \textit{exemplo ponendae tempora sume}
\textit{cuspidis: inuenies et quod inermis agas} (3.7-8).
\end{quote}

Ovid immediately follows his appeal to Mars to disarm by providing an example of something he did unarmed (\textit{tum quoque inermis eras, cum te Romana sacerdos / cepit, ut huic urbi semina magna dares} – 3.9-10) – the rape of Silvia (3.11-42).\textsuperscript{51} Hinds suggests that ‘this Mars, “captured” by a woman (3.9-10: \textit{te.../ cepit}), evidently has as much right as anyone to enter an elegiac world’.\textsuperscript{52} Holzberg adds that Ovid’s request to Mars to disarm hints at what lies ahead: ‘the book on Mars will unfold under the sign of a Mars without weapons, because war will scarcely be mentioned in it. On the other hand, the book will frequently deal with things erotic some of which will even involve the god of war’.\textsuperscript{53}

\begin{footnotes}
\item Frazer (1929:iii.1-2) does not note any generic concerns with Mars in \textit{Fasti} book three, as he claims that originally, Mars’ principal function may not have been as the god of war but as a god of agriculture.
\item However, Barchiesi (1997:60) points out that Lucretius’ Venus ‘was a sublime protectress and had nothing in common with the goddess of Ovidian erotic elegy’.
\item Hinds (1992a:86) opines ‘The poet’s reassertion of loyalty there to his earliest elegiac roots was specifically interpretable as a compensatory reaction to the perilously unelegiac preoccupation of this immediately preceding book of the poem’. See also Fantham 1998:87-9.
\item Barchiesi (1997:64) sees this as a reference to Pallas Athene, Virg. \textit{Aen.} 15.128ff.
\item Barchiesi (1997:62) suggests that ‘the descent of Mars into the peaceful world of the \textit{Fasti} is brought about by means of a narrative exordium. Ovid decides to attract him into the poem by using the story of his passion for the vestal Silvia’.
\item Hinds 1992a:93. Frazer (1929:iii.3) also notes the common use of the verb \textit{capere} ‘with reference to the captivation or fascination of love’ in the Latin poets.
\item Holzberg 2002:162.
\end{footnotes}
Holzberg is certainly correct in stating that the war-god is involved in other erotic episodes – later in book three, Mars also emulates ‘a good elegiac male’\(^{54}\) by falling in love with Minerva, whom he previously was keen to imitate ‘in the pursuit of \textit{studia pacis}’\(^{55}\) (3.175-6).

However, when Ovid comes to the war-god’s son Romulus (as will be explored below), weapons and war (or at least warlike behaviour), are far from ‘scarcely mentioned’.

Although Mars’ elegiac status as established in the proem of book three does waver here, Romulus is a lot more difficult to accommodate within the generic conventions of the \textit{Fasti}. Many critics note that when Mars begins to answer Ovid’s request \textit{dic mihi, matronae cur tua festa colant} (3.170), the god does not fully disarm as requested in the proem: although he has laid aside his \textit{cassis} (3.171), he keeps hold of his \textit{missilis hasta} (3.172).\(^{56}\) This is seen as an indication that Mars cannot or does not want to fully shed his martial persona. Viewed from another perspective however, it does show that at least Mars is able to offer some sort of generic compromise and at least place one foot in the camp of elegy; Romulus however, remains consistently and ‘uncompromisingly warlike’.\(^{57}\)

As discussed in the previous chapter, Ovid – in common with Livy – initially depicts both Romulus and Remus as largely influenced by the pastoral environment of their early lives. In the \textit{Fasti} however, when the brothers discover that Mars is their father, it is Romulus alone who reacts in accordance with his paternal heritage, since he immediately slays Amulius in a rash and unassisted act. Romulus’ impulsive and aggressive act is especially apparent when compared to Livy’s version of this event, in which the twins are depicted as acting together in assailing Amulius, operating with a sense of military organisation to beset the king, before Romulus slays him.

Romulus’ violent disposition really comes to the fore in the \textit{Fasti} (as noted in Chapter Three) after Remus’ death. Without the balancing effect of his brother – who is portrayed as having more in common with the ‘rustic’ figures of Faustulus and Larentia – Romulus is developed by Ovid as Rome’s first king as very much ‘his father’s son’. Again, Ovid’s uncompromisingly aggressive Romulus stands in stark contrast to Livy’s representation of Rome’s king as continuing to display a combination of traits informed by both his ‘rustic’ upbringing and royal lineage.

The overwhelming influence of Romulus divine paternity in the \textit{Fasti} is succinctly illustrated in his obedience to Mars’ command to take up arms against the Sabines. While

\(^{54}\) Hinds 1992a:100.
\(^{56}\) Barchiesi 1997:62; and Pasco-Pranger 2006:205.
\(^{57}\) Hinds 1992b:117.
Mars’ command to his son (indolui patriamque dedi tibi, Romule, mentem: / ‘tolle preces,’ dixi ‘quod petis arma dabant’ – 3.197-8), may act as a reminder to the reader of the war-god’s traditionally martial (epic) traits, it is perhaps Romulus on whom Ovid wishes to shine the spotlight here rather than on Mars. As suggested in the previous chapter, Romulus could possibly be afforded some defence in his actions against the Sabines as he is simply obeying his father who is goading him into action; but as we have already seen, Mars has made at least some attempt at disarmament in book three, whereas ‘Romulus cuts an emphatically martial figure in the Sabine episode’. While the bellicose side of Mars is emphasised in his explanation of the Matronalia, it also includes ‘a generically mannered rejection of arma too’, the heroes of the war are not the combatants, but the women who curtail the fighting with their elegiacaibly appropriate funereal lamentation (3.213-4) and tears (3.232). Mars then, is capable of presenting a story that includes many elegiac components; Romulus’ role pushes generic boundaries to a greater extent.

Ovid has gone to great lengths to highlight the incongruity of Mars and elegy; however, within this highly charged generic situation, Ovid also introduces Romulus within a book where his stories do not absolutely demand to be told. While scholars suggest that Romulus has drawn his warlike nature from Mars in book three, it must still be remembered that Mars has made some attempt to assimilate with the genre of the poem. While readers attempt to reconcile Mars to the demands of an elegiac poem, their attention has perhaps, been diverted from Romulus and the question of why he has been featured in book three to the extent that he has. Ovid then, introduces Romulus within a book where his incongruity threatens to completely disrupt the generic equilibrium precariously achieved with Mars.

Romulus and Numa

As discussed in Part One of this chapter, Ovid – like Livy – casts Numa as a pious, just, peaceful and wise king. Romulus on the other hand, as previously demonstrated, is depicted as uncompromisingly warlike. The bellicosity of Romulus is made even more pronounced in the Fasti through an exploration of his generic appropriateness in comparison to that of Mars in book three. It is both Romulus’ propensity for violence and his generic incongruity that

60 Hinds 1992a:102. Miles (1995:198) adds that as the Sabine war ultimately brings peace, Mars is offered a way to ‘outdo’ Minerva in her special pacific sphere.
61 Hinds 1992a:104-5. Hinds (105) further notes the etymological link between elegy and funeral lament.
enables an opposition between him and the generically congruent Numa to be observed. This provides one explanation as to why Ovid chose to concentrate so much on Romulus in a way that does not easily fit in book three of the Fasti. Within this opposition Ovid also appears to present a more positive view of Numa than he does of Romulus: Numa is perhaps the most sympathetic character in the Fasti, receiving the warmest treatment of any ancient person in the poem.\textsuperscript{62} This opposition between Rome’s first two kings, has been the subject of much debate amongst modern scholars; however, this debate has often been confined to discussions of formal aesthetics, or to moral and political issues.\textsuperscript{63}

Ovid sows the seeds of his opposition between Romulus and Numa at the very beginning of the Fasti. Immediately after the proem (1.1-26), Ovid narrates how after founding Rome, Romulus erroneously calculated the year at ten months while he was setting the calendar (mentioned above). Ovid states that Romulus’ mistake was due to him being more knowledgeable about war than he was about astronomy:

\textit{scilicet arma magis quam sidera, Romule, noras,}
\textit{curaque finitimos uincere maior erat} (1.29-30). 

The poet continues with an appeal to Caesar to forgive Romulus’ mistake, providing two possible reasons that may have led to the error (1.31-42). Ovid concludes by stating that it was Numa who corrected Romulus’ calendar by inserting an additional two months:\textsuperscript{64}

\textit{at Numa nec Ianum nec auitas praeterit umbras,}
\textit{mensibus antiquis praeposuitque duos} (1.43-4).

\textsuperscript{63} Hinds 1992b:113; Newlands 1995:49; and Pasco-Pranger 2002b:294. Whereas Romulus ‘represents the vanguard of the forces of martial epic’, as a pacific and religious king, ‘the policies of Numa seem to constitute an assertion of the poetic values of the Fasti’ (Hinds 1992b:119-20). See also Green 2004a:46. In asserting the poetic values of the Fasti, some scholars suggest that Ovid goes so far as to identify Rome’s second king with himself, as indicated by the ‘autographical footnote’ (Hinds 1992b:113) Ovid includes in his description of the grove at Aricia (3.261-75). Pasco-Pranger (2002b:294) believes that this rare autobiographical intrusion ‘is surely pointed, drawing a parallel between Numa and the poet: just as Numa received inspiration (consilium) from the goddess for his establishment of laws and rites, so the poet of the Fasti received poetic inspiration in writing his own version of the sacral year’. Pasco-Pranger 2006:96 judges Ovid’s association of himself with Numa as a way of exploring contemporary constraints on speech. See also Feeney 2006.
\textsuperscript{64} Ovid also alludes to a change in the calendar introduced by the decemviri of 450 BC at (2.53-4). See Robinson 2011:91.
As explored in Part One, the implied wisdom of Numa in fixing Romulus’ error, together with his piety in not overlooking Janus and the ancestral shades\(^{65}\) and pacifism in the mention of Janus, stand in stark contrast to the bellicosity and lack of learning that led to Romulus’ mistake. Hinds explains the contrast Ovid makes between the two kings in generic terms: ‘in *Fasti* 3, and in the poem as a whole, Ovid self-consciously sets against the *arma* of martial epic two other formal “opposites,” besides the ones normally associated with epic-elegiac oppositions in Augustan poetry: he opposes *arma* to *sacra* and *arma* to *sidera*.\(^{66}\)

With the seeds of opposition between Romulus and Numa firmly sown at the very start of the *Fasti*, this contrast begins to germinate in line with Hinds’ set of ‘opposites’ in book three. In a similar way to book one, Ovid juxtaposes Romulus’ and Numa’s roles in setting the length of the year, in a longer narrative about the development of the Roman calendar (379-166). Beginning at the end of the potted biography of Romulus and Remus, this fresh episode starts with Romulus, standing on the threshold of his new kingdom, vowing to honour his father by naming the first month of the year after him (3.72-6). Initially, Romulus would seem to be demonstrating a sense of *pietas* on a par with that we have already seen in Numa, as Ovid declares this was a pious deed that pleased Mars (*uox rata fit, patrioque uocat de nomine mensem. / dicitur haec pietas grata fuisse deo – 3.77-8*). However, this impression of *pietas* is quickly deflated as it soon emerges that Romulus ‘got it wrong’ and calculated the years two months short.\(^{67}\) Furthermore, the militarism of Romulus and his primitive subjects is once again emphasised, as Ovid states: *et tamen ante omnes Martem coluere priores: / hoc dederat studiis bellica turba suis* (3.79-80).

Ovid then goes to considerable lengths to illustrate the astronomical illiteracy of Romulus and his people, directly contrasting *arma* with *sidera* in the reasons he gives as to why the year was originally calculated at just ten months. As we shall see later, the rustic militarism that caused this calendrical mistake is a far cry from the piety, knowledge and peace that will not only lead Numa to correct Romulus’ error, but will also define the second king’s reign. Although competent in military matters (*qui bene pugnabat, Romanam nouerat artem:/ mittere qui poterat pila, disertus erat – 3.103-4*), the ancient Romans were ignorant of the constellations (3.105-114). Their ensigns were of a military nature not an astral nature, and their

---

\(^{65}\) Note how while Numa does honour the ‘ancestral shades’ (1.43-4), Romulus has to be reminded by the ghost of his dead brother Remus to give him a proper funeral (5.471-4).


\(^{67}\) As Hinds (1992b:122) explains, this ‘act of pietas, alas, is sadly ill-conceived. Romulus and his primitive subjects are in no position to impose their will on the calendar year. Astronomical illiterates as they are, they are working with a year which is two months short’.
subsequent ignorance and lack of science led them to miscalculate the length of the year (3.115-20).

With the number ten therefore, held in great honour (*hic numerus magno tunc in honore fuit* – 3.122), Romulus’ personal bellicosity is also highlighted in his creation of the institutions of the state, which includes the foundation of a number of military companies (3.128-30). Ovid adds that ten months were also the ascribed period of mourning for a wife after her husband’s death (*hoc luget spatio femina maesta uirum* – 3.134); with such a glut of military associations already in the reader’s mind, it is perhaps difficult not to imagine that this *femina* was widowed through war.

After listing a number of rites and customs that provide proof that the year used to begin in March (3.135-51), Ovid finally reveals that it was Numa who put the calendar right (3.152). As considered in Part One, although Ovid does not specify that Numa’s correct calculation of the year was directly the result of his knowledge of astronomy (Ovid only explicitly cites astronomical reasons for the subsequent imperial calendrical reforms – 3.161-66), the fact that Numa rectified Romulus’ mistake implies a strong contrast in terms of knowledge with his predecessor; whether astronomical or not, Numa’s wisdom is made in explicit in Ovid’s proposition of two possible sources of his learning – Pythagoras and Egeria (3.153-4).

The opposition between Romulus and Numa really starts to flourish as Ovid turns to his account of Numa’s expiation of Jupiter Elicius’ thunderbolts as part of his broader explanation of the rites of the Salii (3.285-392). Speech forms a major feature of this episode and it is not only Numa’s wisdom that is highlighted through his dialogue, but also his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ associations.\(^68\) Within this episode, Numa first engages in a conversation with Faunus and Picus that extends over sixteen lines (3.309-22), which leads to a further fourteen lines of dialogue with Jupiter Elicius (3.333-46); the king is allocated approximately eight lines of direct speech in total. Immediately after Numa has learnt the secrets of expiating Jupiter’s thunderbolts, he is allocated an additional four lines of direct speech, as he returns home to tell his people what has happened (3.351-4); the king receives nearly two more lines of direct speech when he asks Mamurius what he would like in return for making copies of the Salian shield (3.385-6). Later at *Fasti* 4.641-72, Numa engages in another conversation with Faunus about how to stop a famine, although he is not given any

\(^{68}\)Littlewood (2002b:188-9) further posits that Numa’s dialogue with Jupiter raises the issue of free speech and - with Numa representing Augustus - the emperor’s control over freedom of speech in the last decade of his life.
actual lines of speech. While Romulus has considerably more lines of direct speech throughout the whole of the *Fasti* – twenty-two in total – it is the differing styles of the two kings’ discourse that is most significant. Apart from his lament over the rape of the Sabine women (2.431-4), all of Romulus’ speech is confined to him giving commands or making declarations (3.73-6; 3.432; 4.813-4; 4.827-32; 4.838-40; 4.848; 4.852); most of Numa’s speech on the other hand, involves verbal exchange with other characters. In contrast to Romulus, who blindly obeys the command from Mars to pick up the sword and begin war with the Sabines (3.198), Numa follows Jupiter’s demand for a head (3.339) with an impressive display of wordplay that eventually leads to a reinterpretation of this demand. It is through this clever wordplay that Numa’s wisdom is reaffirmed. In the succinct summary of Porte: ‘Mis en vers par Ovide, ce processus de substitution est très approximatif. Il faut restituer un premier jeu sur les sonorités: *caput/caepititum*, << l'oignon >>, devenu *cepa* chez Ovide pour des raisons métriques; un second jeu, toujours de sonorités: *caput/capilli*. Enfin un troisième, subtil, entre *anima*, et le nom du petit poisson, sardine ou anchois, *maena*, qui en est tout simplement l’anagramme (on trouve *maena* et *maina*). Ainsi, Jupiter obtient-il ce qu'il demande, à cela près que les lettres ne sont pas dans l'ordre!'

When Numa proceeds to address his subjects, telling them about his encounter with Jupiter, he does not issue an order like Romulus does, but speaks to them in a conversational tone, using the ‘associative’ first person plural (3.351-4). Moreover, his rusticity and parity with his subjects are emphasised as he seats himself on a wooden throne in the midst of the crowd (3.359-60). The king invites further verbal exchange with Mamurius later, when he asks him what reward he desires in return for his creation of replicas of Jupiter’s shield, while at the same time also asserting his own honesty (3.385-6). In this way, the manner of Numa’s speeches in general reinforces his egalitarian image in contrast to his dictatorial counterpart Romulus (see below).

Ovid’s use of speech to cast Numa as a ‘man of the people’ in opposition to Romulus is also reinforced through comparison of the style of dialogue employed by other characters

---

69 Faunus also serves to forge a connection between Numa a speech as both Varro (Lat. Ling. 7.36) and Lucretius (4.581-3) note the speech related etymology of the word ‘faunus’. Parker (1974:212) states that the story of Faunus helping Numa to end the famine (4.641-72) is not found elsewhere in Latin literature although and claims it is inspired by Latinus’ encounter with Faunus in *Aen*. 7.81-106. However, it could also be inspired by Livy’s account of a pestilence, when men wished they could go back to the times of Numa (1.31.5-8). See also Porte 1985:159-62.

70 Perhaps here Romulus accords more with Cicero’s account of him as savage but in possession of divine wisdom (De Rep. 2.5.10).

featured in the lives of Romulus and Remus. As discussed in Chapter Three, Ovid (in a direct response to Livy), allots just over nine lines of speech to one of the servants charged by Amulius to abandon the infant twins on the banks of the river Tiber (2.395-404). Not only does this dialogue give unusual prominence to these ‘rustic’ characters, but in content and style it very much conforms to elegiac convention in contrast to the more military-epic directives of Romulus’ speech. The emotional lamentation of the servant’s elegiac words are similarly reflected in Remus’ sixteen-line speech, which he delivers posthumously to Faustulus and Larentia (5.459-74) – two other ‘rustic’ figures that Ovid goes to great lengths to associate with Remus (as explored in Chapter Three). In asking heu ubi Mars pater est? (5.465), Remus could even be seen to be responding to the servant who, sensing something godlike in the appearance of the baby Romulus and Remus, questions why their divine father did not come to their rescue (2.397-400).

Consideration of Livy can also help enrich the discussion above and provide another possible reason as to how and why Ovid presented this opposition between Romulus and Numa. As demonstrated above, Ovid can be seen to be using Livy as a major source for his depiction of Numa in Fasti book three. More than this however, the opposition Ovid creates between Romulus and Numa can be seen as an indication of the extent to which Ovid actively engages with the historian’s account, both building on and responding to the dyad that Livy creates between the two kings.

**Livy’s dyad**

Scholars have noted that Livy ‘acknowledges the ambiguities of Romulus’ reputation even as he emphasizes Romulus’ role as founder and as a model for subsequent refounders’. Critics cite a number of examples of where these ambiguities manifest themselves: by reporting the murder of Remus (1.72), Livy presents ‘a contradiction between Romulus the fratricide and Romulus the conditor urbis, the bad man and the good’; Livy’s reporting of the possible assassination of Romulus by the senate (1.16.4) and his ambivalence towards

---

72 The elegiac aspects of the servant’s speech are realized through their pity, lamentation and tears: see Robinson (2011:266-7). See also Heinze 1919:26-7.
73 There is a similar distinction between the speech of Sextus and Lucretia in Ovid’s account of the rape of Lucretia as discussed in Chapter One.
74 Miles 1995:103.
75 Ogilvie 1965:54. See also Miles 1995:103.
stories of Romulus’ divine origin (Pref. 7; 1.4.2) and apotheosis (1.16.5-8), also contribute to his ambiguous attitude towards Rome’s first king (as explored in Chapter Three). Ogilvie suggests that ‘Throughout Roman history Romulus remained a controversial figure’, and that Livy deliberately takes ‘a position among the diverse, often conflicting attitudes toward that figure that were current and still being worked out in his own age’. Despite his ambiguous presentation, critics still see Romulus as commanding the ‘greatest respect’ amongst all Rome’s founders in Livy.

The contrast between Livy’s Romulus and Numa is also well established, with Numa viewed as offering a balance to the obvious ambiguities and difficulties of Romulus’ character. However, on closer examination, Livy’s portrayal of Numa not only has the potential to reinforce the ambiguities of Romulus, but also to expose a potentially more sympathetic portrait of Numa than previously thought. In doing so, Livy’s ultimate reconciliation of the characteristics of the two kings, (ita duo deinceps reges, alius alia uia, ille bello, hic pace, ciuitatem auxerunt ... Cum ualida tum temperata et belli et pacis artibus erat ciuitas - 1.21.6) is potentially undermined.

Livy’s presentation of Numa’s attention to religious matters as a development or elaboration of Romulus’ piety is cited as one way in which the historian conveys the primacy of Romulus over his successor. Certainly Dionysius makes explicit the idea that Numa expanded on the foundation laid by Romulus who established the principal rites of their religion (2.23.6), with Numa leaving the original rites of his predecessor untouched as he believed them to have been founded in the best possible manner (2.63.2). However, apart from consulting the auspices before assuming kingship ‘in conscious imitation of Romulus’ (1.18.6), nowhere does Livy go as far as Dionysius to suggest that the rituals or laws that Numa introduced were in any way an evolution of Romulus’ religiosity; in fact, Livy seems keen to demonstrate the originality of Numa’s religious institutions by citing him

---

76 Miles 1995:103.
77 Ogilvie 1965:85. Ogilvie adds that ‘at the back of his career lurked the fratricide and other violent deeds, to be turned to his discredit if political needs required’.
78 Miles 1995:103.
79 Miles 1995:123. Boyle (2003:58 n.77) believes Livy gives a more favourable representation of Romulus than is found in Ovid.
81 Although Cicero does present a similar reconciliation between the style of reigns encompassed by the characteristics of Romulus and Numa (De Rep. 5.3), he does not specifically refer to Romulus in this context.
82 Miles 1995:123.
83 Miles 1995:123. Miles further suggests that Numa’s concentration on religious matters reaffirms the piety first seen in Romulus.
as a unique exemplar to his subjects (unici exempli – 1.21.2; see below), and stating that he created a new foundation of laws and religious observances:

**Qui regno ita potitus urbem nouam conditam ui et armis, iure eam legibusque ac moribus de integro condere parat** (1.19.1).

While Ovid also admits that Numa reinforced religious rites that were already in existence – *tradita sacra* (3.280) – he nowhere suggests that these rites came from Romulus; the poet therefore, provides no possible religious foundation from Romulus for Numa to build on.

Even though Livy does not confirm that Numa’s religious institutions were based in any way on Romulus’ piety, he does depict the first king, like Numa (1.19.2), attending to both religious and legal matters (1.8.1-2):

**Rebus diuinis rite perpetratis uocataque ad concilium multitudine quae coalescere in populi unius corpus nulla re praeterquam legibus poterat, iura dedit; quae ita sancta generi hominum agresti fore ratus, si se ipse uenerabilem insignibus imperii fecisset, cum cetero habitu se augustiori**

In stating that he duly attended to the worship of the gods, Livy certainly seems to underline Romulus’ piety. This reputation is reinforced throughout Livy’s account of Romulus in a number of examples of the king attending to certain religious rites (1.7.3-4; 1.7.15; 1.12.5-6). However, while Romulus may appear pious when Livy’s account of his reign is read in isolation, when it is compared to that of Numa, doubts as to the extent of his piety begin to creep in. After explaining at the very start of his account of Numa’s reign that Rome’s second king decided to introduce law and religion, Livy states that Numa realised that this could not be done in the midst of wars (1.19.2); if, as Livy seems to suggest here, religion and justice cannot easily sustain their existence in times of conflict, exactly how effective were they when Romulus was in charge? Romulus’ *pietas* then, rather than providing a foundation for Numa to build on, would seem to raise a number of questions. By displaying some scepticism towards Romulus’ *pietas*, Livy draws attention to an opposition between Rome’s first two kings.

