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11. COMPLEMENTARITY AND CONTRADICTION IN OVIDIAN MYTHOGRAPHY

Joseph Farrell

1. Introduction

It stands to reason that mythographic sources should have played a role in the composition of Ovid's works, and recent work suggests more and more that this must be the case. But the complex motives behind Ovid's engagement with this tradition have proven difficult to comprehend and to integrate with Ovidian criticism as a whole. There are some fairly clear reasons why this is so. One is the understandable tendency of critics to emphasize Ovid's use of poetic sources organized along mythographic lines, such as Nicander's *Heteroeumena* and, more recently, the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, rather than of conventional prose mythographies. But a greater appreciation of what Ovid may owe to his fellow poets, while obviously a good thing in itself, should not be allowed to obscure his debt to mythographic treatises and encyclopedias. Another factor is that many of Ovid's works flaunt their relationships to various prose genres other than mythography. This the *Ars amatoria* does by imitating earlier didactic poetry of the metaphrastic tradition, while the *Heroides* and the exile poetry, in their different ways, thematize their relationship to prose letters. In the case of the *Fasti*, the obvious im-

---


importance of the calendar itself as the primary structural model for the poem and the specific verbal parallels that can be found in a few specific calendars, especially the *Fasti Praenestini*, have tended to distract attention away from the potential influence of other prose genres. As for the *Metamorphoses*, it now seems clear that the genre of universal history contributed in significant ways to the architecture of that poem. But it is still obviously worth investigating the extent to which the concerns of prose mythographers in particular influenced Ovid’s treatment not only of individual myths but especially of the relationships among them.

Some important preliminary work has been done, and as an example of how