---

84 The possible military association of Romulus’ *insignibus imperii* in Livy, perhaps providing a contrast with the *imperii pignora* Numa receives from Jupiter Elicius in the *Fasti*. Gee (2000:41-2) also notes that Numa’s *ancile* might be seen as the equivalent of Aeneas’ shield (Aen. 8.664). However, she points out that unlike Aeneas’ shield, the ancile is a religious and not a military item.
The variant characters of Romulus and Numa also emerge in 1.8.1-2 (quoted above), in Livy’s description of the differing ways in which they introduce and enforce their respective rules of law. While both Romulus and Numa have to find a way to convince the rustic population into accepting these laws, Romulus’ methods appear much more dictatorial and self-serving than Numa’s. Romulus ‘gives’ the people laws both in order to assert, and by way of asserting, his own position of authority. This hint of Romulus’ autocracy is perhaps reaffirmed as Livy reports the divergent ruling styles of the two kings. In explaining how Numa’s religious reforms had diverted the thoughts of the populace from violence and arms, Livy states that:

\[
\text{et animi aliquid agendo occupati erant, et deorum adsidua insidens cura, cum interesse rebus humanis caeleste numen uideretur, ea pietate omnium pectora imbuerat, ut fides ac ius iurandum pro legum ac poenarum metu ciuitatem regerent. Et cum ipsi se homines in regis uelut unici exempli mores formarent … (1.21.1-2).}
\]

The dread and fear that the population was, by implication, subjected to previously under Romulus, together with the spontaneous imitation of Numa by his subjects, not only highlights Romulus’ potential for tyranny by comparison, but also reinforces the idea that Numa is not acting in an autocratic way; rather it gives the impression that Numa is very much an egalitarian – on a par with his subjects rather than superior to them. Certainly some sense of duplicity, or at least manipulation of the population, could be seen in Numa’s invention of his relationship with Egeria in order to convince the people to accept his measures (1.19.5; as discussed above). However, Numa’s objective here seems solely concerned with the common good: he even plays down his own position by claiming he is acting not on his own authority but as an interpreter of the gods (1.19.5).

Livy’s portrait of a relatively liberal Numa comes even more sharply into focus when compared to Cicero’s version. Through his implementation of religion, Cicero’s Numa seems to display a similar sense of autocracy that Livy’s Romulus does. In Cicero, Numa makes the performance of religious rites difficult and insists that they be learnt by heart and scrupulously observed (De Rep. 2.27). Contrast this with Livy’s Numa who, rather than making the performance of the rites difficult, allocates provision of assistance for the people in the correct performance of religious rites (1.20.6-7). Furthermore, in following the

---

85 Ogilvie (1965:95) points out that ‘the deception of an ignorant people for their own good was a traditional feature of Numa’s work’.
example of the Greek kings in having private property, not farming his own land and acting as judge in public lawsuits (De Rep. 5.3), Cicero’s Numa emerges as superior, not equal, to his people.

Livy’s Numa appears as more pious and peaceful and less autocratic when compared both to the historian’s own version of Romulus and to the representation of Numa in other sources. The emphasis that Livy places on the differences between the two monarchs (which is subtle but marked), creates a chasm between them sits uncomfortably with his final reconciliation of their respective warrior and pacifist characteristics. Cicero’s Numa seems to play second fiddle to his predecessor, his peaceful ways made subservient to Romulus and his warlike ways (De Rep. 2.25: noted above). Livy on the other hand, presents Numa’s peaceful ways in a more positive light: as Ogilvie suggests, ‘Whereas other Romans accepted war and military service as fields in which a man’s uirtus could be seen to best advantage, L. rejects that assumption. For him war itself is degrading – efferari militia animos’ (1.19.2).

Ovid then builds on the subtle juxtaposition that Livy creates between Rome’s first two kings, presenting an even stronger opposition between the pious, wise, just and pacific Numa and the pugnacious Romulus. Through Numa’s location in a generically appropriate rustic setting, his egalitarian relationship with his subjects and his conversational dialogue (as evidenced throughout this chapter), Ovid’s Numa emerges as diametrically opposed to Romulus; Numa has much in common with the ‘rustic’-'plebeian’ Remus and other more ‘ordinary’ figures in the poem (see Chapter Three). Crucially, unlike Livy, Ovid offers no such reconciliation of Romulus and Numa in the Fasti: for Ovid, Numa ‘represents an

86 The language used by Dionysius to describe Numa’s various measures also, perhaps, betrays a hint of autocracy in the king. Dionysius claims that Numa used land allocation and later bestowed honours on the plebeians and patricians in order to adapt ‘the whole body of the people, like a musical instrument [hösper organon] (my emphasis), to the sole consideration of the public good’ (2.62.5). Furthermore, Dionysius claims that Numa invented his relationship with his nymph wife Egeria ‘to the end that, when once the people were possessed with a fear of the gods, they might pay a greater regard to him (my emphasis); and, willingly, receive the laws he was enacting as derived from them’ (2.61.1). Although Livy claims Numa might have invented Egeria for similar objectives, he does present the king as less self-serving than Dionysius’; rather than wanting the people to pay more attention to him, Livy claims that Numa pretended that he was acting under the advice of Egeria for the good of the people themselves (1.19.4-5).

87 Furthermore, in describing Numa as the ‘mother’ of justice and religion (Numae mater huic urbi iuris et religionis fuit – De Rep. 2.3), Cicero could be seen to be denigrating these qualities in relation to Romulus, who is described as ‘father’ of the nation (De Rep. 1.64). In extolling the virtues of monarchy, Scipio includes Numa among his list of ‘just kings’, but he is sandwiched between Romulus and Tullus – both of whom were famed for their militarism (in Tullus’ case see De Rep. 2.33). Miles (1995:102) states that ‘Cicero is the first in this century [first century B.C.] for whom we can be certain of a favourable identification with Romulus’.

88 Ogilvie 1965:95.
alternative to Romulus’ martialism rather than a possibility of compromise with it’. If anything, the peaceful, pious Numa emerges as being superior to his militaristic predecessor. The poet appears to expand on Livy’s ‘whispered’ opposition between the two kings, amplifying the doubts and fractures inherent in Livy’s account reading. What is more, by magnifying Livy’s doubts and fractures in his version of Romulus and Numa, it could be argued that the potential complexities in Livy can only be fully grasped when read in conjunction with the Fasti.

90 Newlands 1995:91-2. However, it is difficult to agree with Newlands that this is expressed mainly as comedy.
91 This could be seen as an example of ‘retroactive intertextuality’ in which the meaning of an earlier text is affected by a later text. See Edmunds 2001:159-63.
CHAPTER FIVE

Servius

Introduction

The last two chapters analysed Ovid’s engagement with Livy in relation to the depiction of Romulus and Remus (Chapter Three) and Numa (Chapter Four) in the *Fasti*. Both chapters argued that Ovid engages in a direct dialogue with Livy, building on and reacting to the historian’s portrayal of these characters, in order to create his own nuanced representations of them. It also emerged that it was through these specific portraits that our understanding of some of the wider issues and themes in the *Fasti* can be enhanced. In relation to Romulus and Remus, Chapter Three argued that through his discourse with the historian, Ovid creates an opposition between the brothers and in doing so presents a more sustained and positive interest in the ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ aspects of Roman history than Livy does. By investigating a similar opposition between Romulus and Numa, Chapter Four contended that Ovid utilizes generic convention to develop Livy’s version of Rome’s second king in order to comment on the history of Rome itself in its most authoritative version. This chapter will apply the same level of scrutiny afforded to Romulus and Remus and Numa also to Servius Tullius and in doing so will demonstrate that Ovid continues to converse with Livy in developing his own distinct depiction of Rome’s sixth king.1 Furthermore, it will maintain that through Servius, Ovid continues to draw attention to the more ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ aspects of the history of Rome.

After briefly examining the structure of Ovid’s narration of the reign of Servius, this chapter will review the pre-Livian sources available for the king. It will then analyse the proliferation of ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality with Livy that has led to a general agreement that Ovid is relying on the historian as his main source for his depiction of Servius.2 It is

---

1 Ovid makes no mention of Rome’s third king, Tullius Hostilius, provides only a brief reference to the fourth king Ancus Marcius (6.803) and is also silent as to the fifth king, L. Tarquinius Priscus. Servius’ son-in-law Lucius Tarquinius, later to become Rome’s last king Tarquinius Superbus, plays a role in Ovid’s narration of Servius Tullius (as discussed in this chapter); he is also alluded to as part of Ovid’s account of the rape of Lucretia (2.687-852) as discussed in Chapter One. Ovid refers to Servius as the seventh king (*Fasti*. 6.624). Both Littlewood (2006:185) and Wiseman and Wiseman (2013:147) suggest that although Servius is the sixth king in the usual sequence, Ovid is probably including Titus Tatius in his list, whom he makes only a few brief references to throughout the *Fasti* (1.260, 1.272, 2.135, 6.49). Servius will be referred to as the sixth king throughout this thesis.

2 Bömer 1957:i.26; Ogilvie 1965:186; Newlands 1995:222; Holzberg 2002:171; Murgatroyd 2005:201; and Littlewood 2006:177. This chapter will argue against Ridley (1975:159) who disputes the view that Ovid relied mostly on Livy for his depiction of Servius.
through this ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality that Ovid’s ‘thematic’ engagement with the historian also begins to emerge; in particular, through close engagement with the historian in relation to the speech of Servius’ daughter Tullia, Ovid further develops Livy’s version of her, elaborating on her malevolence and role in the murder of her father.

With few extant sources for the life and reign of Servius, this chapter will turn to Dionysius (and to a lesser extent Cicero) – the author of the only other comprehensive account of the king – in order to comprehend how Livy adapted the tradition of Servius for his own particular ends. Despite apparently relying on the same sources and reproducing a generally stable tradition, Livy and Dionysius offer significantly different depictions of the king; Livy’s Servius emerges as much less autocratic than Dionysius’, less driven by his own personal ambition for power and with more in common with the lower classes. As this chapter will then move on to argue, Ovid takes Livy’s version of Servius as the foundation for his own characterisation of him, casting the king in much firmer ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ terms, with the result that the latter has more in common with Numa (and Remus) than with Romulus.

Ovid goes one step further than Livy by omitting all details of Servius’ reign that have the potential to highlight the issue of his pro-plebeian or pro-patrician stance, his militarism or autocratic tendencies. Ovid also utilizes generic convention, treating Servius in a similar way to Numa, amplifying Livy’s depiction of Rome’s sixth king in terms comparable to the second sovereign. By presenting the speech of Tullia in similar terms to that of Romulus in the *Fasti*, Ovid creates a new opposition between father and daughter that mirrors that of the ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ Numa and his counterpart Romulus.

Through a close parallel reading of Ovid and Livy’s version of Rome’s sixth king, it becomes apparent that the poet is, again, not just using the historian as a ‘factual’ source, but is actively engaging with him. In the process, we realise that once again Ovid is doing more in the *Fasti* than simply ‘playing’ with genre or making comment on contemporary Augustan politics – as has often been asserted by modern scholars. Rather, Ovid is exploiting the elegiac conventions of his poem in order to make a sustained comment on broader Roman history particularly in terms of its ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ aspects.

---

Ovid’s narration of Servius Tullius

All references to Servius Tullius in the *Fasti* occur in book six. Covered in a total of just seventy-four lines, Servius receives significantly less attention than his regal predecessors Romulus (and Remus) (377 lines) and Numa (179 lines). Servius is first mentioned (in terms of the linear structure of the poem) in relation to the festival of Mater Matuta (6.473-568). Ovid briefly notes that on this day, Servius consecrated a temple to the goddess in the Forum Boarium (*hac ibi luce ferunt Matutae sacra parenti / sceptriferas Serui templa dedisse manus* – 6.479-80), before giving a lengthy account of the myth of Ino (6.481-568).\(^4\)

Immediately following this, Ovid states that Servius also founded a temple to Fortuna in the same place and on the same day as that of Mater Matuta (6.569). Although not in chronological order, the poet then provides an account of the conception and death of Servius (6.581-624), as part of three possible explanations as to why the statue of the goddess in the temple of Fortuna was covered in toga (6.570-636). Ovid’s final reference to Servius occurs in relation to the festival of Fors Fortuna at another temple dedicated to her by Servius on the banks of the river Tiber (6.781-4).\(^5\)

Ovid’s account of Servius in relation to the festival of Fortuna at the temple in the Forum Boarium (6.569-636) forms his longest narration relating to Rome’s sixth king in the poem. After asking why the statue of Servius in the temple of the goddess is hidden by toga (*sed superinieictis quis latet iste togis? / Seruius est, hoc constat enim, ...* – 6.570-1), Ovid states that there are different explanations for this (6.5.71-2), proceeding to narrate three of them. The first relates to Fortuna’s shame at having loved Servius – a mere mortal (6.573-80); the other two relate to the murder of Servius by his daughter Tullia. Ovid continues to narrate Servius’ murder in some detail (6.581-616), concluding with an explanation of this incident.

---

\(^4\) Ovid’s account of Ino is told by Bacchus, the son of her sister Semele, who was rescued by Ino from the wrath of Hera; it contains no further references to Servius. Frazer (1929:iv.272) claims that Ovid erroneously identified Ino with Mater Matuta.

\(^5\) The plurals *munera regis* (6.776) and *templa propinqua deae* (6.784) suggest that Ovid is referring to two riverside temples of Fors Fortuna (Platner and Ashby 1926:213-4; Frazer 1929:iv.332). Livy (10.46.14) notes that near to the temple to Fors Fortuna built by Servius, Sp. Carilius also erected a temple to the goddess in 293 BC with the spoils of his victory over the Etruscans and Samnites; Platner and Ashby (1926:214) believe it is the Carvilian temple that Ovid is erroneously regarding as Servian. Livy also mentions the temple of Fortuna and Mater Matuta in the Forum Boarium (33.27.1-4). Dionysius notes Servius built two temples to Fortune - one in the Forum Boarium and the other beside the river Tiber, which he claims was dedicated to Fortune Virilis (4.27.7). Varro states that Servius dedicated a temple to Fors Fortuna on the banks of the river Tiber (Lat. *Ling.* 6.17). See also Scullard 1981:155-6; Oakley 2005:iv.453-4; Littlewood 2006:223; and Carandini 2012:156, 378 & 551.
as the reason for the statue being covered (6.617-24). Ovid ends his account by noting that when the temple once burnt down, ‘the only thing that survived was the statue of Servius because Vulcan was his father (6.625-6). The latter acts as an introduction to his account of the king’s conception and birth (6.625-36).

The Sources

The life and reign of Servius Tullius would have undoubtedly been included in the various pre-Livian histories of Rome – most notably those of Fabius Pictor and L. Cincius Alimentus (as reviewed in Chapter One); however, only a handful of short fragments from these early writers survive. These mainly relate to Servius’ census (Piso FRHist. fr. 16; Tubero FRHist. fr. 4), his creation of local tribes (Fabius Pictor FRHist. fr.9 = Cato fr.17 = Vennonius fr. 2) and his calendrical reforms (Hemina FRHist. fr.18; Tuditanus FRHist. fr.1 = Hemina fr. 21 = Antias fr. 6 = Macer fr.6; Geminus FRHist. fr.4; as discussed in Chapter Three). Piso asserts that Servius, as part of his census, introduced coined money (FRHist. fr.16), an act likewise mentioned by Varro (FRHist. fr.1); Piso also makes a separate

---

6 Despite Ovid’s certainty (hoc constat enim – 6.571), Littlewood (2006:174) claims that the identity of the statue was much debated amongst ancient authors (perhaps it is through this very statement of certainty that Ovid indicates his awareness of this debate). Dionysius also claimed the statue was of Servius (4.40.7), whereas Livy identified it as Pudicitia Patricia (10.23.3). Bömer (1958:377) and Scullard (1981:151) identify this goddess as Fortuna Virgo.

7 Livy (24.47.15-16) reports that the temples of Fortuna and Mater Matuta burned down in 213 BC. Carandini (2012:156) notes that the temple of Fortuna was destroyed, perhaps by fire, and reconstructed, only a few decades after it was originally built by Servius.

8 Ogilvie (1965:156) believes that Fabius Pictor was the first historian to give the reign of Servius ‘most of its present features’. Livy himself cites Fabius Pictor as a source in his account of the Servius’ centuriate reforms at 1.44.2. Bispham and Cornell (FRHist..iii.29) similarly state that Fabius Pictor is likely to have narrated the main elements of Servius’ murder. Ogilvie (1965:157-60) further suggests that Valerius Antias and Macer provided accounts of Servius’ birth, although no fragments survive. Dionysius includes a number of generic references to unidentified sources in his account of Servius (4.6.1, 4.6.3, 4.40.1), as well as specific source references to Fabius Pictor (4.6.1; 4.15.1; 4.30.2), Gellius and Macer (4.6.4), Piso (4.7.5; 4.15.4) and Vennonius and Cato (4.15.1). Rich (FRHist..iii.9-10) suggests Dionysius citation of ‘local records’ regarding his account of Servius’ conception (4.2.1) could have been the record of the Pontifex Maximus; but as the reference is vague, he may not have ‘had any specific archive in mind’. Oakely (FRHist..iii.470) believes that Tubero (FRHist. fr.4) is likely to have provided an extended account of the Servian census, but this does not prove he was a source either for Livy’s or Dionysius’ version of this. However, he adds that the passages in Livy (1.42.5-43.13) and Dionysius (4.16.1-22.2) ‘suggest that such descriptions were found in earlier annalists’.


10 In this fragment, it is also stated that Varro agrees with Geminus’ account.
reference to the offspring of the king (FRHist. fr. 18), and Varro briefly mentions Servius’ death in terms of the naming of the Vicus Sceleratus (Lat. Ling. 5.159). Antias (FRHist. fr. 20) provides an account of Servius’ death. Servius’ comitia centuriata, creation of urban tribes, army and wars are also mentioned in an anonymous fragment (Anonymous 1 FRHist. fr.1) thought to have been written before 5 AD.

Only a few fragments of Ennius’ account of Servius survive; two relate to Tanaquil’s interpretation of the flames observed on the head of Servius (3.143-5 Sk.), with a third possibly referring to Servius’ foundation of the temple of Diana on the Aventine (3.149 Sk.). Diodorus (10.1-2) only provides a very brief account of Servius in which he narrates how Tarquin lambasted Servius for his illegal assumption of the throne, before hurling him down the senate steps; he adds that during Servius’ forty-four year rule, the king established many institutions by virtue of his high character. As with Numa (see Chapter Four), Cicero provides the only relatively comprehensive pre-Livian account of the reign of Servius (De Rep. 2.37-40). In his account, Cicero makes a brief allusion to Servius’ parentage (De Rep. 2.37), but mainly concentrates on Servius’ centuriate reforms and style of government (De Rep. 2.38-40); although he implies Tarquin’s role in the murder of Servius (De Rep. 2.45), Cicero makes no mention of Tullia.

It is in Livy that the ‘first surviving detailed account’ of Rome’s sixth king is found. In terms of its main features, Livy’s account of Servius is thought to closely resemble the tradition as established by Fabius Pictor, albeit with some alteration (and influence from other sources). Next to Livy (as previously noted), the most comprehensive and contemporaneous account of Rome’s regal period occurs in Dionysius. Both Livy and Dionysius inherit a tradition that offers variant perspectives on Servius’ pro-patrician or pro-

---

11 Piso’s reference to Servius’ children and grandchildren occurs as part of a longer account by Dionysius (4.7.1-5) about the death of the king. Pobjoy (FRHist.:iii.202-3) claims it is impossible to know if any of the details regarding Servius’ demise in this passage can be attributed to Piso, with caution needed even in Dionysius’ explicit attribution of Piso’s words regarding the king’s descendants.
12 For a full discussion of this fragment see Briscoe FRHist.:iii.663-5.
13 Skutsch (1985:552) refutes claims that 14.387 Sk. infers Servius’ notion that cremations should not be done in the daytime.
14 Further Ciceronian references to Servius occur in De Rep. 2.53, 3.47 and De Div. 1.121.
16 With specific reference to the story of Servius’ death, Ogilvie (1965:184-5) claims that there would have been ‘no change in the main outline’ of the story from the oral tradition of the third century BC to Livy’s account.
17 Ogilvie (1965:156-7) states that Livy, like all other historians, would have altered and embellished his account of Servius in line with his own particular special interests. See also discussion of Servius’ conception and birth below.
18 As well as Ovid’s Fasti, Herbert-Brown (1994:150) notes that Livy and Dionysius offer the only other versions of the story of Tullia.
plebeian status; as will be seen later, it is because of this variation in the tradition that a comparison of Livy with Dionysius will prove especially important in ascertaining the relationship between Livy and Ovid in their depictions of the king. By comparing Livy’s account of Servius with that of Dionysius, not only will Ovid’s engagement with Livy be made apparent, but so also will the poet’s consequent development of Servius in relation to his wider ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme within the Fasti.

**Ovid’s engagement with Livy**

Ovid’s account of Servius is less wide-ranging than that of Livy (the specific effect of this will be explored below), since he focuses mainly on the king’s birth and Tullia and Tarquin’s conspiracy to murder him. Since Ovid does not cover many of the aspects of Servius’ life and reign charted by the few surviving pre-Livian sources (surveyed above), it is impossible to know for sure which, if any, of these he might be using for his account. However, as noted above, it is generally accepted that Ovid used Livy as his major source for his account of Servius. As will be seen, this is especially apparent in terms of the poet’s depiction of Tullia and Tarquin – the main protagonists in Servius’ murder; although Ovid’s version of the birth of Servius differs from that of Livy, the poet can still be seen to be engaging with the historian by ‘filling in’ the mythical holes in the latter’s account.

After signalling his use of Livy as his main reference point through various incidences of ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality, Ovid initially establishes a strong ‘thematic’ resemblance between his characters of Tullia and Tarquin and their Livian counterparts, and proceeds to expand on Livy’s depiction of these figures. This process ultimately leads to the emergence of a more malevolent Tullia and comparatively reticent Tarquin in the Fasti – the comprehension of which would be somewhat challenging without knowledge of Livy’s portrait of the pair; as Newlands states ‘the distinctive character of the narrative in the Fasti clearly emerges from its intertextual engagement with Livy’s account of Tullia’.19 As will be seen later in this chapter, Ovid’s specific characterisation of Tullia and Tarquin then ‘feeds into’ the poet’s casting of Servius in specifically ‘plebeian’ terms.

Ovid denotes his engagement with Livy right from the start of his account of the murder of Servius through the use of ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality. After noting that Servius’ daughter Tullia had accomplished her marriage to Tarquin by criminal means (*Tullia coniugio sceleris*

---

19 Newlands 2000:194.
mercede peracto – 6.587), Ovid introduces a speech in which she urges her husband to kill Servius and claim the throne for himself, noting that *his solita est dictis exstimulare uirum* (6.588). Just prior to narrating how Tullia and Tarquin hatch a plot to murder their respective spouses, Livy similarly states of Tarquin *et domi uxor et Tullia inquietum, animum stimulante* (1.46.2). Ovid’s use of *exstimulo* as a conscious verbal echo of Livy is perhaps cemented as ‘das Wort erscheint nicht vor Ovid in der Literatur’. At the end of her speech in the Fasti, Ovid states that Tarquin *talibus instinctus solio priuatus in alto / sederat: ...* (6.597-8), thus beginning the affray that will result in Servius’ death (6.597-602). Ovid’s use of *instingo* echoes Livy’s use of *instigo*: the latter, immediately after his narration of Tullia’s speech states that *His aliisque increpando iuuenem instigat* (1.47.6). Livy uses this verb again later, in the same context, claiming that Tarquin was *his muliebribus instinctus furis* (1.47.7) to begin soliciting for support to take Servius’ throne for himself.

By using ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality to emulate the same force of Tullia’s words and their effect on Tarquin as Livy, Ovid also reflects the historian ‘thematically’ in casting Tullia as the leading force in the criminal deeds that are about to follow. Livy says of the couple prior to his narration of Tullia’s speech:

*Contrahit celeriter similitudo eos, ut fere fit: malum malo aptissimum; sed initium turbandi omnia a femina ortum est* (1.46.7).

Livy’s Tarquin shares some of his wife’s immorality (and as will be discussed later take some part in the murder of Servius). In the Fasti Ovid proceeds to expand on Livy’s depiction of Tullia and makes her culpable for the conspiracy to murder Servius; Tarquin conversely, is relegated to a mere supporting role, his guilt reduced to ‘meek acquiescence’. A ‘direct verbal’ intertext between Ovid and Livy is visible in Tullia’s request to her husband that ‘*si uir es, i, dictas exige dotis opes’* (Fast. 6.594) and its counterpart in Livy: ‘*Si tu es cui nuptam esse me arbitror ...*’ (Liv. 1.47.3). It also serves

---

20 Bömer 1958:ii.378. A survey using PHI confirms Bömer’s conclusion. Bömer also notes Ovid’s use of *exstimulare* in Met. 5.165, 6.459 and Trist. 3.2.29.

21 In making Tullia ‘the protagonist in his account, the prime mover and the prime actor, and not allowing other characters much of a share of the limelight’, Murgatroyd (2005:203) sees Ovid’s account as an example of his ‘renarration’ of Livy.

22 Littlewood 2006:178. In Livy, while Tullia may take the dominant role in their murderous plans (1.46.7), she has a slightly more like-minded partner in Tarquin; just prior to Tullia’s involvement, Tarquin has already attempted to oust Servius by spreading reports he was ruling illegally and by vilifying him to the senate (1.46.1-2). Dionysius (4.28.2-5, 4.30.4) is more explicit in casting Tullia and Tarquin as equal in their malevolence. See also Herbert-Brown 1994:150
to bolster both Tullia’s iniquity and Tarquin’s relative meekness in the *Fasti*, compared to their equivalents in Livy.\(^{23}\) The more pointed interrogation of Tarquin’s masculinity in the *Fasti* – as opposed to her mere querying of the one she married in Livy – not only emphasises the malignance of the questioner, but also the more timid nature of her addressee. Moreover, questions of gender identity, it may be suggested, are also more appropriate in the elegiac genre to which the *Fasti* belongs.

The idea that Ovid is consciously escalating the malevolence of Livy’s Tullia in the *Fasti* is further indicated by the fact that his Tarquin is goaded into sitting on the king’s throne by the strength of Tullia’s words (*talibus instinctus* - 6.597), whereas in Livy, he responds to her fury (*mulierbribus instinctus furii* - 1.47.7); Tullia’s comparative lack of frenzy in the *Fasti* has the effect of making her seem even more evil and calculated than in Livy.\(^{24}\) As will be explored below, by having Tarquin react to Tullia’s words rather than her madness, Ovid also draws attention to the importance of her speech in his development of his ‘plebeian’ theme through his depiction of Servius.

With Tarquin now seated on his father-in-law’s throne in both Livy and the *Fasti*, Ovid again gestures towards the historian through ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality in explaining the reaction of witnesses to this incident (*attonitus* – *Fast*. 6.598; *Liv*. 1.47.9). However, Ovid’s account of the ensuing events that eventually lead to Servius being thrown down the steps of the senate vary both in extent and detail from Livy. Not only is Ovid’s four-line account significantly shorter than Livy’s more detailed version (*Fast*. 6.598-602; *Liv*. 1.47.10-48.5), but the poet is also ambiguous as to Tarquin’s precise involvement in the assault on Servius. Whereas Tarquin’s only explicit involvement in the event in the *Fasti* is to snatch the sceptre from his father-in-law as he lies at the foot of the Esquiline Hill (6.600), Livy is explicit in having Tarquin physically hurl Servius down the Senate steps before sending his attendants to kill him (1.48.3-5).\(^{25}\)

Littlewood is possibly correct in claiming that Ovid’s reason for omitting these details is because he ‘is solely concerned with Tullia’s crimes’;\(^{26}\) and to admit

\(^{23}\)Littlewood (2006:179) notes the ‘dramatic impact ... the blunt crudeness of the four opening monosyllables’ of *Fast*. 6.594. In *Livy*, Tanaquil says ‘*si uir es*’ (1.41.3) in her speech imploring Servius to take up the kingship following Tarquinius’ death. Ogilvie (1965:161) notes the strength of this common taunt, that ‘in Latin is too strong for refined literature and is favoured by the more excited style of letters’.

\(^{24}\)Dionysius does not report a speech by Tullia at this point. However, he does give her a lengthy speech to Tarquin where she implores him to marry her and murder her father (4.29.2-7). Rather than being stimulated into action by her words as in Ovid or her fury as in Livy, Tarquin gladly agrees to her proposals (4.30.1).

\(^{25}\)Dionysius (4.38.5) is also emphatic in depicting Tarquin hurling Servius down the stairs as is Diodorus (10.1). While Dionysius (4.39.3) goes on to report that Tarquin sends his servants to kill the injured king, Diodorus merely relates that he was put to death but does not mention by whom. Cicero (*De Rep*. 2.45) simply states that Tarquin’s hands were stained with Servius’ blood.

\(^{26}\)Littlewood 2006:180.
Tarquin’s involvement in this attack to the extent that Livy does would undermine Ovid’s prior characterisation of both his docility and his wife’s malice.

Considering the historian’s more definitive allegation of Tarquin’s aggression in this episode, it is somewhat surprising that Ovid should point to Livy’s account through both ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality: the poet seems to invert the perspective of Livy in his description of the infirm and aged Servius being overpowered by his son-in-law (hinc cruor et caedes, infirmaque uincitur aetas – Fast. 6.599; Tarquinius ... multo et aetate et uiribus validior – Liv. 1.48.3). However, Livy does proceed to offer Tarquin some defence for his brutal actions by stating that it was sheer necessity that compelled him to physically attack the king (1.48.3) and that he was only acting in accordance with Tullia’s suggestion (Creditur, quia non abhorret a cetero scelere, admonitu Tulliae id factum – 1.48.5).27 By referring to Livy’s account then, Ovid could be drawing attention to Livy’s vindication of Tarquin, thus reinforcing his own characterisation of Tullia as the prime agent in the murder of Servius. Nevertheless, there is still a potential ambiguity in Livy’s initial assertion, and his consequent justification, of Tarquin’s violence; an ambiguity that is perhaps, only discernible by the reader when Livy is read in conjunction with the Fasti.28

The iniquity of Ovid’s Tullia is additionally bolstered by reference to Livy in relation to how she came to be married to Tarquin. Immediately prior to Tullia’s speech, in which she incites Tarquin to kill her father, Ovid states that she achieved her marriage by means of crime (6.587); Tullia then provides a mere two-line summary in her own words of how the pair killed their respective siblings and former spouses (6.589-90). In the Fasti, Tullia describes her and Tarquin as pares (6.589), a ‘direct verbal’ echo of Livy’s (dis)pares, which he uses to describe Tullia and her sister (longe dispares moribus – 1.46.5). The effect of this intertext not only directs the Fasti reader to Livy’s much more extensive account of this episode (1.46.2-9),29 but it also reinforces Ovid’s representation of Tullia’s wickedness by replicating the obvious moral implication of Livy’s description.30 In highlighting Tullia and

27 Herbert-Brown (1994:150) sees Livy here as expressing ‘uncertainty that the actual murder was at Tullia’s hands’. However, Miles’ (1995:63-4) argument that Livy is not suggesting that the story is less credible in historic terms, but in terms of moral judgement, seems more likely: ‘Tullia’s reported behavior is difficult to believe not because it is unsupported by evidence but because it is such an outrageous violation of accepted social norms’.

28 This demonstrates Edmunds’ (2001:159-63) theory of ‘retroactive intertextuality’.

29 Within this narrative, Livy himself points his reader (ut ante dictum – 1.46.5) to his prior narration of details as to how Servius attempted to divert any potential animosity the sons of Tarquinius may feel towards his ascension to the throne by marrying his daughters to them (1.42.1-2). By directing his reader to Livy’s passage at 1.46.2-9 therefore, Ovid’s reader would be able to gain the full circumstances that led up to Tullia and Tarquin’s conspiracy to murder Servius.

Tarquin’s moral parity, Ovid also ‘thematically’ reflects Livy’s declaration that the couple were drawn together by their equal wickedness (1.46.7: quoted above). Just before Tullia proceeds to instruct Tarquin to kill her father, she states regia res scelus est (6.595), verbally echoing Livy’s similar statement at the beginning of his account of the couple’s slaying of their siblings (Tulit enim et Romana regia sceleris tragici exemplum – 1.46.3). As well as being more ‘pithy’ than in Livy, thus strengthening his dismal picture of Tullia, Ovid’s exclamation ‘encompasses two marital murders already committed and a parricide-regicide now well in hand’.

Following Servius’ murder, Ovid continues to signal his engagement with Livy through a number of incidences of ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality: both writers narrate how Tullia discovers her father’s corpse in the middle of the road and commands her driver to drive over the body (Fast. 6.603-6; Liv. 1.48.6-7). Through these verbal echoes, Ovid concurs ‘thematically’ with Livy in cementing Tullia’s malevolence. Both poet and historian describe Tullia as ferox (Fast. 6.604; Liv. 1.46.6) and identify this coach as a carpentum (Fast. 6.603; Liv. 1.48.5). Littlewood notes the moral laxity associated with the word carpentum, which because of the Lex Oppia became a ‘symbol of luxuria and arrogance’.

Both authors also use the same word – resisto (Fast. 6.606; Liv. 1.48.6) – as Tullia’s command to her driver to drive over the body of Servius.

The strong ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality between Ovid and Livy clearly suggests that the poet was using the historian as his main source for his account of Servius Tullius. Not only does this direct verbal intertextuality indicate that Ovid was using Livy as a ‘factual’ source, but also, through his adaptations of Livy’s version and the different emphases these express, it denotes further ‘thematic’ intertextuality with the historian.

**Livy and Dionysius**

As has now been established, Ovid is utilising Livy as his most important source for his account of Servius, especially in terms of his characterisation of Tullia and Tarquin. As will

---

31 By presenting Tullia and Tarquin as equal in their moral laxity, Ovid could be seen to be undermining his depiction of Tullia as the more evil of the two. However, as noted above, she is still depicted as very much the driving force in the conspiracy to murder Servius, her extended passage of direct speech (6.589-96) in itself a demonstration of this (Littlewood 2006:178).
33 Littlewood 2006:179.
34 Littlewood 2006:181; Fast. 1.617-36; Liv. 34.1.3.
35 Similarly with Servius’ murder (see above), Newlands (2000:195) claims ‘Livy cautiously ascribes this event to hearsay (feritur) and thus distances himself and the reader from it’.
be examined below, Ovid’s depiction of Tullia and Tarquin is instrumental in his casting of Servius in specifically ‘plebeian’ terms. Since the comprehension of this casting is reliant on an understanding of Livy’s representation of the king, it is necessary to appreciate the character and significance of the historian’s own nuanced portrait of Servius. The most illuminating way to do this is to compare Livy’s account with that of Dionysius; not only does Dionysius provide the only other extant wide-ranging account of Servius, but the general resemblance of his and Livy’s accounts reinforce the notion that there was a long-standing \(^{36}\) ‘homogeneous tradition’ \(^{37}\) relating to Rome’s sixth king. It is only through such a comparison therefore, that Livy’s own particular depiction of Servius can be understood and consequently Ovid’s particular engagement with Livy – rather than the general tradition – can be fully appreciated. Before analysing how Ovid engages with Livy to develop his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme through his portrayal of Servius, this chapter will compare Livy and Dionysius’ versions of the life and reign of Servius.

Servius is particularly ripe for Ovid in terms of the poet’s exploration of the ‘plebeian’ aspects of Roman history in the \textit{Fasti}. The clash between Servius as a pro-patrician and pro-plebeian character was a major problem facing later annalists when dealing with the figure of Servius. The ambiguity of Servius developed in the late Republic with Sulla, \(^{38}\) who used the king as a model for his own legislative reforms to remove power from the \textit{comitia tributa} to the \textit{comitia centuriata}; in order to do this, Sulla and his supporters ‘had to present him [Servius] as a conservative ruler’. \(^{39}\) As a reaction to Sulla, the \textit{populares} adapted Servius to reflect their programme, inventing some of his popular measures, such as land distribution, which ‘can on the whole be characterised as reflecting the Gracchan and post-Gracchan age’. \(^{40}\)

While Livy and Dionysius’ accounts of Servius closely resemble each other in terms of the main biographical details (see discussion below), there are some significant variations. One

\(^{36}\) Ogilvie 1965:156; Thomsen 1980:19.

\(^{37}\) Thomsen (1980:19) claims that in relation to the main features of Servius’ biography, the sources indicate that there was ‘an homogeneous tradition’.

\(^{38}\) Ogilvie 1965:185. Scholars point out that this contradiction may have had its roots in the earliest tradition concerning Servius, in which he was an Etruscan usurper and therefore, ‘could not accept a political domination of the prominent \textit{gentes} effected through their special organ, the Senate’ (Thomsen 1980:245). Thomsen (1980:109) believes that this aspect of the tradition is reflected in Livy (1.41.6), Dionysius (4.5.3) and Cicero (\textit{De Rep.} 2.37-8) who all point out Servius’ illegal reign. For the Etruscan tradition relating to Servius see also Cornell 1995:133-41; Forsythe 2005:100; and Littlewood 2006:172.


\(^{40}\) Thomsen 1980:249. See also Gabba 1961:99-100; and Ogilvie 1965:187. Scapini (2015:279) also notes the correlation between Roman history and Greek literature as Servius’ reforms parallel those of Solon the enlightened tyrant and lawgiver.
of the main differences between Livy and Dionysius’ account of Servius is the way they deal with the problem of whether Servius was pro-patrician or pro-plebeian. Dionysius goes into considerable detail about the animosity between the senate and Servius (4.8.1-2, 4.10.4-6, 4.20.1); by omitting such detail, Livy’s account creates a far less antagonistic atmosphere between the king and the elite. Similarly, Dionysius gives much more detail about Servius’ dealings with the plebeians (4.8.3-10.1, 4.10.6-12.3, 4.20.1); although initially this appears to make Servius more favourable towards the plebeians than the patricians, ultimately he emerges as an autocrat, playing both the plebeians and the patricians in order to satiate his own personal ambition for power.41 As Thomsen states, in Dionysius especially, Servius’ measures are more demagogic in that ‘Servius systematically curried the favour of the people to win its support against the Senate’.42 Like Dionysius, Cicero’s Servius also emerges as a more Machiavellian figure, displaying a better understanding of the government of a state than any of the other kings (De Rep. 2.37), with the plebeians cast as less interested in the welfare of the state (De Rep. 2.40).

While Livy acknowledges these oppositions (1.41.6-7), he is less emphatic than Dionysius in presenting Servius as either pro-patrician or pro-plebeian; subtle indicators in Livy’s account suggest that the reader is supposed to interpret Servius as more balanced in his dealings with both the patricians and the plebeians, and if not wholly pro-plebeian, he at least shares more in common with the lower classes than with the elite. This comes across not just in Livy’s narration of Servius’ reign, but also in his account of Servius’ servile ancestry and in his use of a number of motifs similar to those used in his portrayal of Numa and antithetical to those in his account of Romulus.

Although both authors ultimately encapsulate Servius as a good, moderate and just king,43 this encapsulation sits more easily with Livy’s version – because he has created a character

41 Ridley (1975:159) claims that Dionysius ‘provides two contradictory views of Servius: as a supporter of the senate and patricians and rich, and as a supporter of the plebeians and the poor’. See also Gabba (1961:98-121).
42 Thomsen 1980:249.
43 According to Gabba (1991:157) Dionysius ultimately presents Servius as ‘the legislator who rationalized the social and political system already existing at Rome and created by the Latin League’. Le Bohec (2015:115) states that both Livy and Dionysius depict an important transformation taking place under Servius – he was a great reformer ‘who reorganised both the state and Roman society’. See also Forsythe 2005:102; Fox 2015:294; and Mineo 2015:148. However, considering his positive posthumous reputation as a good, moderate and just king (Liv. 1.48.8; Dio 4.40.3; Cic. De Rep. 3.47), Thomsen (1980:246) warns against accepting in reality the tradition of Servius as favourable to the lower classes and antagonistic to the Senate; Thomsen (1980:250) claims that although Servius’ centuriate system did change state organisation, it drew a sharp dividing line between the classes, favoured the wealthy and ‘did not introduce any kind of democracy’. Littlewood (2006:179) claims that the only surviving fragment suggesting Servius’ democratic tendencies is from Accius’ play Brutus. Martin (2015:266) maintains that Livy ‘distances Servius from the image of a tyrant’.
less in need of rehabilitation. (In contrast, as discussed in Chapter Three, by highlighting the
two contradictory sides of Romulus’ character, Livy creates a character who is in need of
reparation). Ovid then builds on these motifs in his portrayal of Servius, aligning the king
more firmly with his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ characters (Numa and Remus) in opposition to
Romulus. Not only does this reinforce the idea that Ovid is using Livy as his source, but also
that he is actively engaging with the historian; it is only by a synchronous reading of Ovid
with Livy that the nuances of Ovid’s account become clear and in particular the poet’s focus
on the more ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ aspects of Roman history. Furthermore, it is perhaps only
through a parallel reading of the Fasti and AUC that the nuances of Livy’s version of Servius
are discernible when compared to the standard representation of the tradition as represented
(as much as it can be) by Dionysius.

Comparison of Livy and Dionysius

Following his narration of his conception, birth and how he came to power (4.1.1-7.5),
Dionysius sets up an opposition between Servius and the patricians from the very beginning
of his narration of the king’s reign. After receiving the guardianship of the kingdom on
Tarquinius’ death, Dionysius relates that the patricians objected to this, since it occurred
without a decree of the senate and did not comply with other legal requirements (4.8.1-2). In
response, the patricians plan to compel Servius to lay aside his rods of office at his first
convention of the senate so they can appoint an interrex and later a legal ruler of their
choosing (4.8.1-2). Having learned of these plans, Servius ‘applies himself to flattering and
courting the poorer citizens, in hopes of retaining the sovereignty through them’ (4.8.3). He
does this by calling an assembly of the people and delivering a long speech about how he has
assumed his royal position in a bid to safeguard the future sovereignty of Tarquinius’
grandchildren (4.8.3-9.1-5), before listing a number of measures he plans to introduce for the
benefit of the lower classes, including debt relief, tax reform, land distribution and fairer
justice (4.9.6-9).

While on the surface, Servius’ promised measures appear to cast him in a pro-plebeian light
with a genuine concern for the common people, the fact that they are part of a plan to secure
his own position (4.8.3) does somewhat muddy this initial impression.

---

44 Although Dionysius makes several references to Servius’ popularity with the lower classes, including the
plebeians and slaves (3.72.7, 4.39.2), this is often achieved by his manipulation of the people for his own
ends. For example, although his introduction of the Saturnalia seems to benefit slaves, it is ultimately aimed
propositions lead to the plebeians viewing Servius in a favourable light (4.10.1), his political gaming and self-interest is evident: Dionysius relates how Servius artfully outmanoeuvred the senate to ‘get possession of the royal power against their will’ (4.10.6) by causing ‘a report to be spread throughout the city that the patricians were plotting against him’ (4.10.6).

As a result, Servius calls another public assembly saying he will resign his office if the people wish him to do so; however, they unanimously vote to elect him king (4.12.1-3).

Servius’ lack of any real concern for the plebeians and his adept political manoeuvring for his own personal gain are also evident in Dionysius’ version of the king’s centuriate reforms (4.15.1-21.3). Despite his seeming pro-plebeian stance as demonstrated by his proposed benefits to them (discussed above), Servius later denies them their democratic rights in order to appease the patricians’ discontent that these reforms left the poorer classes exempt from both taxation and military service (4.20.1).

Most telling is that according to Dionysius he did this ‘without the plebeians noticing it [elathe tous dēmotikous]’ (4.20.1) thereby outwitting the people (4.21.1).

In contrast to Dionysius, Livy does not present such an explicit opposition between Servius and the patricians. Not only does Livy omit much of the detail of Servius’ ‘to-ing’ and ‘fro-ing’ between the patricians and the plebeians that Dionysius relates (4.8.1-12.3, 4.20.1: discussed above), but he downplays the illegality of Servius’ rule (1.41.6-7): ultimately Livy’s new king is accepted by both the patricians and the plebeians with much more ease than in Dionysius (1.42.3).

at making them more acquiescent to their masters and accepting of their lot in life (4.14.3-4); similarly, he gives foreign slaves plebeian rights and status, but only as a way to increase the citizen body (4.22.3). Furthermore, Dionysius notes that while Servius may have been the first Roman to have received the sovereignty from the people alone, he did this only by bribing and courting the favour of the poor (4.40.1). 45 Cicero seems to take a similar stance to Dionysius; after explaining Servius’ centuriate reforms, Scipio states that the majority of votes was in the hands of those to whom the highest welfare of the State was the most important (2.40). In this way, a negative judgement against the plebeians could be implied in the sense that they are less capable of voting in the interests of the state. Compare this to Livy (1.43.10) who offers a clinical explanation of the reforms with no personal judgement.

46 Dionysius then goes on to give a relatively lengthy explanation as to how this ‘deception’ worked with this new voting system (4.21.1-3). Its undemocratic nature is further highlighted by Dionysius’ comment that ‘this form of government was maintained by the Romans for many generations, but is altered in our times and changed to a more democratic form’ (4.21.3).

47 The animosity of Dionysius’ patricians towards Servius on account of his illegal rule is negated by Livy, who in contrast states that Servius primus iniussu populi, voluntate patrum regnavit (1.41.6). Later, when Servius returns from a campaign against Veii, Livy’s intimation of Servius’ unlawful rule is quickly glossed over as he is readily accepted as king by both the patricians and the plebeians (fusoque ingenti hostium exercitu haud dubius rex, seu patrum seu plebis animos periclitaretur, Romam reedit – 1.42.3). Earlier in his account of Servius, after his narration of Servius’ conception and birth (1.39.1-6) and prior to the murder of Tarquinius Priscus (1.40.2-7), Livy states that both the king and Servius were held in the very highest esteem by both the patricians and the plebeians (non apud regem modo sed apud patres plebeis longe maximo honore Ser. Tullius erat – 1.40.1).
Instead of underlining any hostility between Servius and the patricians as Dionysius does, Livy seems to transfer this opposition to Servius and Tarquin. Not only does this lessen the sense of animosity between Servius and the patricians preferred by Dionysius, but it also diminishes Dionysius’ depiction of Servius’ personal ambition for power. Rather than in the context of a plot against him by the patricians (D.H. 4.10.6), it is in response to a report from Tarquin that he is ruling without the consent of the people that Livy’s Servius proceeds to gain the goodwill of the plebeians with land distribution measures; he is then unanimously voted as king (1.46.1). In a bid to usurp Servius, Tarquin seats himself on the king’s throne in the curia and launches into a tirade of abuse (maledicta – 1.47.10) in which he accuses Servius of abetting the lower classes and of hating the nobility (1.47.11) and abuses him for his lowly birth and illegal rise to power (1.47.10). By placing this information entirely in the mouth of Tarquin (although it is not direct speech), Livy manages to insinuate potentially negative (or contradictory) aspects of the historical tradition about Servius, while still minimising any sense of the king’s clash with the patricians or his manipulation of the plebeians for his own autocratic ends. Livy makes Servius’ rule seem if not entirely legal, then at least morally legitimate, thus mitigating any sense of personal ambition on Servius’ behalf.

While both historians give a similar account of Tanaquil in terms of basic ‘fact’, Dionysius’ narration of her role in Servius’ ascent to the throne demonstrates more royal personal aspiration than the equivalent account in Livy. Both Dionysius and Livy narrate how after Tarquinius is fatally wounded by the Marcii brothers, Tanaquil proposes that his death be kept secret from the people of Rome and that Servius should take over the king’s duties in a bid to establish his position before the death of Tarquinius is finally revealed (D.H. 4.4.2-5.2; Liv. 1.41.1-6). Thomsen claims that both Livy and Dionysius give the same report that ‘Tanaquil in concert with Servius carried through a cunning plan’. In Livy, however, this plan appears as more the work of Tanaquil than of Servius; she very much

48 Whereas Livy (1.42.1) identifies Lucius Tarquinius and his brother Arruns Tarquinius as the sons of Priscus Tarquinius, Dionysius (4.6.1-6) disputes this, claiming they were his grandsons.
49 Livy begins this episode by stating that Servius quamquam iam usu haud dubie regnum possederat (1.46.1), thus further diminishing Tarquin's accusation that iniussu populi regnare (1.46.1).
50 Later Dionysius reports that Servius learns that Tarquin is leading a conspiracy against him. The pair thus engage in a lengthy debate in the senate as to the legality or otherwise of Servius’ rule (4.31.1-36.3). The more balanced tone adopted by Tarquin, in comparison to his verbal abuse of Servius in Livy, perhaps lead the reader to believe that Dionysius’ Tarquin has a legitimate point, thus reinforcing his overall portrayal of Servius as a skilled politician with an aspiration for power.
51 Thomsen 1980:10.
52 Thomsen 1980:10.
takes the lead, commanding Servius ‘like a general before battle’ to do as she bids, with no interjection from him. Although, in Dionysius, Tanaquil also issues orders for the closing and clearing of the palace after Tarquinius is fatally wounded (4.4.3), her speech to Servius is much less authoritative than in Livy. Dionysius not only betrays Servius’ more active role in Tanaquil’s plans, but he also intimates his sense of personal ambition by describing him as a man of action, who was keen not to let the opportunity for power slip from his grasp (4.4.1-2).

Livy also seems eager to convey a stronger sense of pacifism in Rome’s sixth king. In comparison to Dionysius, Livy omits much detail about Servius’ military campaign against Veii, simply stating that the war was most opportune for the tranquillity of the state and that Servius’ bravery and good fortune were conspicuous in his defeat of the enemy (1.42.2-3). Considering the brevity of Livy’s account, it is perhaps surprising to learn from Dionysius that this war proceeded for twenty years and included many pitched battles (4.27.3-4) that exhausted all sides both in terms of men and money (4.27.4). Not only does Livy downplay Servius’ militarism by the brevity of his account of the campaign against Veii, but he also seems keen to balance it with a reference to Servius’ most important work of peace – the

---

53 Ogilvie 1965:161. Ogilvie adds that the style of Tanaquil’s oration to Servius contrasts with her ‘precise and matter-of-fact’ speech to the people, aiding Livy’s picture of her as ‘a clever and unscrupulous woman’.

54 Tanaquil’s authority in Livy is demonstrated by her issuing of orders for the palace to be closed after Tarquinius is first attacked (iubet – 1.41.1); her use of imperatives in her speech to Servius (erige te - 1.41.3; reputa - 1.41.3) and the double use of nunc (Nunc te illa caelestis excitet flamma; nunc expergiscere uere - 1.41.3). Her concluding statement perhaps most revealing in terms of her being the driving force behind this plan (Si tua re subita consilia torpent, at tu mea consilia sequere - 1.41.3).

55 Tanaquil’s plans seem much more of a group enterprise in Dionysius. Whereas in Livy, Tanaquil only addresses Servius - beginning her speech tuum est ... Servui (1.41.2-3), in Dionysius she addresses Servius, his wife and mother Ocrisia (4.2.3), with a speech that is replete in first person plurals (‘we’ must not let the murderers of Tarquinius obtain power, ‘let us conceal [kruptōmetha]’ Tarquinius’ death – 4.4.4-8. Later, when Tanaquil speaks to the public, she merely ‘commends [synistēsin]’ (4.5.2) Servius as guardian of the king’s interests, rather than commanding them to obey him as she does in Livy (Ser. Tullio iubere populum dicto audientem esse – 1.41.5).

56 Although Livy does state that on assuming the kingship Servius took steps to assure his position (Nec iam publicis magis consiliis Servius quam priuatis munire opes - 1.42.1), this is immediately followed by an account of how Servius married his daughters to the sons of Tarquinius in a bid that they might not show the same animosity towards him as the Marcii did to Priscus Tarquinius (1.42.1). By contrast, Servius’ humanis consiliis (1.42.2) in adopting this measure to the treachery, hostility and jealously shown towards him by members of his household (1.41.2), Livy appears to justify Servius rule and displace any sense of his megalomania. The idea that Servius is seeking the kingship to sate his personal thirst for power is further diminished by Livy; in her speech, Tanaquil is emphatic in stressing the divine favour of Servius (1.41.3). While Dionysius acknowledges this, he is less emphatic than Livy (4.2.2, 4.4.1, 4.40.6-7).

57 Dionysius also provides a relatively lengthy narration of the Servius’ military achievements before his kingship (4.3.1-3) and mentions that Servius was awarded ‘three most splendid triumphs’ (4.27.3). Cicero also highlights Servius’ militarism – as part of a potted biography of the king, Scipio notes that Servius made war on the Etruscans and avenged the wrongs of which they were guilty (De Rep. 2.38).
centuriate reforms (1.42.4). Livy then compares these reforms with Numa’s introduction of religion (1.42.4-5). Through this direct comparison between Servius and Numa, Livy appears to cast Rome’s sixth king in a similar vein to Rome’s second king (see Chapter Four) by – if not wholly making him a pacifist – at least balancing his militaristic exploits with his works of peace. Conversely, Dionysius’ more martial Servius would seem to have more in common with Livy’s Romulus (see Chapter Three), and he is placed on an equal plane with both Rome’s first and second kings.

Ovid and Livy

Through this comparison with Dionysius, Livy can be seen to be creating his own specific portrait of Servius. While Livy does not explicitly cast Servius as either pro-patrician or pro-plebeian, he does emerge as less manipulative, ambitious and militaristic than his Dionysian counterpart. Through these characteristics, and a direct comparison, Livy depicts Servius as having more in common with Numa than Romulus. As will be explored below, Ovid can be seen to be casting Rome’s sixth king in decidedly ‘plebeian’ terms. Ovid’s engagement with Livy in his narration of Servius’ has already been established in this chapter, through the above examination of a range of examples of both ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality. It seems likely therefore, that the poet’s representation of Servius is a specific response to Livy, not to the tradition in general: the poet is expanding the more understated ‘plebeian’ aspects of the historian’s portrait of the king.

58 Livy stresses this balance in relation to Servius’ census and centuriate reforms in two further references to their suitability to both war and peace (1.42.5). Similarly, in shaping all domestic policy, Livy again seems to tip the balance more in favour of peace than war (formatis omnibus domi et ad belli et ad pacis usus – 1.45.1), adding that ne semper armis opes adquirerentur, consilio augere imperium conatus est (1.45.1). Dionysius also notes Servius’ achievement in war and peace (4.27.7), but he does not stress Servius’ pacifism overall to the same extent that Livy does.

59 Although Livy notes that Servius enrolled twelve centuries, three of which had been instituted by Romulus (1.43.9), and notes that Servius’ reforms differ from those of Romulus (and the other kings) (1.43.10), he does not make any direct comparison between Servius and Romulus as he had for Servius and Numa (1.42.4-5).

60 Dionysius does not make any direct comparison between Servius, Numa or Romulus, but he does seem to put them on an equal footing by claiming that Servius ‘drew up laws, in some cases renewing old laws that had been introduced by Romulus and Numa Pompillianus and had fallen into abeyance, and establishing others himself’ (4.10.3). Cicero also places Romulus, Numa and Servius on a par by citing all three as examples of ‘just kings’ (3.47). However, some scholars see a link between Livy’s Servius and Romulus; according to Mineo (2015:148), in Livy ‘Servius Tullius embodies the accomplishment of the institutional and moral evolution of Rome initiated by Romulus, a first apex in the history of the Urbs’. Mineo adds that Livy depicts Servius as possessing similar moral attributes to Camillus, Scipio and Augustus and that this indicates to the reader that he has achieved the ‘perfect political balance’.
Just as Livy omits some details of Servius’ reign so as not to draw attention to the problems of his patrician / plebeian stance (like Dionysius does), Ovid goes one step further by not including any information about Servius’ political reforms. By not raising this issue, Ovid is free to forge strong links between Servius and the plebeians. Furthermore, since Servius’ centuriate reforms were essentially military in nature, Ovid’s failure to mention them (or indeed any of Servius’ military achievements, which are likewise downplayed by Livy) strengthens the implicit link between Servius and the Fasti’s peace-loving Numa. It is through this emphasis on Servius pacifism, as well as on his centuriate reforms, that Livy makes both explicit and implicit comparisons between Rome’s sixth and second king. This prominence enables Ovid to build on the Livian Servius and go on to create an opposition between the sixth king and his malevolent and Romulus-like daughter Tullia. Of course, these omissions could also be the result of the thematic and generic concerns of both this individual episode and the Fasti as a whole. The details of Servius’ political or military career might be superfluous to an aetiology of why the statue in Fortuna’s temple is covered by togas and his centuriate reforms might be ‘generically unapproachable’, just as his military career is generically inappropriate. However, such thematic and generic constraints have not prevented Ovid from dealing with similar political concerns in his depiction of other characters such as Romulus and Numa (see Chapters Three and Four). It is perhaps, rather, that this very act of omission is not only calling attention to his engagement with Livy, but is additionally being used by the poet to make his own very particular comment on this aspect of Roman history.

The first hint of Servius’ ‘plebeian’ associations in Ovid’s account occur in the second reason he gives for Fortuna’s statue being covered by togas:

... post Tulli funera plebem
confusam placidi morte fuisse ducis,
nec modus ullus erat, crescebat imagine luctus,

---

62 As Littlewood (2006:xlix - l) suggests Servius’ centuriate reforms and his connection to the goddess Fortuna who ‘was directly associated with military victory’ meant he ‘presented Ovid with a generic challenge’.
Later, in Ovid’s account of Servius’ murder, this plebeian grief is reflected in the tears of the carriage driver whom Tullia forces to drive over the body of her father (*corpus ut aspexit, lacrimis auriga profusis / restitit... – 6.605-6*). While both Livy and Dionysius also relate this event, Ovid’s version looks to Livy in terms of detail: the poet signals his engagement with the historian through ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality (*resisto – Fast. 6.606; Liv. 1.48.6: as discussed above*). Furthermore, Ovid seems to build on Livy’s emotional characterisation of the driver, converting his terror on first seeing Servius’ body in Livy (1.48.6) into anguish in the *Fasti* (6.605). The emotional effect of seeing the lifeless Servius seems much less profound for Dionysius’ driver. Although moved by the piteous spectacle (4.39.4), his reaction is calmer, and there is a possible hint of sarcasm when he asks Tullia ‘Do you not see your father lying dead, Tullia, and that there is no other way but over the body?’ (4.39.4). The fact that Dionysius feels the need to explain that the driver was more upset by ‘shocking deed [tô pathei]’ than the physical assault he receives from Tullia, perhaps dilutes the impact of this act (4.39.5). As Ogilvie notes, while the similarity between Livy and Dionysius in terms of the details of the episode suggest they were using the same source, ‘most of the tragic features of the story in Livy are due to Livy himself’.

The affection felt for Servius by the *plebs* that these events betray in the *Fasti*, contrasts sharply with the malevolence of Tullia which, as examined above, Ovid has consciously intensified by building on Livy’s portrait of her. The main way in which Ovid develops Livy’s character of Tullia is through her speech to Tarquin in which she incites him to murder her father (*Fast. 6.589-96; Liv. 1.47.3-6*); the poet adapts certain words and phrases of the historian’s version to emphasise her aggression, cunning and malice. Dionysius’ version of Tullia’s speech contrasts considerably with Ovid and Livy both in terms of succinctness and tone. Representing more of a rhetorical exercise in which Tullia implores Tarquin to consider the legitimacy of his right to the throne, her speech shows none of the demands for action that Ovid and Livy do; she even goes as far as to seek Tarquin’s

---

64 Dionysius’ account of this episode differs from Livy’s and Ovid’s in that it is first the mules, rather than the driver, that become distressed at the sight of Servius’ body; the driver then asks Tullia directly if she has seen his body (4.39.4; he has no direct speech in Livy or Ovid). Dionysius continues to narrate that Tullia, in her anger at her driver having stopped the carriage, throws a stool at him before commanding him to drive over the body (4.39.4; there is no stool throwing in Livy or Ovid). Dionysius is perhaps, more explicit in his narration that the driver then ‘led the mules forcibly over body’ (4.39.5), whereas Livy reports *Tullia per patris corpus carpentum egisse fertur* (1.48.7) and Ovid makes no direct reference to this act, instead stating *certa fides facti: dictus Sceleeratus ab ilia* (6.609).
65 Ogilvie 1965:186. Ogilvie (1965:189) also notes a ‘high tragic vein’ in Livy’s speech of Tullia.
permission to speak and assurance of confidentiality (4.29.1-2) before her lengthy address (4.29.1-7). Later, after Tarquin challenged Servius’ position by seating himself on the throne, Tullia merely advises him to ‘put Servius out of the way’ (4.39.2-3).66

Ovid also expands on Livy’s characterisation of Tullia as the instigator of the conspiracy to kill her father (analysed above). Although Ovid, Livy and Dionysius all highlight the parity of the couple’s evil natures (Fast. 6.589-90; Liv. 1.46.7; D.H. 4.28.2-3, 4.30.4-5),67 Dionysius, in contrast to Ovid and Livy, very much assigns them equal parts in planning the crime.68 It is Tarquin who is first noted as planning to drive Servius from the throne (4.28.3) and he gladly agrees to the course of action Tullia proposes in her speech (all expressed in the first-person plural – 4.29.7) to achieve this (4.30.1) – and together they plot Servius’ downfall (4.30.5). Although, as in Livy (1.48.3-4), Dionysius has Tarquin throw Servius down the senate-house steps, it is on Tullia’s subsequent advice that he sends some of his servants after the wounded king to finish the job (4.39.2-3).69

Ogilvie notes that there is nothing in Dionysius that corresponds to Tullia’s speech in Livy. Instead, Dionysius sets up a lengthy, but ineffective, debate between Servius and Tarquin in which they deliberate as to who has the rightful claim to the throne (4.31.1-36.3); Livy has substituted for this ‘a dramatic scene between Tullia and Tarquin largely of his own composition’.70 It is mainly through Tullia’s dialogue that Ovid closely engages with Livy in order to develop the historian’s version of this character, elaborating on her malevolence and putting her firmly in the spotlight for Servius’ murder: ‘in the Fasti, the majority of the narrative is centred on Tullia’s heinous words and deeds alone’.71 As well as elaborating on this, Ovid also uses Tullia’s speech to build an opposition between her and her more ‘plebeian’ father. The nature of Tullia’s speech in the Fasti has much in common with Romulus’ dialogue in the poem (see Chapter Four); just like Romulus’ speech, Tullia’s

---

66 Tullia also ‘advises’ Tarquinius on what to do next after he has failed to secure Servius’ resignation from the kingship and Tarquinius considers her advice as ‘excellent’ (4.38.1).
67 Dionysius stresses the ‘bold, arrogant and tyrannical nature’ of Tarquin as much as he does Tullia’s rashness and wickedness (4.28.2-3); he also emphasises the equality of their impious and bloodthirsty natures in plotting Servius’ downfall together (4.30.4-5).
68 It is hard to agree with Herbert-Brown (1994:150) who claims that Dionysius lays the blame for Servius’ murder wholly on Tarquin and yet acknowledges the assistance of Tullia. It is also worth noting that in Dionysius, when Tarquin has seated himself on the throne, it is Servius who rushes at him first, precipitating his killing (4.38.4).
69 Littlewood (2006:180) notes Ovid’s use of sanguinulentus to describe the deaths of Servius (6.602), Lucretia (2.832) and Remus (4.844, 5.470). Bömer (1958:ii.189) also notes its use in relation to Dido (3.640).
70 Ogilvie 1965:189.
71 Newlands 2000:194.
discourse is confined to raising questions and giving commands\textsuperscript{72} and is littered with imperatives (\textit{i – 6.594; exige – 6.594; cape – 6.595; tingue – 6.596; duc – 6.608}). The tone and style of both Tullia’s and Romulus’ speeches contrast significantly with the conversational manner of Numa’s discourse in the \textit{Fasti} (see Chapter Four). Tullia’s speech demonstrates her brutality in much the same way that Romulus’ speech displays his bellicosity. Moreover, Tullia’s command to her husband to kill his socer and seize his regna (6.595; also \textit{sceptra gener socero rapta Superbus habet – 6.600) recalls the Sabine war that was the result of Romulus’ initiation of the rape of the Sabine women \textit{(tum primum generis intulit arma socer – 3.202: as explored in Chapter Three). By casting Tullia in similar terms to Romulus and creating a contrast between her and the plebeians, Ovid could be seen to be mirroring the juxtaposition he creates between the ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ Numa and his antithesis Romulus in other parts of the \textit{Fasti} (see Chapter Three). Although this does not in itself set up an immediate opposition between Tullia and Servius, such a dichotomy does emerge if Ovid’s subsequent portrayal of Rome’s sixth king in ‘plebeian’ terms is taken into consideration.

Another way in which Ovid casts Servius in ‘plebeian’ terms is through his account of the king’s conception and birth which occurs at the end of his narration of the festival of Fortuna (6.627-36). Although Ovid cites a god – Vulcan – as Servius’ father, he also emphasises the king’s servile maternity, thus establishing his ‘plebeian’ affiliation which will be reinforced later in the \textit{Fasti} (see below).\textsuperscript{73} While Ovid’s version of Servius’ conception differs to that of Livy (1.39.5-6), the poet can still be seen to be conversing with the historian by supplementing the mythical aspects of Livy’s account (as he has done with other episodes explored in previous chapters).

Ovid reports that while performing the sacred rites together, Tanaquil and Ocresia saw the shape of a male organ in the ashes of the fire in the hearth, and that Tanaquil ordered Ocresia to sit on it, thereby becoming pregnant (6.629-34). Livy makes no reference to this version of Servius’ conception, although he may indicate he is aware of it by stating of Servius’ upbringing in the royal palace and betrothal to Tarquinius’ daughter: \textit{credere prohibet serua natum eum paruumque ipsum seruisse} (1.39.5). The historian then proceeds to give his preferred account that Servius was the son of the chief of Corniculum and that he and his mother were rescued from slavery and taken to live at the palace when that city was captured

\textsuperscript{72} Except in his lament over the rape of the Sabine women 2.431-4 (see Chapter Three).

\textsuperscript{73} Pasco-Pranger (2006:271) notes that although Servius’ father is clearly identified as Vulcan, Servius’ servile origins are also explicit – his mother is decidedly a slave who submits to Tanaquil’s orders (6.630; 6.633) and nothing said of her possible noble origins. Servius therefore is ‘both serua natus and deo prognatus’.
by the Romans (1.39.5-6). Although Dionysius also reports the same ‘fabulous’ account of Servius’ pyrogenous conception as Ovid (4.2.1-3), he also narrates the same version as Livy and states that this is the account that he can best agree with (1.4.2). Both Ovid and Livy report that when Servius was an infant, his head burst into flames, but Livy reports this fire prodigy as a favourable portent of his future kingship (1.39.1-4), whereas Ovid interprets it as proof of his divine paternity (6.635-6). Ovid’s decision to highlight the legendary version of Servius’ conception obviously fits in with the thematic and generic concerns of the Fasti – just as Livy’s choice to omit it fits in with his (Preface 8-9). Ogilvie claims that the tradition of the fire appearing around Servius’ head as a child was the rationalised and more respectable version of the more primitive story of how Servius was conceived by a flame in the shape of a male organ. In this way, Ovid once again appears to augment the mythical aspects of the tradition that Livy chose to exclude.

Despite Livy’s protestations that Servius’ parentage had nothing to do with slaves (1.39.5-6: the length of which are possibly an indication that he is protesting too much), ‘the rest of his account depends on the king’s birth as a slave’. It is Servius’ servility and consequent foreignness that form the main reasons as to why Ancus Marcius’ sons object to Servius’ prospective kingship and decide to kill the king (Liv. 1.40.1-4; 1.40.3; 1.47.10, 11; 1.48.2). In contrast, in Dionysius it is Servius’ illegal ascension to the throne that offends Tarquin rather than his servile maternity, which is only mentioned briefly in this context (4.38.4). By asserting Servius’ servile ancestry through his choice of explanation of Servius’ conception Ovid would seem to answer, or at least challenge, Livy’s uncertainty. Moreover, it is through his servile heritage that Ovid establishes Servius’ more pro-plebeian credentials. In doing so

74 Littlewood (2006:186) suggests that Verrius Flaccus could have been one of Ovid’s sources for this story. Cicero does not provide any details of Servius’ conception or birth beyond remarking that his mother was a slave in the household of Tarquinius and his father was one of the king’s dependents (De Rep. 2.37); however, there is possibly a vague allusion to the fire-prodigy in this passage (scintilla ingenii). There is also a brief reference to the fire-prodigy in De Div. 1.121.
75 Ogilvie (1965:158-60) believes that the oldest version of Servius’ parentage related that his mother was a slave woman and the fire-god Vulcan was his father (as told by Ovid Fast. 6.627-8). However, ‘a more sceptical age’ substituted the fire-god as Servius’ father with one of Tarquinius’ clients – Ogilvie presumes this to be the account offered by Fabius Pictor. Ogilvie argues that a father, who was a mere client of the king, would have been considered ‘too humble for the greatest of Rome’s kings’, hence a royal father was invented for Servius, probably by Valerius Antias. Ogilvie further asserts that the version of events that states that the fire prodigy occurred when Servius was a baby (as found in Ovid Fast. 634-6 and Livy 1.39.1-3) probably came from Macer. Valerius Antias’ states that the fire prodigy occurred not when Servius was an infant but as he lay dying (FRHist. fr. 20).
76 Ridley 1975:155. See also Pasco-Pranger 2006:271. Livy is also more explicit as to Servius’ servile birth at 4.3.12.
77 Livy’s explanation that Servius’ mother was really rescued from slavery on account of her unique nobility and brought to live with her son at the palace, also raises the question as to why he was being brought up in such a humble fashion (1.39.3).
he forges an even closer association between the king and the plebeians than is expressed by Livy.

Ovid further confirms Servius’ lower class heritage and thus his ‘plebeian’ links in his narration of the festival of Fors Fortuna (6.771-84):\(^78\) *conuenit et seruis, serua quia Tullius ortus / constituit dubiae templae propinquae deae* (6.783-4). As well as noting the suitability of this festival for slaves and plebeians because of the humble rank of its founder (6.781-4), the outdoor location and *coronae\(^79\)* worn by the revellers attribute a certain bucolic quality to the setting of this festival that is held in common with other ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ figures in the *Fasti* (namely Remus and Numa as discussed in Chapters Three and Four). As will be discussed in Chapter Seven, the open air drunken revelry by the riverbank also reflects the celebrations of another popular festival, that of Anna Perenna (3.523-42).\(^80\)

As well as this rustic setting, other elegiac imagery is also evident in Ovid’s earlier narration of Servius; from the very start of his aition of Fortuna, ‘Ovid’s vocabulary in the first two couplets (573-60) transposes the cultic associations of Servius and Fortuna into the world of amatory elegy’.\(^81\) While this may not be surprising in an elegiac poem, as we have seen already, Ovid’s use of elegiac motifs is not always just confined merely by the generic convention of the *Fasti*. Just as with Romulus, Remus and Numa, Ovid uses generic conventions as part of his specific casting of these figures, with his more ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ characters – Remus and Numa – notably more elegiac than Romulus (see Chapters Three

\(^{78}\) Barchiesi (1997:264-5) and Syme (1978:33) note Ovid’s omission of the anniversary of Augustus’ official adoption of Tiberius in favour of a popular festival. This could demonstrate how Ovid combined his interest in the plebeian features of Rome’s history combined with a critique of current imperial issues. With its ‘deep roots in the lives of the Roman masses’ the cult of Fors Fortuna stood in stark relief to Tiberius’ Claudian family who were ‘the pinnacle of aristocracy, with a well-known reputation for intolerance and arrogance’ (Barchiesi 1997:265). Despite Tiberius’ efforts to reverse the anti-plebeian tradition of his ancestors and regain popular support (Syme 1978:33-4) by amongst other things, the dedication of a temple to Fors Fortuna in 17 AD (Platner and Ashby 1926:213; and Carandini 2012:557), he merits no mention in this context in the *Fasti*. As Barchiesi (1997:265) maintains, instead Ovid talks of the humble Servius and ‘a very different kind of monarchy. To speak of his accession to the throne is not at all diplomatic if the day should be dedicated to a more recent successor; the king celebrated for his humble origins is not an appropriate substitute for Tiberius’.

\(^{79}\) Littlewood (2006:224) notes that the garlanded boats (6.779) are also reminiscent of the garlanded donkeys at another ‘popular’ festival, the Vestalia (6.311).

\(^{80}\) Littlewood 2006:224. Through the resemblance in the phrasing *plebs colit hanc* (6.981) with *plebs uenit ac* (3.525), Littlewood (2006:225) further note ‘a similarity in the character of the “worshippers”’ at this festival and that of Anna Perenna.

\(^{81}\) Littlewood 2006:174. In explaining Fortuna’s shame at her love for Servius as one possible reason for the covering of her statue, Ovid states that she *furtius ... amores* (6.573), leading Littlewood (2006:174) to assert ‘the customary secrecy which attended illicit love intrigues in Roman elegy made *furtius* a conventional adjective to describe *amores*. Littlewood (175) adds that the use of Roman amatory elegy continues at 6.575 and (182) at 6.608 (see below); at 6.623-4 Littlewood (185) further notes that beginning and ending a couplet with *esse* was ‘a common device in Ovid’s elegiac verse’. 142
and Four). By similarly applying elegiac tropes to Servius, Ovid reinforces his ‘plebeian’ credentials still further by forging a link between him and Remus and Numa in opposition to Romulus.82

Interestingly, there are also small traces of this correlation between Servius and Numa – and consequent opposition between Servius and Romulus – in Livy. As examined above, Livy highlights Servius’ pacifism (as he does with Numa – see Chapter Four) and makes direct comparisons between the two kings; this contrasts with Dionysius who highlights Servius’ militarism and equates him to both Numa and Romulus. In common with Numa, Livy also highlights Servius’ learning (1.39.4) and use of diplomacy rather than arms (1.45.1). Moreover, Servius’ own adversaries – the Marcii brothers and Tarquin – appear to identify more with Romulus. On hearing they have been ousted from inheriting the kingship by Tarquinius’ marriage of Servius to his daughter, the Marcii express their disgust at the son of a slave becoming king with the exemplum of Romulus:

\[\text{ut in eadem ciuitate post centesimum fere annum quam Romulus deo prognatus deus ipse tenuerit regnum donec in terris fuerit, id Seruius seruus serua natus possideat} (1.40.3)\].

---

82 Littlewood (2006:182) notes how at 6.608, in ordering her driver to drive over the body of Servius, ‘Ovid chooses shockingly brutal language to accentuate Tullia’s unwomanly ruthlessness and inhumanity. Spondees heighten the drama of the first three words’. This contrasts with the ‘elegiac pathos of the vehicle’s “reluctant” wheels [which] foreshadow the speaking statue and the supernatural voice of Fortuna’. Littlewood (2002a:208) posits a similarity between Servius and Numa in relation to their divine ‘lovers’, with Servius’ union with Fortuna ... described in similar terms as Numa’s association with the nymph, Egeria, coniunx consiliumque (3.276)’.
CHAPTER SIX
The early Republic in the Fasti and Livy

Introduction

In the preceding chapters, Ovid’s engagement with Livy has been examined in relation to the poet’s narration of the lives of Romulus and Remus, Numa and Servius. Within this analysis, this thesis has established evidence of a systematic dialogue between the two authors; not only does this suggest that Ovid closely follows Livy, but also that he is developing a consistent ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ emphasis or theme within his narration of ‘historical’ events in the Fasti.

This chapter moves on from the regal period and applies the same level of enquiry to Ovid’s account of three episodes within the Republican era. In doing so, it reveals how Ovid continues to engage with Livy, using him as his main reference point. It is, as in the regal period, through this relationship with his predecessor in prose that Ovid can be seen to be continuing the pursuit of his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme. The treatment of these episodes will be briefer than those already examined in the regal period, in large part because the amount of lines Ovid devotes to them is less than that applied to Romulus and Remus (377 lines), Numa (179 lines) and Servius (seventy-four lines); at fifty-three lines the Gallic siege receives the most coverage, followed by the Fabii at the Cremera (forty-eight lines) and Anna Perenna and the plebeian secession (twelve lines). This is part of a wider pattern (as noted in Chapter One), in which Ovid’s treatment of historical episodes generally diminishes in length as we move away from early Rome and into the era of the Republic (see Chapter Seven). That said, Ovid still provides three relatively lengthy accounts of Republican ‘historical’ episodes, devoting forty-four lines to the exile and return of the flute-players (6.649-92), fifty-two lines to the Floralia (5.279-530) and 102 lines to Magna Mater’s journey to Rome (4.247-348) (as will be explored in Chapter Seven).

Part one of this chapter will examine Ovid’s narration of Anna Perenna and the first secession of the plebs to the Sacred Mount in 494 BC. It will demonstrate how, perhaps more than with any other events in the Fasti, ‘thematic’ intertextuality with Livy in these episodes challenges modern perceptions of Ovid’s lack of ‘historical consciousness’ in the poem. Furthermore, it is only by a parallel reading of Ovid with Livy that, once more, the poet’s interest in the ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ associations of this event can be fully realised.
Genre will also form a large part of the discussion in part two of this chapter – which relates to Ovid’s coverage of the Fabii at the battle of the Cremera in 477 BC. Although Ovid’s use of Livy for this event has been recognised in modern scholarship, the current chapter will argue that this engagement demonstrates more than just ‘generic’ experimentation on behalf of the poet; through use of genre, amongst other things, Ovid casts the Fabii in ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ terms. This in turn offers a new way of reading their defeat at the Cremera.

In part three of this chapter, the poet’s version of the Gallic siege of 390 BC will be analysed. This analysis will once again demonstrate how the ‘historical’ scope of this passage can only be realised when read in conjunction with Livy. It will further assert that through Ovid’s ‘thematic’ engagement with Livy, the poet continues to explore his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme within his narration of this event.

These three events make up the majority of Ovid’s narration of the early Republic up until the Gallic siege. Within this time period (as shown in the ‘history of Rome’ chart in Chapter One), Ovid only makes brief references to three other ‘historical’ events: the Decemvirs’ law code (2.53-4: see Chapter Four, footnote 61), the war with the Volsci and Aequi in 431 BC (6.721-4) and Camillus’ conquest of Veii in 396 BC (1.641; 6.361: see below).

**PART ONE: ANNA PERENNA AND THE PLEBEIAN SECESSION TO THE SACRED MOUNT**

**The Sources**

The first event Ovid narrates in his coverage of the Republican era (in chronological terms) involves Anna Perenna and the secession of the plebs to the Sacred Mount in 494 BC. The basic narrative generally reported in the annalistic sources\(^1\) is that, following years of debt and military service, the plebeians sought their own magistracy in order to gain protection against the repressive conduct of the patricians, and withdrew to the Sacred Mount in protest.\(^2\) In an attempt to dissuade the plebs from their dissent, Menenius told them the fable of the body and the limbs, as a metaphorical demonstration of the mutual reliance between the higher and lower classes of society. On ending their secession, the plebeians were

---

\(^1\) Smith (2012:110) claims that the ancient sources are generally unanimous, ‘with a few variations’, in their narration of events regarding the origins of the plebeian tribunate.

\(^2\) Scullard 1935:76; Ogilvie 1965:293; and Vasaly 2015:38.
eventually rewarded with the creation of the tribunate.\(^3\) Few pre-Livian sources survive for the first plebeian secession to the Sacred Mount.\(^4\) One fragment from Piso (\textit{FRHist.} fr. 24) claims that the secession was made to the Aventine\(^5\) and not the Mons Sacer, while another discusses the number of plebeian tribunes elected as a result of the action (\textit{FRHist.} fr. 25); these are the ‘earliest references in the Roman annalistic tradition to the office of the tribune of the plebs’.

Ogilvie believes that Dionysius’ account of the event ‘is pungently Valerian’, meaning Valerius Antias must have provided an account; but he claims Livy (2.31.7-33.3) probably used Licinius Macer as his source for the actual secession.\(^7\) While the parable of the body and the limbs is likely to be ultimately of Greek extraction – Dionysius himself states that it was composed in the manner of Aesop (6.83.2)\(^8\) – Ogilvie suggests it was introduced into Roman historiography by Fabius Pictor and his successors.\(^9\) Dionysius (6.83.2) claims Menenius’ apologue was recorded by all the ancient historians (without specifying particular historians he might have in in mind). No mention of the secession appears to survive from Ennius.

Cicero (\textit{De Rep.} 2.58-9) notes the secession first to the Sacred Mount and then to the Aventine in the context of the state’s debt crisis - which ultimately led to the creation of the tribune of the plebeians. According to Ogilvie, there are probable echoes of the parable of the body and the limbs in Cicero’s discussion of the topic that wrongful gains are against the laws and nature and threaten the security of human society (\textit{Off.} 3.21-2).\(^10\) Diodorus makes a brief reference to the election of plebeian tribunes, but does not mention the secession itself (11.68.8).

---

\(^3\) The war with the Aequi and Volsci in 431 BC - to which Ovid makes a brief reference (6.721-4) - also occurs in the context of the plebeian fight for consular power. Due to the brevity of Ovid’s reference however, information from another source is required to attain full knowledge of the details of this conflict. When read in conjunction with Livy (4.25.1-30.3; which, as has been argued previously, a contemporary reader of the \textit{Fasti} was most likely to do), the full plebeian significance of this event becomes apparent. The historian relates that the war took place during a long campaign to secure the appointment of plebeians as military tribunes with consular power (4.25.1-14). With battle lines drawn on Mount Algidus, the plebeians eventually concede to compel the consuls to appoint a dictator, Tubertus, who leads the Romans to victory (4.26.1-30.3).

\(^4\) A second plebeian secession in 367 BC is mentioned by Ovid at 1.643-4. Livy notes that this secession almost happened 6.42.10.

\(^5\) For a discussion of the Aventine and Rome’s social order during the Republic see Mignone 2016.

\(^6\) Pobjoy \textit{FRHist.}:iii.206.

\(^7\) Ogilvie 1965:311.

\(^8\) Ogilvie 1965:312; and Cornell 1995:448-9 n.65.

\(^9\) Ogilvie 1965:312-3.

\(^10\) Ogilvie 1965:312.
As has been witnessed in previous chapters, Dionysius provides the only other surviving comprehensive account of the event (6.43.2-48.3). While Livy and Dionysius’ accounts generally concur regarding the details of the secession, as will be seen below, although there are some variations in terms of both ‘fact’ and style.\(^{11}\)

**Ovid’s narration of Anna Perenna**

As already stated, the secession of the *plebs* to the Sacred Mount is the first Republican event that Ovid narrates in the *Fasti* (3.663-74), occurring as part of his wider narration of the festival of Anna Perenna (3.523-696). After describing the common folk celebrating Anna Perenna’s *festum geniale* (3.523) on the banks of the river Tiber, Ovid sets about righting the many erroneous rumours (3.543) about the identity of the goddess.

Ovid turns to Virgil for inspiration for the first of his potential explanations as to who Anna Perenna was, offering Dido’s sister as one possibility (3.545-656).\(^{12}\) The poet proceeds to recount a lengthy tale of how this Anna came to Italy after her sister’s suicide, where she received a warm welcome from Aeneas. Fearing that Aeneas’ wife Lavinia is plotting against her, and having been warned of this threat by Dido in a dream, Anna flees her hosts’ home in terror. After being swept away by the flooded river Numicus, she is turned into a river nymph. From her new watery home, she is heard saying that her new name is Anna Perenna - meaning perennial river (*amnis perennis*– 3.654).

After briefly listing a further four prospective identities for Anna Perenna (3.657-60), Ovid moves on to narrate his version of the plebeian secession to the Sacred Mount, now identifying Anna as a poor old woman from Bovillae (*orta suburbanis quaedam fuit Anna Bouillis, / pauper, sed multae sedulitatis anus –* 3.667-8). Ovid omits the story of Menenius’ fable, instead suggesting that Anna visited the seceding *plebs* and bolstered their failing supplies with cake (3.669-72).

Anna Perenna as a cake-baking Bovillan woman is not mentioned by Livy or any of the other extant annalistic sources, leading Bömer to declare that ‘Dieses kleine Geschichtchen

---

\(^{11}\) Walsh (1961:180 n.2) notes that Dionysius’ arrangement of the plebeian secession is quite different from Livy.

\(^{12}\) Barchiesi (1997:21) describes Ovid’s equation of Anna Perenna with Dido’s sister as a ‘continuation, completion and replica of the *Aeneid* ... a mini- *Aeneid*’. As well as noting the influence of Virgil’s *Aeneid*, McKeown (1984:170) also believes Ovid is drawing on Varro here. See also Litttlewood 1980:305-14; and Newlands 2006:361-2.
hat keine Parallelüberlieferung’. While admitting that there could have been a tradition about an Anna from Bovillae, Bömer claims it is impossible to know for sure whether or not she was involved in the Sacred Mount secession.

Ovid’s account of Anna Perenna ends with a story of how she duped Minerva into believing she had arranged for her to marry Mars, as an explanation as to why girls sing ribald songs at Anna’s festival (3.675-97). Immediately following this aition, there is a comparatively short account of Julius Caesar’s murder and apotheosis which occurred on the same day (3.697-710).

Livy, Ovid and the Fasti’s ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme

Ovid’s account of the first plebeian secession to the Sacred Mount (3.663-74) offers one of the best examples of reader-focused ‘thematic’ intertextuality with Livy in the Fasti. Not only does this ‘thematic’ intertextuality enable the reader to reassess the ‘historical’ scope of Ovid’s rendering of the secession of the plebs, but also to ascertain its relevance to the poem’s ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme.

As noted above, Ovid’s account of the Sacred Mount forms part of his broader aition for the festival of Anna Perenna (3.523-696), a festival that he introduces in decidedly ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ terms. Ovid’s description of the plebs (3.525) celebrating the goddess’ festival on the banks of the river Tiber is replete with pastoral imagery: the poet describes how the celebrants sit drinking with their partners on the uirides ... herbæ (3.525), with some of them camping under the open sky or in tents (3.527-8). The reeds used in place of rigid pillars for the tents (3.529-30) perhaps recall through contrast the architecture of the imperial templæ...ææ (1.223-4) that the poem sets out to celebrate. The riverside location also recalls two other passages in the Fasti in which Ovid pursues his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian theme. It is beside the Tiber that celebrations, including much drunken revelry, also take place for the

---

13 Bömer 1958:ii.190. Harrison (1993:456-7) suggests that Callimachus’ Hecale could be a model for Ovid’s Anna Perenna, noting that while Callimachus’ story has no particular political overtones, the journey of Theseus travelling to Attica to solve the problems of his people could be used to stress democratic and populist views.

14 Bömer 1958:ii.190.


16 Note also how Janus, recalling a bygone age when Rome was new, states that the Capitol was decked with leaves Fast. 1.203. Littlewood (1980:303) observes that tentoria (3.535) is not found in any other descriptions of Roman festivals. Littlewood further senses ‘a touch of Ovidian humour’ in the fact that the celebrants ‘drape their interwoven arbours with traditional Roman city dress’. 148
festival of Fors Fortuna (6.771-84), which Ovid deems as suitable for the lower-classes, owing to the servile origins of the founder of the goddess’ temple, Servius Tullius. As discussed in Chapter Five, Ovid casts Rome’s sixth king in ‘plebeian’ terms in opposition to his more aggressive daughter Tullia. What is more, these are the banks of the same river where Romulus and Remus’ were abandoned as infants, before being rescued by the she-wolf (2.383-422). As suggested in Chapters Three and Four, this setting marks the beginning of the influence of the pastoral environment in which the twins live till early adulthood, until Romulus emerges as more influenced by the bellicose nature of his father Mars, following the death of his more ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ brother Remus.

Scholars generally see Ovid’s overall presentation of the festival of Anna Perenna in generic terms. Ovid’s prioritisation of this popular festival over the assassination of Julius Caesar, which happened on the same day (3.697-704) is often interpreted as an instance of the greater suitability of the former to the Fasti’s ‘peaceful elegiac agenda’. In acting thus, it is argued, Ovid comments on contemporary issues by drawing attention to the tension between such antique festivals and the obtrusive insertion of the imperial family into Roman religious cult. Similarly, considerable attention is paid by critics to Ovid’s identification of Anna Perenna with Dido’s sister as ‘an example of a possible transposition of the Aenied into the elegiac mode: this variation on the epos is nothing less than a project to demilitarize high Augustan poetry’. A different, but complementary, interpretation is offered below.

**Ovid and Livy**

As the foregoing demonstrates (and as noted in Chapter One), genre and contemporary ‘Augustan’ concerns have often dominated analysis of episodes in the Fasti. Such a focus, taken together with the relative brevity of the ‘historical’ details provided by the poem, have together facilitated the relative neglect by modern critics of Ovid’s treatment of the secession to the Sacred Mount; this is perhaps understandable as the poet takes just eleven lines to

---

summarise this event which is covered over three chapters in Livy.\textsuperscript{20} As remarked in Chapter One, however, the terseness of some references to historical events in the \textit{Fasti} often belies their significance: the reader requires prior knowledge in order to understand this significance. In creating the most recent (and authoritative) version of Roman history available to the contemporary audience of the \textit{Fasti}, Livy is by far the most likely account that an Augustan reader would refer to for such background information. In examining Ovid’s engagement with Livy in this instance therefore, we can turn from an author-based approach to a reader-based approach: Livy is the most likely account that an Augustan reader of the \textit{Fasti} reader is going to read the poem against, even if Ovid appears to make no direct reference to \textit{AUC}. And when Ovid’s account of the plebeian secession to the Sacred Mount is read against Livy, the reader will find meaningful differences between the poet and the historian’s versions of events.\textsuperscript{21}

Livy appears to present a conventional account of the secession of the \textit{plebs}, as far as can be ascertained considering the dearth of pre-Livian sources. Certainly, the details of Livy’s account in general concur with that of Dionysius who, as suggested in previous chapters, is commonly considered to be replicating the ‘canonical’ version of Roman history.\textsuperscript{22} Livy narrates how Menenius told the story of the belly and the limbs to the dissenters on the Sacred Mount in a bid to persuade them to end their sedition (2.32.8-12). Menenius recounts how in a bygone age the different parts of a human body did not all agree with each other but had their own ideas and voice. Thinking it unfair that they did all the work to provide food for the idle belly, the hands, mouth and teeth rebelled and refused to play their part in providing the belly with sustenance. However, as soon all were reduced to the utmost weakness, they learned how they were all mutually reliant on each other for nourishment. Menenius ends his sermon by drawing a parallel between the anger of the \textit{plebs} towards the patricians and the dissension of the limbs against the belly.

In contrast, Menenius and his fable do not feature in the \textit{Fasti}. However, one theme in common between Livy and Ovid’s version of the secession is, of course, food. With provisions running low on the Sacred Mount, Anna Perenna – a poor, old woman originally from Bovillae – bakes cakes every morning which she distributes amongst the protestors.

\textsuperscript{20} Livy’s account of the actual secession ranges over three chapters (2.31.7-33.3), however it is sited as the last act in a much longer account of the background to the plebeian struggle for the tribunate (2.22-33.4).
\textsuperscript{21} See Chapter Two.
\textsuperscript{22} Dionysius narrates a more embellished version of Menenius’ apologue (6.86.1-5) as part of a much longer debate between the Senate and the \textit{plebs} as to how to resolve the secession (6.49.1–87.3). While Livy claims that Menenius was a plebeian by birth and therefore dear to the \textit{plebs} (2.32.8), Dionysius (6.49.2) explicitly states that he was a senator and noted for taking the ‘middle ground’ politically (6.49.2).
However, whereas Livy’s plebs are persuaded by Menenius and his culinary tale into desisting with their protest, in the Fasti, Ovid does not give an exact account of how or when the secession ended; he merely states that a statue was erected to Anna Perenna pace domi facta (3.673).

By omitting to narrate that the plebeians were persuaded to end their dissent as Livy does, Ovid’s plebs not only display a sense of self-reliance within their own social strata, but also retain a sense of strength and autonomy. While the patricians may have enacted a concordia ciuium (2.32.7; also 2.33.1) according to Livy, such concordia seems undermined in the Fasti, since Ovid’s plebs retain their power through the supply of Anna Perenna’s cakes (quod sibi defectis illa ferebat opem – 3.674).

Despite the plebs seemingly retaining their position of power in Ovid in contrast to Livy, the historian still conveys a strong sense of ‘people power’ in his narration of events leading up to the secession. Again, Livy appears to be adhering to the established tradition here, if Dionysius’ account is anything to go by. Even though Ovid diverges from Livy in his version of the secession therefore, the poet’s less conciliatory plebs could still be seen as a development of their counterparts in Livy (as representative of the ‘canonical’ tradition).

The power of the plebs manifests itself in Livy through the reaction of the populace following the protestors’ withdrawal to the Sacred Mount. Livy recounts that the city was thrown into a great panic, with the remaining plebeians terrified of violence from the senators and vice versa, and with the senators also fearing the threat of war, civil or foreign (2.32.5-7). Dionysius similarly reports that there was much tumult and lamentation, as many attempted to leave the city, with violence also threatened against those who refused to obey patrician orders to stay (6.46.1-2). The political might of the plebs is further evidenced as Livy ends his account by reporting that the establishment of the tribuni plebei (Liv. 2.33.2: also implied by Ovid – 3.663) was the direct result of the protest. According to Ogilvie,

23 Whereas Ovid states that the plebs had run out of food (3.665-6), Livy’s plebs are not starving, although there is a sense that rations are limited as they have only taken enough provisions for several days subsistence (2.32.4).
24 Chiu (2016:25) notes that ‘Anna is the heroine of the piece for not reconciling the quarreling orders à la Menenius Agrippa but for helping the plebeians only’. In Livy the plebeians honour Menenius for his role in reconciling the orders by paying for his funeral expenses (2.33.11); in the Fasti they honour Anna for assisting them in their standoff against the patricians with a statue. Thus, according to Chiu (25-6) while the plebeians ‘have reconciled with the patricians and reintegrated into the larger Roman society, they keep their own identity as plebeins with their own history and shared experiences’.
25 Harrison (1993:457) suggests that Ovid’s statement regarding the tribunate at 3.663 gives the passage ‘at least an indirect political meaning’. However, Harrison places this meaning in ‘contemporary terms’ in that it glances at the fact that tribunicia potestas was one of the major constitutional foundations of power for Augustus: The plebs may have had no protector in 494, but they certainly had one by the Augustan period,
the creation of this magistracy was the consequence not of the *plebs*’ political weakness but of their political strength – a force that was ‘enough to institute a revolutionary and extra-constitutional office designed to frustrate the due processes of law’.  

One facet of Ovid’s account that could be seen as a direct response to Livy is the more positive attitude that both authors demonstrate towards the plebeians. By not mentioning their eventual compromise with the patricians, Ovid expresses a more optimistic view of the *plebs* by allowing them to maintain the ‘upper hand’ in their protest. In addition, the esteem the poet reveals towards the lower-class Anna is obvious as he recounts how she is honoured with a statue for her services in feeding the revolting *plebs* (3.673-4). His positivity towards the *plebs* is perhaps also indicated by the fact that the poet himself favours this *aison* as to Anna Perenna’s identity (*haec quoque, quam referam, nostras peruenit ad aures / fama nec a ueri dissidet ulla fide* - 3.661-2). In highlighting the oppression of the *plebs* in his account of events preceding the secession, Livy also appears to take a more sympathetic approach to them when compared to Dionysius. Livy goes to considerable lengths to describe the sufferings of an old soldier (2.23.3-7) who introduces the pitiful plight of the ‘ordinary’ Roman caught in the debt bondage and military service that will eventually result in the Sacred Mount sedition. His description of the protestors as they arrive on the Sacred Mount could also be interpreted as being complimentary to the *plebs*: Livy highlights their egalitarianism as they operate without a leader and their pacifism as they quietly go about

---

26 Dionysius’ account is much more democratic and, according to Ogilvie (1965:311) more diplomatic than Livy, as the patricians ultimately seek to find a compromise to bring an end to the situation (6.47.2) and agree to approve all reasonable demands from the plebeians (6.48.1). This begins a lengthy procession of speeches (6.49.1 – 87.3) which eventually results in the end of the sedition and the creation of the tribune of the plebs (6.87.1-3).

27 Ogilvie 1965:294. On the contrary, Vasaly (2015:103) maintains that ‘Livy often presents the *plebs* as intimidated, fearful, and confused, vulnerable to abuse from above and tongue-tied – or at least severely hampered in their attempts to engage effectively in the political process’.

28 In introducing his first *aison* for Anna Perenna as the sister of Dido, Ovid states *quae tamen haec dea sit, quoniam rumoribus errat / fabula proposito nulla tegenda meo* (3.543-4). Although it would seem that Ovid is suggesting that this version of the identity of Anna Perenna is the truth, his later claim at 3.661-2, implies that it is the secession Anna who represents the true identity of the goddess.

29 It is impossible to establish for certain any originality in Livy’s presentation of a more ‘plebeian friendly’ version of the secession if, as Ogilvie (1965:311) suggests, he used Macer as a source. As Oakley (*FRHist*.i.328) remarks, it is widely thought that Macer’s history reflected his pro-plebeian political attitude; (Ogilvie 1965:12) similarly states that Macer was ‘unashamedly a *populares*’. It would be possible therefore, that any sympathy Livy displays towards the plebeians in his account of the secession, could come from Macer.
their task without provocation (2.32.4). Conversely, Dionysius opines that some of the seceding plebs were lazy, dissolute, envious of others, unable to afford to gratify their desires and devoted to vicious practices, and it was this that made them hostile to the government (6.46.3). While admitting that the plebeian protestors did not act from any malicious intent, Dionysius claims they acted according to their passion rather than their reason, as is the wont of an ignorant populace (6.47.2). Whereas Dionysius presents a much more democratic process that eventually leads to the end of the secession and the foundation of the plebeian tribunate, Livy seems to couch the creation of the tribunate in the same terms of concordia (2.33.1) as a ‘slogan for those in power’, rather than representing true accord between the patricians and the plebeians, Menenius’ apologue has taught the plebs subordination to the patricians.

As with Romulus however (see Chapter Three), Livy still appears to want to maintain at least a veneer of impartiality; as sympathetic as Livy may be to the soldier in the forum, he still describes him in negative terms (Obsita erat squalore uestis, foedior corporis habitus pallore ac macie perempti; ad hoc promissa barba et capilli efferauerant speciem oris – 2.23.3-4). Similarly, despite being an inter preti arbitro concordiae ciuium, (2.33.11) Menenius, as a plebeian himself, spoke prisco illo dicendi et horrido modo (2.32.8-9). While Ovid offers no direct gesture towards Livy’s account of the secession of the plebs in terms of ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality, it is most likely the historian’s account that a contemporary Fasti reader would turn in order to obtain the background details to the poet’s comparatively brief account. After doing so, not only is the full extent of the ‘historical’ significance of Ovid’s account realised, but so also is the meaning of his nuanced ‘rustic-plebeian’ rendition of the event in the context of his aition for the identity of Anna Perenna.

30 In contrast, Vasaly (2015:102-3) sees Livy’s description of the plebs here in more negative terms, their lack of a leader meaning they are disorganised and inarticulate. However, she concedes that even without leaders, Livy’s plebs ‘pose a grave danger to the state, as they are emotionally volatile and potentially violent’.
31 Levick 1978:220. Levick (223) also states that it was Cicero who ‘decisively revived Concordia as a slogan of those in possession of power and property’. In teaching the plebs subordination to the patricians, Momigliano (1942:118) suggests that Menenius’ apologue best suits the historical situation before 366 BC; Momigliano observes that later, when narrating events of 367 BC (6.42.11), Livy presents concord ‘as a reciprocal concession between patricians and plebeians’. Gabba (1991:203) says of Dionysius’ version of Menenius’ speech ‘the ignorant masses will never cease to need prudent leadership, while the Senate, which has the capacity for leadership, will always require a submissive multitude’.
32 Momigliano 1942:118.
33 In the judgement of Walsh (1961:37), Livy remains relatively impartial politically, and although he favoured an aristocratic type of government and was fully aware of the dangers of mob rule, the only indication of an anti-plebeian bias in the extant books is in his discussion of agrarian legislation in the first decade. Kraus (1994:26) maintains that book six shows ‘L.’s interest in the world outside the senate led him to combine a history of the elite with that of the plebeians which was “utterly innovative”’.
34 This is why, according to Ogilvie (1965:313), Livy chose not to report Menenius apologue in direct speech.
**PART TWO: THE FABII AT THE BATTLE OF THE CREMERA**

**The Sources**

Very few pre-Livian sources survive for the Fabii and the battle at the Cremera. The battle is mentioned in relation to institution of ‘black days’ (Hemina *FRHist*. fr. 23 = Gellius fr. 8) and in relation to the ill-omened Faucia *curia* (Macer *FRHist*. fr. 23). There is one extant reference to the triumphant delaying tactics of Fabius Maximus in Ennius (12.363-5 Sk.), but its context within the *Annales* is unknown. Cicero notes that Fabius Maximus was thoughtful and cautious (*De Rep.* 5.10) but provides no details about the battle itself. Diodorus (11.53.6) makes only a summary reference to the Fabii and their defeat at the Cremera. Apart from Ovid and Livy, Dionysius offers the only other extant extended account of the Fabii at the Cremera (9.15.1-22.6).

**Ovid’s narration of the Fabii and the battle at the Cremera**

The majority of Ovid’s coverage of the Fabii occurs in book two of the *Fasti*, and concerns their defeat at the battle at the Cremera (2.195-242). Totalling forty-eight lines, it is the second longest military narrative in the poem after the Gallic siege. Immediately following his account of the Cremera, Ovid tells the story of the raven, bowl and snake constellation (2.243-66) before moving on to his *aition* of the Lupercalia festival (2.267-452).

The Fabii are also briefly mentioned twice within Ovid’s account of the Lupercalia in the context of Romulus and Remus’ recovery of livestock stolen by cattle-rustlers (2.375, 377: see below). There is, in addition, a fleeting reference to the family in book one (1.605-6) as part of Ovid’s eulogy to the emperor on receiving the title Augustus (1.593-616): after asserting that no surname can rank above that of Fabii, Ovid states that because of their services, the family was called *maxima* (1.606). Ovid’s summary allusion to the Fabian sobriquet ‘Maximus’ here, once again illuminates how the briskness of some of the poet’s ‘historical’ references can obscure their potential significance. The most obvious allusion is to Fabius Maximus Cunctator, who earned this title after defeating Hannibal through his

---

35 Skutsch (1985:529-31) makes several suggestions as to where Ennius’ reference to Fabius Maximus Cunctator may have come in the *Annales*, including speeches where Fabius was cited as an *exemplar*.

famous military tactic of delaying (Livy. 22.12.1-23.2).\textsuperscript{37} Ovid repeats the name ‘Maximus’ at the end of his account of the battle at the Cremera, where he predicts the future birth of the illustrious Fabius Maximus Cunctator (\textit{... tu, Maxime, nasci / cui res cunctando restituenda foret} – 2.241-2: see below).\textsuperscript{38} However, a knowledge of Livy reveals that yet another member of the family, Quintus Fabius Rullianus – a censor in 304 BC who created the four urban tribes – also received the title ‘Maximus’ (Livy. 9.46.13-4).\textsuperscript{39} There are therefore, potential allusions to three ‘historical’ events within this single-line citation in the \textit{Fasti}.\textsuperscript{40}

\textbf{Ovid’s intertextual relationship with Livy}

It is well established that Ovid’s account of the Fabii at the Cremera (\textit{Fast.} 2.195-242) closely follows that of Livy in terms of the details of the battle (2.48-50), and that the poet’s account contains significant ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality with the historian.\textsuperscript{41} Although Ovid’s account is considerable shorter than Livy’s, they both present the same version of events in general outline. After offering to defend Rome against the encroaching Veientes in 479 BC, 306 members of the Fabii march out of Rome via the Porta Carmentalis to the banks of the river Cremera. Despite successfully repelling the Veientes to begin with, the Fabii are eventually lured into a trap, where the enemy entice the Fabii to attack a small number of men as they tend their herds in the middle of an open plain. With the rest of the Veientes hiding in surrounding bushes, the Fabii are ambushed. The entire Fabian clan is slaughtered except for one male, who was too young to bear arms: he will become a forefather to the famous Fabius Maximus Cunctator.

Ovid follows Livy closely in stating that this single family fought the war on behalf of the city: his engagement with the historian is signalled by ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality (\textit{una domus uires et onus susceperat urbis - Fast.} 2.197; \textit{familiam unam subisse ciuitatis onus - Liv.} 2.49.1). In focussing his attention solely on the Fabian fighters, Ovid also concurs with

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{37} It is possible that this sobriquet (sc. Cunctator) had its origin in Ennius (Skutsch 1985:531).
\item \textsuperscript{39} Green 2004a:278.
\item \textsuperscript{40} Cairns (2002:39-40) notes a similar ‘conflation’ of the achievements of different members of the same family in relation to the elder and younger Scipios in \textit{Horace Epodes} 9.23-6 and \textit{Odes} 4.8.13-20, with the latter also ‘assimilating’ the second and third Punic wars.
\item \textsuperscript{41} Frazer 1929:ii.322; Ogilvie 1965:361; Richard 1988:531; Harries 1991:151; and Robinson 2011:181. Harries (1991:151) also points out that ‘studies have again confirmed that the additional information and alternative versions in Dionysius of Halicarnassus have next to no bearing on the Ovidian account’.
\end{itemize}
Livy in terms of the details of the event, as both authors differ from other accounts by ignoring the 4,000 other troops who accompanied them (D.H. 9.15.3; Diod. 11.53.6). This emphasis on the Fabian clan continues with Ovid’s echo of Livy’s repeated use of *gen-* in the historian’s description of the Fabii leaving the city to embark on their military assignment (*gentem omnem suam ... uidet* – Liv. 2.49.3; *omnes unius gentis* –2.49.4; *gентiles* – *Fast.* 2.198; *generosus*- *Fast.* 2.199). Ovid also seems to be thinking of Livy’s version in having the Fabii depart from the house of the consul Caeso Fabius (*Fast.* 2.199; Liv. 2.49.1); Dionysius makes no mention of this.

In describing the qualities of the family as they march out of Rome, Ovid again follows Livy closely in stating that *e quis dux fieri quilibet aptus erat* (*Fast.* 2.200); *quorum neminem ducem sperneret egregius quibuslibet temporibus exercitus* (Liv. 2.49.4). Similarly, there are factual reminiscences and verbal echoes between Ovid and Livy in their description of the Fabian departure from the city via the ill-omened *Porta Carmentalis* (*Carmentis portae dextra est uia proxima iano* - *Fast.* 2.201; *Infelici uia, dextro iano portae Carmentalis, profecti* – Liv. 2.49.8).

While the tone of Ovid’s description of the actual combat seems to owe more to Virgil than it does to Livy (see discussion below), the historian still remains very much in the foreground as the poet’s source of ‘factual’ detail. Ovid’s use of Virgil perhaps even intensifies his ‘thematic’ affiliation with Livy (as will be discussed in more detail later). For example, Ovid’s use of the Virgilian simile of lions hunting scattering herds (*Aen.* 9.339-42) to describe the Fabian attack on the Veientes (2.205-10), could be seen as building on Livy’s description of the Veientine ambush of the Fabii (2.50.6). The historian explains how the Veientes lured the Fabii into their trap by leaving grazing flocks on the plain, before describing the Fabii’s attempt to capture the animals thus: *palatique passim uaga, ut fit pauore iuncto, raperent pecora, subito ex insidiis consurgitur* (2.50.6).

At the end of the account of the battle, Ovid signals his return to Livy as his source in narrating that only one member of the Fabii survived the assault, with a ‘direct verbal’ intertext (* unus ... relictus* – *Fast.* 2.240; *unum ... relictum* – Liv. 2.50.11). Both authors

---

45 The influence of both Homer and Virgil are detected in Ovid’s narration of the battle at Cremera, but most scholars seem to favour Virgil as the main influence on Ovid as he is ‘closer to home’ (Robinson 2011:189). See also Harries 1991:156-7; and Merli 2000:203-24.
46 Also found in Homer ii. 15.630-7.
explain that the survival of this boy was due to him being too young for warfar and also ensured the future birth of the celebrated Fabius Maximus Cunctator (2.239-42; Liv. 2.50.11). Dionysius, by contrast, treats the idea that only one family member survived with incredulity, and offers a relatively lengthy discussion as to why it was impossible (9.22.1-6).

**Ovid’s plebeian theme**

One notable difference between Ovid and Livy’s account is the date on which the battle at the Cremera took place. While Livy places the conflict as having occurred on 18th July (6.1.11), Ovid places it on 13th February. Considering the extent to which Ovid draws on Livy for so many details in his narration of the battle at the Cremera, this point of divergence is particularly ‘significant in alerting us to the special quality of Ovid’s treatment’. Scholars have provided a number of possible reasons as to why Ovid chose a different date to Livy: these include the possibility that Ovid was using a different source – perhaps another historical account or private Fabian family records; or that he mistakenly dated the ambush as the same day as when the Fabii originally departed from Rome; or that his narration of the Cremera was intended for the seventh book of the *Fasti* but was inserted in the wrong place by an editor after the poet’s death. Newlands cites generic and stylistic reasons, and Harries suggests that Ovid adapted the date in order to deliberately present the battle at the Cremera as a prelude to the Lupercalia, so as to establish a specific approach with which to read the proceeding narration of the festival. Harries’ proposition seems more compelling in the light of Ovid’s apparent tendency to deliberately ‘misplace’ episodes

---

48 Livy (6.1.11) claims that both the battle at the Cremera and that at the Allia took place on the same day, although not in the same year. Dionysius gives no specific date for the conflict.

49 The different dates given by Livy and Ovid for the date of the battle at the Cremera suggests there was more than one tradition for the event. Ogilvie (1965:360-1) proposes that Livy was likely following two different accounts that diverged in giving a summer or a winter date for the battle. The existence of two separate traditions is reinforced by Dionysius (9.18.5), who relates both versions which he claims came from Roman sources (9.21.6). See also Harries 1991:153; and Robinson 2011:183.


51 Bömer:ii.1958:95-6; Ogilvie 1965:360; Harries 1991:152; and Robinson 2011:183. Fabre-Serris (2013:92) dismisses the suggestion that Ovid either invented a new date or made a mistake, making his use of another tradition the most likely source for his date.


54 Newlands 1995:90 n.16.Newlands (1991:250-1) also suggests that Ovid’s choice of date for the battle at the Cremera enabled him to make a link between the Fabian episode and the following star myth of the raven, snake and bowl through the common theme of delay.

55 In linking the Fabian family to a fertility festival, Harries (1991:156ff) proposes that Ovid explores issues relating to the survival of the Fabian gens, with consequent lessons for both the imperial family and Rome itself.
in the *Fasti* in order to establish thematic connections between events that are otherwise ‘historically’ unrelated (as noted in Chapter One and illustrated with Romulus and Numa in Chapter Four). Furthermore, in an adjunct to Harries’ theory, this chapter will argue that Ovid’s alternative temporal location of the Fabii episode enables it to be read in accordance with the *Fasti*’s ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme.

In introducing his version of the battle at the Cremera, Ovid states that it occurred on the same day that the god Faunus is celebrated at his temple on Tiber island (2.195-6). By evoking the popular, rustic deity Faunus – Ovid himself emphasises Faunus’ as *agrestis* (2.193) – at the start of his account of the Fabian involvement at the Cremera, the poet begins a chain of associations between the family and other ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ figures in the *Fasti*. As has been explored in preceding chapters, Ovid depicts his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ characters (Remus, Numa, Servius) as decidedly non-militaristic, and more suited to elegy than their more bellicose counterparts (Romulus, Tullia).

While Ovid’s initial introduction of Faunus in relation to the Fabii may be brief (2.193-4), when read in conjunction with the subsequent account of the Lupercalia, the god’s rustic and pacific nature really comes to the fore. Following his account of the Cremera and his narration of the raven, snake and bowl constellations (2.243-66), Faunus appears again when Ovid begins his account of the Lupercalia (2.267-452). In recounting the origin of the worship of Faunus (2.269-82), Ovid’s description of Evander’s Arcadia – from where the deity originated – is replete with pastoral imagery, evoking the non-combative atmosphere of the Saturnian Golden Age. The poet continues this bucolic and peaceful ambience in recounting how it was the custom for Faunus and the ancient Arcadians not to wear clothes as a possible reason for why Lupercalia participants run naked (2.283-302). As explored in Chapter Four, Faunus also has two encounters with Rome’s second king Numa, whom Ovid casts in ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ terms in direct contrast to his bellicose predecessor.

The notion of the rustic and pacific Faunus is further underlined by Ovid’s mention of the Tiber island where the god’s altar stands (2.193-4), when considered in terms of ‘thematic’ intertextuality with Livy. Livy reveals a military significance for the island which the brevity of Ovid’s reference compels him to omit. In discussing the redistribution of the royal

---

56 Robinson (2011:180) states that both Faunus and the Fabii have links to the Lupercalia festival. Reference to Faunus at this point therefore, helps link all three together. See also Harries 1991:168.
57 Harries (1991:164-5) sees potential for contemporary comment in this passage. Fabre-Serris (2013:92-3) also believes that Ovid evokes the time of Arcadia in his reference to Hercules, the progenitor of the Fabii, at the end of his account of the Cremera (2.237). This story is also found in Plutarch’s biography of Q. Fabius Maximus (1.1).
property following the demise of the Tarquins, Livy explains that the senate decreed that their land should become the Campus Martius; crops harvested from the area were then thrown into the Tiber and the island was formed (2.5.2-5).\textsuperscript{58} Mention of Faunus’ temple could also be viewed as demonstrating Ovid’s ‘historical consciousness’. It might provoke the recollection that, after being vowed in 196 BC, the building was constructed from fines collected from three pecuarii who had been convicted of cheating\textsuperscript{59} (Liv. 33.42.10) and dedicated in 194 BC by Domitius (Liv. 34.53.4). As an example of reader-focused ‘thematic’ intertextuality, such a reference is arguably only ascertainable when read in conjunction with Livy.

Mention of the river Tiber also recalls the riverside site of Romulus and Remus’ abandonment that represents their early pastoral lives - as discussed in relation to Anna Perenna above. Furthermore, Ovid’s description of the swollen river Cremera (2.205-6) also recalls the flooded Tiber where the infant twins are abandoned (2.389-90).\textsuperscript{60} It is also on the banks of the Tiber that the lower classes assemble for the festival of Fors Fortuna at her temple dedicated by the ‘plebeian’ king Servius (6.773-84; see Chapter Five) and the popular festival of Anna Perenna (see discussion above).

When considered within the wider context of the Lupercalia festival, therefore, the mention of Faunus at the beginning of Ovid’s narration of the Cremera serves to set the Fabii within the same bucolic and non-militaristic terms that characterise Ovid’s ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ figures throughout the \textit{Fasti}.\textsuperscript{61} In addition to this, it also establishes a connection between the Fabii and Romulus and Remus who, perhaps, encapsulate most strongly the opposition Ovid creates between his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ and more militaristic characters. This connection is made explicit in the section of the Lupercalia narrative that recounts the twins’

\textsuperscript{58} Livy also alludes to other temples on Tiber island (2.5.4-5) which Ogilvie (1965:246) states are those of Aesculapius, Tiberinus, Jupiter Jurarius, Semo Sancus and Veiovis. See also Carandini 2012:553.
\textsuperscript{59} Carandini 2012: 571 n.108. See also Platner and Ashby 1926:205-6; and Robinson 2011:180.
\textsuperscript{60} Robinson (2011:187) expresses his surprise that in such a concise account of the Fabii at the Cremera, Ovid includes ‘a seemingly unimportant detail which is not found in Livy’. As well as anticipating the impetuous rush of the Fabii into the plain (2.219-24) Robinson says that the real significance of this detail is that it acts as a generic marker ‘which signals the switch to the epic narrative proper’. Harries (1991:154) claims that the phrase \textit{celeri passu} not only ‘matches the speed of the Fabii’s advance’, but that the adjective \textit{rapax} ‘anticipates the appalling slaughter of a whole \textit{gens} on the river bank’. Robinson (2011:187-8) adds that the phrase \textit{celeri passu} ‘also has suitable epic pedigree: it is found elsewhere only at Ennius, fr. 67 Sk., where it is used of the wolf that suckled Romulus and Remus ... [a foretaste, perhaps, of the story Ovid will narrate at 381-422].’

\textsuperscript{61} Despite their status as a patrician \textit{gens}, the Fabii are still cast by Ovid in the same terms as various ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ characters. As with other figures in the \textit{Fasti}, such as Remus and Numa, Ovid seems less concerned with the reality of a character’s actual social status and more concerned with how their personality traits and behaviours ‘fit in’ with his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme.
encounter with the cattle-rustlers (2.361-80: see Chapter Three). Crucially however, it is specifically to Remus that the Fabii are linked as the group of shepherd youth who follow Remus (2.375), while the Quintilii are among those who follow Romulus (2.378).

Considering the militaristic subject matter, and the scope of Ovid’s generic experimentation in the Fasti in general (as demonstrated throughout this thesis), it should come as no surprise that Ovid should take inspiration from Virgil by including three epic motifs in his presentation of the battle at the Cremera (2.209; 2.215-8; 2.231-4). 62 Paradoxically, the epyllion aspects of Ovid’s account do seem somewhat curious, considering the lengths to which he has gone to establish the Fabii as ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ figures. As has already been mentioned, such ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ characters are often depicted as conforming to elegiac principles in opposition to their more aggressive ‘epic’ counterparts. 63 It is however the polarity between Ovid’s epic description of the battle and its more elegiac combatants, that enables the poet to further reinforce the Fabii’s ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ features. As Ovid ultimately reveals, the Fabii are defeated (2.225-36), demonstrating that, as elegiac characters, they are unable to succeed in an ‘epic’-‘militaristic’ context. The sole surviving member of the clan owed his life to his ‘elegiac’ behaviour in not participating in combat (2.239-40): as Robinson notes: ‘Fabius’ glory will not lie in epic arma, but through a rather elegiac avoidance of warfare’. 64

As well as reinforcing the Fabii’s ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ credentials, Ovid’s use of epic motifs also affirms his ‘thematic’ engagement with Livy. Harries notes that through his use of epic mannerisms, the poet implicitly echoes ‘the criticism of the incautious and fatal audacia of the Fabii which is more directly noted in Livy’; 65 for example, the rashness of the Fabii as they hasten into the valley where the Veientes lie in wait to ambush them, made obvious by their comparison to the rushing torrens (2.219) of a flooded river. Ovid’s use of epic motifs could additionally be interpreted as the poet attempting to ‘out-do’ the historian, as the ‘Ovidian comment is all the more effective for the allusive way it is delivered’. 66

---

62 Virg. Aen. 2.304-10, 2.494-9, 9.339-42. 10.707-18; also Homer Iliad 15.630-7.
63 Robinson (2011:178) opines that ‘Ovid’s account of this national disaster brings the elegiac Fasti as close as it comes to the world of epic, with its martial content, epic similes, and allusions to Homer and the Aeneid’.
64 Robinson 2011:196.
65 Harries 1991:156. Fabre-Serris (2013:96) notes that haste is a flaw that the Fabii, Faunus and Remus all share in the Fasti. However, as this thesis has demonstrated it is also a characteristic of Romulus’ behaviour. Perhaps the important difference is that while Romulus’ rash behaviour can be seen to be self-serving, the Fabii act for the common good (see Fabre-Serris 2013:97).
66 Harries 1991:156.
PART THREE: THE GALLIC SIEGE

The Sources

While details vary between accounts of the Gallic invasion and siege, most accounts share the basic outline that after his victory at Veii in 396 BC, Camillus was exiled on a charge of religious sacrilege. After the Romans were badly defeated at the battle of the Allia in 390 BC, the city of Rome was captured and razed by the Gauls except for the Capitol, which endured a long siege. Most accounts conclude with the rescue mission of Camillus who drives the Gauls out of Rome by military means and recovers the ransom of gold previously paid to the Gallic chieftain Brennus to bring an end to the siege.67

The Gallic invasion and siege of Rome would undoubtedly have been included in the accounts of the historians reviewed in Chapter One, although few fragments of their accounts remain.68 A number of fragments survive from Claudius Quadrigarius, who began his history with the Gallic invasion and siege of Rome in 390 BC.69 However, the brevity of all these fragments makes it impossible to obtain any clear picture of the details of Claudius’ account. Those relating to the Gallic sack that do survive concern Pontius Cominius’ journey to Rome from Veii to seek the senate’s approval for Camillus’ recall from exile and appointment as dictator (FRHist. fr. 1);70 communications between Veii and the Capitol (FRHist. fr. 2);71 the Gauls’ arrival in Rome (FRHist. fr. 22);72 a Gallic defeat of the Romans, most probably at the battle of the Allia (FRHist. fr. 24);73 and a meeting between the Romans and the Gauls in 390 BC (FRHist. fr. 27).74 The correspondences between these fragments and Livy mean Claudius was very likely the former’s source for this event.

Two further sources refer to the institution of black days following the battle of the Allia (Hemina FRHist. fr. 23, = Gellius fr. 8) and an additional two relate to the death of Manlius,

---

67 Polybius (2.18.1-4) narrates that after a three-day siege the Gauls made terms with the Romans and left unharmed and defeated (see also 1.6.2-4, 2.22.4-5) leading Williams (2001:142-3) to conjecture that Camillus was a later addition to the tradition. While it is possible that Livy used Polybius as a source for his account of the Gallic siege there is little evidence to suggest this. Polybius was one of Livy’s main authorities for the later decades, from book 25 onwards according to Walsh (1961:125), but only a subsidiary source for the earlier period. See Ogilvie 1965:5 and Briscoe and Rich FRHist. i.85.

68 The literary tradition about the Gallic sack is believed to have started with the Greeks as early as the fourth-century BC (Williams 2001:146). For a full discussion of sources for the Gallic siege see Williams 2001:142-50.

69 Briscoe FRHist. i.289.
70 Briscoe FRHist. iii.300.
71 Briscoe FRHist. iii.300.
72 Briscoe FRHist. iii.300.
73 Briscoe FRHist. iii.300.
74 Briscoe FRHist. iii.300.
who repulsed some Gauls attempting to scale the slopes of the Capitol. Nepos (FRHist. fr. 5 = Varro fr.2) claims Manlius was later killed by being flogged to death, whereas Varro (FRHist. fr. 2 = Nepos fr.5) states that he was hurled from the top of the Tarpeian rock. Hemina (FRHist. fr. 22) provides an account of the priest Dorso who ignored the threat from the Gauls to descend the Capitol to carry out an annual sacrifice. Fabius Pictor (FRHist. fr. 31 = t.17 = Fabius Maximus Servilianus fr.10) refers to the first appointment of a plebeian consul twenty-two years after Gallic sack. Lutatius (FRHist. fr.10) notes that the staff used by Romulus in the inauguration of the city of Rome was found in the ruins of the Palatine after it had been burnt by the Gauls. Cato’s two extant references to the Gauls (FRHist. fr. 33, 151) possibly come from an ethnographic passage in the Origines: these may have been among Livy’s sources for his similar anthropological passage (5.33.4-35.3). Clodius (FRHist. fr. 1) notes that ancient Roman records were lost during the Gallic sack.

Only one relevant fragment survives from Ennius, offering a retrospective statement regarding the Gallic assault on the Capitol (Ann. 7.227-8 Sk.). Skutsch believes Ennius’ account is likely to differ from others in not attributing a long siege to the Gauls. Livy provides the fullest extant account of the Gallic siege, with Diodorus (14.115.2-117.9), Dionysius (13.6.1-12.2) and Plutarch (Cam. 15-30) providing similar but not identical and less comprehensive accounts. Cicero mentions the Gauls twice, noting first that the walls surrounding the city of Rome were so well built by the kings that they remained impregnable even up to the time of the Gallic invasion (De Rep. 2.11), and secondly in a discussion of the customs of foreign nations (De Rep. 3.15-6).

Ovid’s narration of the Gallic siege

Apart from two brief notations in book one (1.57-60; 1.453), the majority of Ovid’s narration of events relating to the Gallic invasion and siege occur in two separate passages in book six.

---

75 Cornell FRHist.:iii.80 &158.
76 Ogilvie (1965:700-2) rejects claims that Livy used Varro as a source here. In detecting a number of Greek elements within Livy’s passage (5.33.4-35.3), Ogilvie suggests Greek ethnographic sources such as Posidonius and Timagenes.
77 Skutsch 1985:405-8 & 610 n.4. Skutsch (1953:77-8 & 1978:93-4) also proposes an alternative tradition that mentions the fall of the Capitol to the Gauls. However, the existence of an alternative tradition is disputed (Cornell 1995:313-18).
78 The book containing Dionysius’ account of the Gallic siege does not survive intact (Gabba 1991:xiii). As a result, it is unclear whether the author omitted the story of the nobles who are slain after choosing to remain in their houses and of Camillus’ speech imploring the Romans not to move the capital Veii, or whether it simply does not survive. Dionysius differs from Livy in providing a retrospective account of the siege, beginning with Camillus’ speech promising to return as dictator and slay the enemy (13.6.3-4).
of the Fasti (6.185-90; 349-94). Totalling fifty-seven lines, the Gallic sack receives the most attention of any military event in the poem and is the second longest account (next to that of the Great Mother’s journey to Rome – 4.247-348) of any event in the Republican period (see chart in Chapter One).

In relating the significance behind certain days in the proem to the Fasti, Ovid alludes to the battle of the Allia as the reason for the institution of ‘black days’ (1.57-60) on which it was forbidden to conduct any religious matter. Ovid briefly refers to the geese that betrayed the Gallic attempt to seize the Capitol, as part of an explanation of how birds came to be used for sacrifices (1.453). Marcus Manlius, who was the first to be woken by the geese and so raise the alarm of the impending attack, is mentioned at 6.185-9 as part of an account of Ovid’s wider celebration of the temple of Juno Moneta (6.183-96). Ovid also alludes to events that, four years after his heroic act on the Capitol, saw Manlius indicted for treason and hurled from the Tarpeian rock. Forming part of his extensive aitio of the Vestalia (6.249-468), Ovid’s longest narration relating to the Gallic siege is used as an aitio for the altar of Jupiter Pistor (6.349-94).

In explaining the origins of Jupiter Pistor’s altar, Ovid assembles a council of the gods sited, in temporal terms, during the Gallic siege. However, as will be seen, the ‘historic’ scope of this passage is much wider than just the siege itself; moreover (as this chapter will argue), it is only through a parallel reading of Livy’s account of the Gallic invasion and blockade that the scope of Ovid’s ‘historical’ content can be fully realised.

**Ovid’s engagement with Livy**

Initially, Ovid’s account of the Gallic siege seems to differ significantly from Livy in terms of the breadth of its coverage. Livy’s comparatively lengthy account of this event (5.33.1-
54.5), begins with the arrival of envoys from Clusium seeking help from the Romans against the Gauls (5.33.1-2) and ends with Camillus’ speech against proposals to remove the capital from Rome to Veii (5.51-54.5). Not only is Ovid’s total coverage of fifty-six lines considerably shorter than Livy’s, but his council of the gods gives the impression that he is only providing a snapshot of the Gallic siege: the gods witness the siege in ‘real time’, as indicated by Mars’ use of the present indicative: *Alpino Roma sub hoste iacet* (6.358). However, the brevity of Ovid’s account, both in terms of its total number of lines and its temporal setting, has the potential to camouflage the scope of its ‘historical consciousness’. By reading Ovid against Livy, the full extent of the ‘historical’ coverage encapsulated by the poet’s version of events can be realised. As the forthcoming discussion will demonstrate, Ovid signals that it is Livy he is using as his main ‘factual’ source and reference point through a number of instances of ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality. Furthermore (as will also be discussed below), it is through this engagement with the historian that Ovid is able to continue the development of his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme within the context of the Gallic sack of Rome.

Ovid gestures towards Livy’s account at the very start of his own report of the Gallic siege with an example of ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality. After declaring that he will explain the meaning of the altar of Jupiter Pistor situated on the Capitol (6.349-50), Ovid follows Livy in stating that the long Gallic siege had resulted in a famine (*fecerat obsidio iam diuturna famem* – *Fast. 6.352; Sed ante omnia obsidionis belliique mala fames utrumque exercitum urgebavit* – *Liv. 5.48.1-2*). The poet then introduces his council of the gods (6.353-4), followed by Mars’ spoken appeal to Jupiter to provide divine assistance to the beleaguered Romans (6.355-74).

At the start of his speech, Mars himself admits that the summary he will provide of events leading up to the Gallic siege will be brief (*ut referam breuiter mala iuncta pudori* – 6.357). Ovid alerts the reader to the fact that it is Livy he is using as his ‘factual’ source for Mars’ synopsis by including three incidences of ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality. In setting the temporal context for his speech, by announcing that Rome is currently under siege (*Alpino

---

81 Farrell 2013:57.
82 Littlewood (2006:lxiv) states that Ovid’s ‘council of the gods’ is ‘an elegiac adaptation’ of Virgil’s own version at *Aen. 10.1-117*, adding (114) that ‘a Council of the Gods, to decide the outcome of human conflict, was a traditional epic motif’ (*Enn. Ann. 1.51-5 Sk.; Virg. Aen. 10.1-117*). Furthermore, there are a number of incidences of ‘direct verbal’ intertextuality with Virgil’s *Aeneid* that indicate Ovid also used Virgil as a source for this passage, especially in terms of stylistic and generic issues (see Williams 1991:187 and Littlewood 2006:112-23). However, as this chapter demonstrates, in terms of ‘historical’ detail, it is to Livy that Ovid turns as his main source.
Roma sub hoste iacet – 6.358), Mars echoes Livy’s use of ‘the comparatively unusual term’\(^{83}\) *Alpini*, as the historian too summarises the circumstances that led up to the Gallic sack (5.33.11). Later in his précis, Mars continues to echo Livy: the god’s description of the old men who decided to stay at home and await their fate at the hands of the Gauls rather than taking up valuable space and supplies atop the Capitol as *triumphales ... senes* (6.364) matches that of Livy’s *senes triumphales* (Liv. 5.39.13). In explaining how these ‘old men’ were cut down in their own homes (6.363-4), Mars continues to demonstrate his familiarity with Livy (5.51.1-8),\(^{84}\) who recounts that they were all slaughtered following Marcus Papirius’ indignant reaction to having his beard pulled by a Gaul (5.41.9-10). Towards the end of his speech, as Mars expresses his frustration that the Romans are unable to take up arms against the Gauls (*atque utinam pugnae pateat locus! arma capessant / et, si non poterunt exsuperare, cadant* – 6.371-2), he once again provides a verbal parallel of Livy’s description of how Camillus did his best amidst the debris of the war-ravaged city to draw up troops against the Gauls (*Instruit deinde aciem, ut loci natura patiebatur, in semirutae solo urbis et natura inaequali – 5.49.4*).

A knowledge of Livy also reveals that despite Mars’ self-proclaimed concision, his summary of events preceding Rome’s sack by the Gauls effectively encompasses the same timespan as Livy’s much longer account of the entire Gallic invasion. As will be evidenced in due course, Mars makes oblique references to the events that precipitated the Gallic invasion of Rome, ending with an evocation of Camillus’ speech that Livy places after the Gauls are finally successfully defeated (5.51.1-54.7). Through a number of instances of ‘thematic’ intertextuality, the poet appears to direct his reader to Livy’s account, so that they may fully unpick the complexity of Mars’ succinct synopsis. By interspersing Mars’ narrative with three ‘direct’ ‘verbal’ intertexts, it would be reasonable to assume the author-focussed nature of this ‘thematic’ intertextuality.

The war-god continues with his address, by alluding to Rome’s victorious military campaigns (*iamque suburbanos Etruscaque contudit arma – 6.361*). Turn to Livy (5.1-23.12), and it becomes apparent that in just a few words, Mars has summed up ‘the three Veientine Wars which culminated in Camillus’ capture of Veii in 396 BC’,\(^{85}\) and preceded

\(^{83}\) Littlewood 2006:115.

\(^{84}\) While acknowledging that Mars appeal to Jupiter is in part based on Venus’ appeal to the god on behalf of a shipwrecked Aeneas (Virg. *Aen.* 1.257ff), Williams (1991:187-8) notes Mars’ faithful replication of the Livian tradition here, although the god does reverse Livy’s sequence of events - placing the story of the old men before the removal of the sacred objects of Vesta from Rome. See also Littlewood 2006:116.

\(^{85}\) Littlewood 2006:116.
the Gallic invasion. The initial hope that these Etruscan triumphs had instilled in Rome is however, according to Mars, short-lived (spes erat in cursu: nunc lare pulsa suo est – 6.362). As well as having the dramatic effect of highlighting the Roman sense of despair at current circumstances, the god’s reference to spes ‘thematically’ recalls Livy’s account and thus expands the ‘historical’ parameters of Mars’ oration. Following their disastrous defeat at the battle of the Allia (also briefly mentioned by Ovid 1.57-60), Livy explains how a large proportion of the population fled from Rome to Veii, leaving those who remained with little hope of being able to defend the city (Nam cum defendi posse urbem tam parua relictus manu spes nulla esset – 5.39.9). Hope also disappears from Rome later when the plebeians, who have been denied the protection of the Capitol, take it with them as they too escape the city (Inde pars per agros dilapsi, pars urbes petunt finitimas, sineullo duce aut consensus, suam quisque spem, suain consilia communibus deploratis exsequentes – 5.40.6).

After alluding to the removal from Rome of the sacred objects of Vesta (6.365-6), Mars proceeds to castigate Jupiter for neglecting his duty to pious Romans in allowing the Gauls to threaten so many sacred buildings on the Capitol (6.367-70). Here, Ovid recalls Livy’s account of the speech Camillus’ made after the Gallic siege ended, in which he implored the Romans not to relocate the capital city to Veii (5.51.1-54.7). However, Mars offers an interesting reversal of the diligentissimus religionum cultor (5.50.1) that forms a central leitmotif in Livy’s version of Camillus’ speech, suggesting instead that it was the divine negligentia rerum humanarum that resulted in the Gallic invasion and siege. It is also the same gods who sit on Ovid’s council – Jupiter, Mars, Vesta and Quirinus - that Livy’s Camillus identifies as ‘Rome’s guardian deities’ (5.52.6-7). In referring to Camillus’ victory at Veii, as well as his post-siege speech, the length of Mars’ summary of events relating to the Gallic siege belies the ‘historical’ period it encompasses. It is only when read in conjunction with Livy – which Ovid directs us to do through both ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality – that the full extent of the poet’s ‘historical’ coverage can be realised, as well as the full significance of intervening incidents tersely mentioned. Together with a number references to other episodes that occurred in the context of this conflict (as surveyed previously), Ovid can be seen to be providing a

86 As noted in the introduction to the chapter, Ovid makes two further brief references to Camillus’ conquest of Veii at 1.641 and 6.183-4.
89 Ogilvie (1965:626) explains that the neglect of religious duty was seen as part of the reason for Rome’s invasion by the Gauls. See also Littlewood 2006:118-9.
relatively comprehensive account of the Gallic invasion and siege. As will now be examined, Ovid can also be seen to be adapting his version of the Gallic siege to his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme and in doing so, offering his own critique of one of the most important instalments in Rome’s past.

**Ovid’s plebeian theme**

In narrating the end of the Gallic siege, Ovid differs from Livy in making no mention of the ransom paid to the Gallic chief Brennus (Livy. 5.48.8-9) or Camillus’ military intervention in ending the siege (5.49.1-7). 91 Instead the poet proposes that the Gallic siege was brought to a close after the Romans threw corn from the top of the Capitol, thus dispelling the Gauls’ belief that they could starve out their hostages (6.377-93). While Livy notes this incident just prior to his narration of the deal made with Brennus (5.48.4), he is sceptical about its veracity (dicitur – 5.48.4). 92 Once again therefore, Ovid’s decision to prioritise this incident could be construed as indicative of his engagement with the historian: the poet supplements Livy’s account with a version of events that the historian has explicitly rejected. Certainly the generic principles and overall thematic concerns of the Fasti would have undoubtedly influenced Ovid’s choice not to highlight the militaristic conclusion to the Gallic siege as told by Livy, choosing instead to narrate an event fitting to the explanation of the origins of a minor altar (6.349-50). 93 When viewed in terms of his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme however, Ovid’s choice of an alternative ending has the potential to expose a more serious assessment of the ‘traditional’ version of the siege (as represented by Livy).

Ovid sets his narration of the Gallic siege in a ‘plebeian’ context from the outset by placing it within his wider aetiology for the festival of the ‘popular’ goddess Vesta (6.249-460). 94 The goddess, who was particularly associated with ‘the lowest social classes such as

---

91 Feldherr (1998:79) states that there were many ‘competing versions’ of the Gallic siege.
92 Livy asserts ‘It is said’ (dicitur) that this event happened (5.48.4). Plutarch (Cam. 28.3-36) likewise downplays the famine.
94 The temporal context of Vesta’s appearance in this passage is important here. As Newlands (1995:132) explains, Ovid represents Vesta here in her traditional Republican guise as a goddess associated with the lower classes. Later however, Vesta climbed the social scale through her appropriation by Augustus as the protector of the imperial family and the Roman empire. See also Littlewood 2006:104.
bakers’, also plays a pivotal role in ending the Gallic siege: it is Vesta whom Jupiter commands to crush and roast the corn, which he then instructs the Romans atop the Capitol to throw down on the heads of the Gauls (6.383-8). Although Ovid does not specify that these Romans were plebeian, they do equate to other ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ characters in the Fasti through their non-militaristic actions in ending the siege (see below). With the Gauls tricked into believing that they will not be able to conquer the Romans through starvation, they are repelled and an altar to Jupiter Pistor is erected:

... iaciunt Cerealia dona,
iacta super galeas scutaque longa sonant.
posse fame uinci spes excidit. hoste repulso
candida Pistori ponitur ara Ioui (6.391-4).

The non-militaristic nature of this act of throwing corn at the enemy seems at first glance incompatible with the sense of force conveyed in Ovid’s description of its effect – the rebuttal of the Gauls (hoste repulso – 6.393). Therefore, Ovid’s choice of words here would seem to conform to Newlands assertion that he is playfully using elegiacs to ‘mock the seriousness of epic modes of narrative’. However, it is difficult to agree with this as an overall assessment of Jupiter’s plan which, according to Newlands, ultimately leads to frivolity, comedy and farce. Admittedly, the visual image created by Ovid’s depiction of the Romans throwing corn onto the heads of their enemies is potentially comic (6.391-2); when considered in conjunction with Ovid’s account of the baker Anna Perenna (see above)

96 Livy states that it was men of military age and able-bodied senators who were chosen to retreat to the Capitol (5.39.9; 5.39.12); however, the existence of a plebeian contingent within this group is perhaps indicated by an explicit contrast with the senatus, caput publici consilii who also retire to the Citadel (5.39.12). Also, in describing the actions of the plebeian Lucius Albinius, Livy relates how he is fleeing Rome inter ceteram turbam quae inutilis bello urbe excedebat (5.40.9-10). Dionysius claims it was ‘the most prominent men [tōn periphanesterōn]’ who took refuge on the Capitol (13.6.1). Diodorus just says it was the populace at the behest of the magistrates (14.115.3).
97 Newlands 1995:134-5. The sense of causation expressed in the ablative absolute hoste repulso (6.393) in relation to the building of the altar to Jupiter Pistor (6.394), would suggest that Ovid is depicting the corn throwing incident as having directly led to the repulsion of the Gauls, even if it is expressed with a sense of irony. Williams (1991:188) similarly notes the ‘ironic humour’ of this episode as ‘the reader’s expectations of a Livian conclusion to Ovid’s treatment of a Livian story are suddenly dashed’. See also Littlewood 2006:119-20. Williams’ (1991:186-7) suggestion that ‘the etymological link between pistor and pinsere’ enables Ovid to present a dual identity for Jupiter as the ‘crusher’ of the enemy as well as the ‘crusher’ of grain, would seem to reinforce the idea that Ovid credits the incident with the corn as bringing the Gallic siege to an end. Furthermore, at the beginning of his account of the Gallic siege, Ovid states that this altar was more famous for its name than its monetary value (6.349).
however, the use of food in the siege also takes on ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ connotations: food effectively becomes a ‘plebeian’ weapon for confronting the enemy.\(^{99}\) The noise the corn makes as it hits the helmets and spears of the Gauls (6.392) perhaps reminiscent of the sound of more conventional military weapons in combat. By giving the plebeians a more pivotal role in one of the most momentous events in Roman history therefore, \(^{100}\) Ovid’s version of the Gallic sack becomes amounts to more than an exploration of generic or thematic concerns.

As has been argued throughout this thesis, central to Ovid’s exploration of his ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme is the association of ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ characters with peace (Remus, Numa, Servius) in opposition to more aggressive figures (Romulus, Tullia). The non-militaristic manner in which the ‘ordinary’ Romans atop the Capitol and Vesta confront the enemy, contrasts markedly to Mars’ suggestion of taking up arms against the Gauls (6.371-2). Romulus’ ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ regal counterpart Numa (explored in Chapter Four), also comes to mind in relation to the beleaguered Romans not just in the king’s association with Vesta (6.263-4), but also in Ovid’s account of how the Romans on the Capitol received a message from Jupiter. Just as Numa receives a message from Faunus on how to avert a famine in a dream (4.662-8), it is whilst asleep that Jupiter tells the Romans ‘surgite et in medios de summis arcibus hostes / mittite, quam minime tradere uolitis, opem!’ (6.387-8).\(^{101}\)

As well as providing a foil by which the Capitol-dwelling Romans can be judged in ‘plebeian’ terms, Mars’ militarism also evokes the bellicosity displayed by Livy’s Camillus, who employs armed combat to defeat the Gauls. As noted earlier, Mars’ speech echoes that of Camillus in Livy through both ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality. Moreover, this connection seems to be reinforced in the historical record, as Livy reveals that as a result of the success of Camillus’ military action against the Gauls, he was hailed as a second Romulus (5.49.7).\(^{102}\)

\(^{99}\) Littlewood (2006:lviii) also notes that food is associated with the theme of war at 6.169-71, with pork, emmer and beans are eaten at the festival of Carne ‘the goddess who ensures the health of the viscera of Rome’s fighting men’. The relationship between Vesta and food is also illustrated in the preceding passage about the bakers’ donkey (6.319-48).

\(^{100}\) As Feldherr (1998:79) rightly suggests, ‘the sack of Rome by the Gauls was one of the most momentous events in early Roman history, and among the most controversial’.

\(^{101}\) Both Numa and the Romans also ‘ponder’ the message they have received whilst asleep (note the intratext of ambages at 4.667-8 and 6.389). See also Littlewood 2006:122.

\(^{102}\) Newlands (1995:134) notes how through his comparison with Romulus, Livy implicitly creates an association between Camillus and Augustus.
Critics have noted that Camillus is ‘strikingly absent’ from the *Fasti*\(^{103}\) – perhaps this is unsurprising considering that one of the greatest generals in Roman history is hardly congruent with the conventions of the elegiac *Fasti*. That said, as has been established above, when compared to Livy, Ovid does allude to Camillus on a number of occasions as well as evoke his character through Mars. Thereby, the poet appears to be deliberately drawing attention to his relative neglect of Camillus and in doing so, highlights his denial of Camillus his role in ending one of the most momentous episodes in Roman history. His choice then, to spotlight the actions of a ‘plebeian’ goddess\(^{104}\) and some ‘ordinary’ Romans, would seem to provide a somewhat incisive comment on the more glorious picture of the general that posterity has handed down to Livy.

\(^{103}\) Newlands 1995:134. Gowing (2005:14-15) emphasises the gravity of Ovid’s denial of Camillus: by failing to commemorate Camillus’ capture of Veii or his part in the Gallic siege is, effectively, to consign Camillus to oblivion. Although Ovid does refer to Camillus by name in reporting his dedication of the temple to Concord, there is a sense of inappropriate levity by referring to ‘one of the greatest heroes in all of Roman history’ (Farrell 2013:58) as Furius and not Camillus. However, Farrell notes that Camillus, as well as being one of the few figures from the Republic whom Ovid names in his earlier poetry (*Am. 3.13*), also appears in the *Fasti* more than once.

\(^{104}\) See footnote 94.
CHAPTER SEVEN
Ovid, Livy and the History of Rome: Directions for Future Research

As the previous chapter demonstrates, Ovid maintains his dialogue with Livy from the regal period to the Republican era. Through an examination of Ovid’s coverage of Roman history in the *Fasti* from Romulus to the Gallic siege, this thesis has sought to establish that the scope of ‘history’ in the *Fasti* is far wider than previously thought. The realisation of the true extent of ‘history’ in the poem is both indicative of, and dependent on, Ovid’s engagement with Livy; through both ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality, Ovid signals that not only is he using Livy as his main ‘historical’ source, but that the significance of his ‘historical’ references can only be realised by a parallel reading of the *Fasti* alongside *AUC*. The poet’s relationship with Livy, as this thesis has tried to demonstrate, has the further effect of enabling Ovid to develop a ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ theme that partially challenges the ‘canonical’ presentation of the history of Rome.

As the ‘history of Rome’ chart in Chapter One demonstrates, Ovid’s coverage of Roman history extends beyond the material that has been explored within the confines of this thesis. There is therefore, scope for further research on those ‘historical’ episodes not dealt with here, both within and beyond the objectives of this thesis as outlined above. More specifically, it is the purpose of this (necessarily brief) final chapter to give some indication of the possibilities for future research offered by the ‘historical’ material that could not, either for reasons of space or consistency of focus, be given full coverage in this thesis.

Scholars note how Ovid expands the parameters of Roman history by going back as far as Janus (especially 1.89-127), and so makes a ‘principle of going back beyond the foundational epic of Aeneas’.¹ As this extends ‘history’ beyond the parameters of Livy’s self-proclaimed objectives in *AUC* (*Praef.* 6-7), it would be impossible to examine this part of the *Fasti* in terms of Ovid’s engagement with the historian. However, both the Janus episode and the significant amount of other ‘historical’ events covered in the *Fasti* help to suggest the impressive scope of Ovid’s coverage of Roman history in the poem.

The inevitable influence of Virgil may also mean that Ovid relied less on Livy in his presentation of Aeneas. However, further study of Ovid’s engagement with the historian in

relation to Aeneas is likely to reveal that Livy still has some bearing on the poet’s version of events. One similarity that the poet and historian do share is the terseness of their accounts of the life of Aeneas: for example, critics note the relatively minor role Ovid gives to Aeneas (4.249-54, 6.419-36) in comparison to Evander (1.469-584, 4.2.271-82, 4.65, 5.91-102, 5.643-4, 6.501-50) and Numa 1.43-4, 3.151-4, 6.257-64, 4.641-72). Livy’s concise treatment of Aeneas (1.1-3) – a mere three chapters in comparison to twelve chapters dedicated to Romulus and Remus (1.4-16) – might seem unsurprising given the stated aims of his work. Despite this, Livy makes two references to Evander, including a relatively lengthy explanation of Evander’s institution of the rite of the *Ara Maxima* (1.5.1-2; 1.7.3-15), as part of his narration of the lives of Romulus and Remus. Ovid’s apparently similar choice of legendary heroes to focus on is perhaps, in itself, a response in part to Livy. Ovid also follows Livy both in honouring Evander for introducing the cult of Lycaean Pan to Rome in the context of the Lupercalia festival (*Fasti* 2.271-82; *Liv. 1.5.1-2) and in highlighting the divinity of Evander’s mother Carmentis (*Fasti* 1.583-4; *Liv. 1.7.10). The poet’s story of Evander’s arrival in Rome (1.469-542), while reliant on Virgil for its details, could perhaps be seen as a response to Livy’s reference to Evander’s occupation of the Palatine for many ages before the time of writing (1.5.1-2). As we have seen on numerous occasions in the course of this thesis, Ovid is concerned to ‘fill in’ perceived gaps in the historian’s version of ‘history’.

Generic convention and the wider themes of the *Fasti* must also play a large part in Ovid’s choice of which historical events to include and which to omit, no doubt determining also to what extent each episode should be treated in terms of length. In the Republican period, following the Gallic siege, Ovid generally assigns only a few lines to events of a military

\[\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{Frazer (1929:iii.167) remarks that in narrating the Alban Dynasty (4.39-54), Ovid follows Livy (1.3.6) in presenting Postumus as the son of Ascanius: he is called Silvius because he was born in the woods (4.41). Virgil, however (*Aen. 6.761-5*), presents a different tradition in which Silvius was a posthumous son of Aeneas and his wife Lavinia. Frazer (171) also notes that Ovid also concurs with Livy (1.3.7-8) in stating that Latinus’ son became a king of Alba (4.43), whereas he is not mentioned in the *Aeneid*.}
\[\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{Aeneas does get brief mentions elsewhere in the *Fasti*, but these are the only two passages that deal at any length specifically with him. Aeneas also features in Ovid’s narration of Anna Perenna’s journey to Italy at 3.601-56, but the focus of this passage is very much on Anna not Aeneas.}
\[\text{\textsuperscript{4}}\text{This includes Ovid’s narration of Hercules’ arrival in Rome and slaying of Cacus (1.543-84).}
\[\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\text{Fantham (2002a:223) notes that Numa is only mentioned once in the *Aeneid* at 6.808-12.}
\[\text{\textsuperscript{6}}\text{Fantham (1992a:157) sees Ovid’s choice of heroes as an echo of Livy, in order to respond to Virgil: by reorientating Livy’s text, he shifts the viewpoint towards Carmentis (162).}
\[\text{\textsuperscript{7}}\text{Fantham 1992a:163.}
\[\text{\textsuperscript{8}}\text{Ovid’s *nec tacet Euandri mater prope tempus adesse / Hercule quo tellus sit satis usa suo* (1.583-4) reflects Livy’s *te mihi mater, veridica interpres deum, aucturum caelestium numerum cecinit* (1.7.10). Green (2004a:268) suggests ‘The whole scene is a reversal of Livy, where Evander suggests that his mother had revealed to him the divine future of Hercules some time before’ the fight with Cacus’.}
nature. He chooses to expand on episodes that are – on the surface at least – more suitable to the poem’s elegiac and thematic concerns. For example, while the First Punic War only receives a total of three lines (1.595, 6.193-4), the burning of the temple of Vesta – an event which occurred in 241 BC, the same year the First Punic War ended – receives eighteen lines (6.473-54).\(^9\) Similarly, whereas the Second Punic War receives a total of twenty lines (1.593, 2.241-2, 3.148, 4.873-4, 6.241-8, 6.765-70), Ovid’s story of Magna Mater’s journey to Rome – which took place in 204 BC while the Second Punic War was still underway – receives 101 lines (4.247-348; see below).\(^10\)

Despite the brevity of some references however, it must be noted that a significant number of such events are still mentioned in Ovid’s coverage of the Republican period (see chart in Chapter One), demonstrating that the Fasti is hardly deficient in terms of its ‘historical’ coverage. Furthermore, as already discussed, the brevity of such references often disguises their ‘historical’ impact, and it is only through the poet’s relationship with Livy that the significance of these events can be understood.

This chapter will now go on to briefly survey the three most substantial ‘historical’ episodes Ovid that narrates in the remaining Republican period after the Gallic siege, in order to demonstrate the benefit that further research into their relationship with Livy could bring.

**Exile and Return of the flute-players**

As part of his aition for the Quinquatrus Miniscule (6.651-710),\(^11\) Ovid calls on Minerva as patron of craftsmen\(^12\) to explain the reason behind the flute-players’ march through the city and why they wear masks and long gowns (6.652-4). The inherently peaceful and artistic subject matter of flute-players (6.651-92) makes them fitted to the generic conventions of the Fasti. Certainly, the generic congruence of this festival must go some way to explaining the importance Ovid attaches too it: not only does Ovid claim he was ordered to recount this

---

\(^9\) Livy’s account of the burning of the temple of Vesta does not survive.

\(^10\) Wiseman and Wiseman (2011:xvi) note the link between genre and the brevity of Ovid’s narration of military campaigns: ‘Battle narrative is not for this genre’. Syme (1978:23-36) notes a number of ‘historical’ omissions in the Fasti; these omissions lead him to ultimately declare the poem as the least satisfactory of Ovid’s works.

\(^11\) Ovid replaces minusculae with minores for metrical reasons. See Littlewood 2006:196.

\(^12\) Littlewood (2006:192) explains that as the goddess of craftsmen, musicians were among the occupations that claimed Minerva as their patron.
event (et iam Quinquatrus iubeor narrare minores – 6.651), but Minerva expresses the high esteem in which the musicians were held in bygone times (6.657-8). However, what it also does is enable Ovid to respond to Livy’s version of this event (9.30.5-10), perhaps even going as far as to challenge the historian’s dismissal of the significance of this event (rem dictu paruam praeterirem, ni ad religionem uisa esset pertinere – 9.30.5). The poet therefore, once again actively uses genre as a means to engage with the historian.

As Minerva proceeds to recount the events that led up to the flute-players’ exile, she explains how they staged a ‘walk out’ after the aediles had decreed that only 10 musicians should accompany funeral possession, and retired to Tibur (6.663-6). Following their enforced repatriation to Rome, Plautius suggested that they should disguise themselves with masks and long robes in order to deceive the Senate as to their identity and numbers (6.685-90). Turn to Livy, and we learn that Gaius Plautius held the censorship with Appius Claudius during the time of the flute-players ‘strike’ (9.29.5-11); furthermore, within his overall portrayal of Appius Claudius, Livy offers varying perspectives, often saddling Claudius with potential anti-plebeian overtones. By naming Plautius (6.685), Minerva could be seen to be recalling the wider context of Livy’s version of the flute-players’ exile (9.30.5-10). Further research into this connection between Ovid and Livy’s account therefore, could reveal the poet’s continuing interest in ‘plebeian’ aspects of Roman history through his allusion to the censor Plautius and potential contextual evocation of Claudius.

---

13 Barchiesi (1997:76-7) claims that Ovid’s use of iubeor (6.651) marks the public importance of this event.
14 In highlighting the antiquity of the flute-player here too (6.657-8), Minerva could also be seen to provide a ‘thematic’ link to Livy’s account of the origin of the Ludi Scaenici (7.2.1-13). Ovid does not provide an account of the Ludi Saeonales in the Fasti, and Syme (1978:23) notes the seriousness of this omission. For a full discussion of Livy’s treatment of the Ludi Scaenici see Oakley 1998:ii.40-72.
15 Holzberg (2002:171) believes that Ovid’s version of the exile of the flute-players is based on Livy.
16 As well as labelling this event as hardly worth mentioning (9.30.5), Livy concludes his account with the derisory comment haec inter duorum ingentium bellorum curam gerebantur (9.30.10). Despite this repudiation however, Livy still proceeds to give a relatively lengthy account of the exile of the flute-players.
17 According to Littlewood (2006:203) all the manuscripts read callidus or Claudius, except A.W.C which all read Plautius. See also Frazer 1929:iv.310-11.
18 For a discussion of Livy’s portrayal of the Claudians in line with their traditionally unfavourable reputation, see Wiseman 1979:77-102. Oakley (2005:iii.363) notes the inconsistency of Livy’s portrayal of Appius Claudius throughout the AUC: his ‘characterisation of Appius as a reactionary is juxtaosed with reports of his behaviour which suggest he was a demagogue and a man of the people’. See also Palmer 1965; MacBain 1980; and Oakley 2005:iii.665-9.
Flora

As previously maintained, a knowledge of Livy is essential in determining the significance of an ‘historical’ episode in the Fasti, with Ovid’s narration of the Flora festival (5.183-378) providing one example of this from the Republican period.19 Within this account, Ovid invites Flora to explain the origin of her games (5.277), and the goddess reveals that they were originally funded from fines collected from illegal public-land grazing, with the remaining money used to build the Clius Publicius (5.279-94). Flora provides a brief explanation of the background of these fines, stating that some people had become rich by illegally grazing their cattle on public lands until the plebeian aediles, the Publicii, successfully brought the matter to court (5.279-90). When read in conjunction with Livy, it becomes apparent that Flora’s sixteen-line dialogue encompasses several major historical events that occurred over a significant period of time.20 The fines Flora refers to came about after the passing of the Licinio-Sextian laws of 367 BC (Liv. 6.35.1-10), while the goddess’ mention of the Clius Publicius recalls events which took place around 211-207 BC during the second Punic war (Liv. 26.10, 27.37.15, 30.26.5).

While Flora herself asserts the ‘plebeian’ associations of both the legislation and the road (5.285-8), the full ‘plebeian’ significance of the Licinio-Sextian rogations in particular, is explicated through reference to Livy.21 The historian provides a comprehensive account of this legislation (6.34.1-42.3), which was proposed by the plebeian tribunes Gaius Licinius and Lucius Sextius, and involved three laws dealing with land ownership limitations, interest on debts and the election of plebeian consuls. As Pellam opines: ‘The struggle for and passage of the so-called Licinio-Sextian rogations of 367 BC is generally regarded as the climactic moment of the “struggle of the orders”’.22

---

19 Ovid is the first writer to provide an account of the festival of Flora (Fantham 1992b:50). Livy’s text for the year 238 BC does not survive so it is impossible to tell whether he included an account of the actual first festival of Flora or not.
20 Following her first speech in the Fasti (5.279-94), Flora makes a second oration (5.296-330), correcting Ovid’s mistaken assumption that her festival was always held annually. The goddess explains how this was not the case until the consuls Laenas and Postumius vowed her an annual festival (5.325-30), which occurred in 173 BC (Frazer 1929:iv.29; Fantham 1992b:50). Taken together therefore, Flora’s dialogue encompasses a significant time period – beginning with the Licinio-Sextian legislation in 367 BC and ending with her annual festival in 173 BC.
21 Herbert Brown (2009:134) notes that along with Anna Perenna, Flora is a defender of the plebs against the senate.
22 Pellam 2014:280. It could also be worth exploring the similarities between Ovid’s narration of the Floralia and Livy’s narration of the Ludi Apollinares (26.23). Ovid’s version of the Floralia might be seen to be offering a ‘rustic’-‘plebeian’ version of Livy’s account of the festival of the imperial god Apollo.
Magna Mater

Ovid’s longest single account of the Republican era concerns Magna Mater’s journey to Rome in 204 BC (4.247-348), recounted as part of his overall narration of the Megalensia festival (4.179-371). In explaining the origins of the Megalensia, Ovid relates how the Magna Mater was brought to Rome by boat, with the goddess herself demanding that she be received by chaste hands (4.249-60). When the Magna Mater arrives in the city, Claudia Quinta asks the goddess for permission to pulls the statue to shore, in a bid to disprove the uncertainty surrounding her chastity (4.319-24).

Scholars believe that Livy was the first author to introduce the idea of Claudia Quinta’s bad reputation. In similarly explaining that Claudia Quinta brought the statue of the goddess ashore, the historian states:

Matronae primores ciuitatis, inter quas unius Claudiae Quintae insigne est nomen, accepere; cui dubia, ut traditur, antea fama clariorem ad posteros tam religioso ministerio pudicitiam fecit (29.14.12).

Ovid follows Livy in questioning Claudia’s chastity, perhaps even amplifying the historian’s more covert declaration of doubt by declaring that, although it was false, a charge was actually brought against her:

casta quidem, sed non et credita: rumor iniquus laeserat, et falsi criminis acta rea est (4.307-8).

The poet proceeds to describe the physical appearance of Claudia Quinta in terms reminiscent of the elegiac mistress, citing this as one of the reasons for the common belief that she was unchaste (4.309-11). Ovid’s statement that, despite her doubtful reputation, nos...

23 Littlewood (1981:384 n.18) states that Livy was the first to introduce the idea of Claudia’s bad reputation. The earliest extant evidence for the character of Claudia comes from Cicero (de Haruspicum Responsa 13.27) in which he portrays her as a paragon of matronly virtue; he also holds her up as an exemplum of virtue in an attack on Clodia during the trial of Caelius (Pro. Cael. 34). Diodorus was the first historian to provide an account of Magna Mater’s journey to Rome, wherein he describes Claudia as the best of the women (34.33.2). Ovid and Livy seem to be the only extant authors who cast any doubt over her chastity. Wiseman (1979:98) claims that, at some point, an anti-Claudian annalist must have introduced this aspect into the ‘popular’ tradition. Chiu (2016:44) claims Claudia Quinta was an established ‘figure of renowned virtue’ in Ovid’s day.
in uitium credula turba sumus (4.312), perhaps problematizes previous assertions about her innocence.

While Ovid is more overt than Livy in raising the question of Claudia Quinta’s chastity, he is less explicit in stating her social status. Although Ovid does cite Claudia Quinta’s ancestry and appearance as indicators of her nobility, he provides ‘no marker of her marital status’: in contrast, Livy is unequivocal in classifying Claudia Quinta as a leading matron (Matronae primores ciuitatis – 29.14.12). This, together with Ovid’s focus on a mixed crowd making merry as they join the procession of the Magna Mater (4.293-6; 4.341-46), again facilitates Ovid’s setting of this ‘historical’ event in a more ‘plebeian’ context: while the entire city comes to meet the goddess in Livy (29.14.13-4), his procession is much more sedate than Ovid’s and concludes with a more formal banquet of the gods and games (Populus frequens dona deae in Palatium tulit, lectisterniumque et ludi fuere, Megalesia appellata – 29.14.14 ).

The spotlight Ovid specifically casts on the more ‘popular’ elements of this episode is perhaps only discernible when his account is compared to Livy’s.

The Caesars

As Livy’s account does not survive in full beyond the events of 167 BC, it is impossible to ascertain Ovid’s engagement with the historian for his narration of events from the middle and late Republic through to the Imperial period. Although Ovid’s narration of ‘history’ from Imperial times is shorter than for preceding periods (see chart), it is still worth noting the number of ‘historical’ episodes he includes reference to. Furthermore, when considered in terms of where Ovid began – with the rule of Saturn, as discussed above – it is worth noting that he brings Roman history right up to contemporary times with Germanicus’ triumph in 17 AD. It would be interesting to see how far the extent of Ovid’s ‘history of Rome’ in the Fasti would have stretched had he completed the remaining six books. The ‘historical’ scope of the first six books might even have a contribution to make to the debate about whether Ovid ever intended to continue with his calendrical project.

26 Periochae, providing summaries of Livy’s lost books, exist for all books except 116 and 117.
27 Wiseman and Wiseman (2011:xxiii) believe that while Ovid ‘pays proper attention to the main Augustan dates ... he does not go over the top’.
28 Ovid makes a prospective reference to this event in 17 AD, possibly following a decree of the Senate in 15 AD awarding Germanicus a triumph for his victory over the Germans whilst the war was still ongoing. See Fantham 2006:383 and Green 2004a:58. The timespan Ovid covers in the Fasti parallels the historical programme outlined at the beginning of the Metamorphoses (1.3-4).
Conclusion

A preliminary examination of events that occurred during the Republican period following the Gallic siege as narrated in the *Fasti*, reveals that Ovid continues to engage with Livy in terms of the poem’s ‘historical’ content. There is therefore, ample scope for further research in relation to this. Although the absence of Livy’s books for the Caesars make a similar analysis of the imperial era unfeasible, Ovid’s coverage of this period still demonstrates the impressive scope of his coverage of the history of Rome within the *Fasti*. 
CONCLUSION

This thesis has attempted to present an investigation of the way Ovid engages with Livy in the *Fasti* in a manner that is both more systematic and more wide-ranging than earlier scholarship (as surveyed in Chapter One). In doing so, it has argued that through a close examination of the relationship between Ovid and Livy, the *Fasti* can be seen to contain a version of a narrative ‘history of Rome’ that has not been previously acknowledged. Furthermore, Ovid’s dialogue with Livy reveals certain a certain focus and emphases within that ‘history of Rome’.

As the previous chapters have demonstrated, Ovid signals his engagement with Livy through both ‘direct verbal’ and ‘thematic’ intertextuality (defined in Chapter Two). As well as utilising the historian as a ‘factual’ source, this intertextuality enables Ovid to engage in a dialogue with Livy through which his own nuanced interpretation of Rome’s past can be judged. Most notably, by reading the *Fasti* in conjunction with Livy, Ovid can be seen to be demonstrating a sustained interest in the more ‘plebeian’ aspects of Roman history.

Beginning with Romulus and Remus, Chapter Three demonstrated that Ovid’s engagement with Livy enabled him to create a very specific opposition between the two brothers. While initially both brothers are equally informed by the pastoral environment of their youth, on Remus’ death, Romulus becomes more influenced by his divine paternity. Thus the poet creates an opposition between the militaristic Romulus and his more ‘rustic’ twin Remus.

Chapter Four contended that Ovid creates a similar polarity between Romulus and Numa. The poet employs generic convention to develop Livy’s version of Rome’s second king in similar terms to the ‘rustic’ Remus, and in contraposition to his bellicose regal predecessor. Ovid continues to engage closely with Livy in his depiction of Servius as evidenced in Chapter Five. By highlighting the servile maternity of Rome’s sixth king and his association with the ‘popular’ festival of Fortuna, Ovid casts the king in ‘plebeian’ terms. Servius is then juxtaposed to his murderous daughter Tullia, who is shown to have more in common with the belligerent Romulus. Moving on to the Republican period, Chapter Six maintains that it is only through familiarity with Livy that the true extent of ‘history’ in the *Fasti* can be realised. Furthermore, it reveals that Ovid appears to focus on those ‘historical’ episodes that are more easily adaptable to his plebeian interests. Chapter Seven suggests areas for further research that fall beyond the limits of this thesis.

Ultimately, Ovid’s engagement with Livy enables him to both interrogate and challenge his predecessor’s version of history. Not only does this reveal that history is more important to
the *Fasti* than previously thought, but it also enables Ovid’s own specific representation of history to be realised. The engagement of Ovid with Livy as demonstrated in this thesis adds a further aspect to existing aesthetic and moral debates surrounding Ovid’s *Fasti*; namely, that by responding to Livy, Ovid is also commenting on Roman history in its most authoritative version.
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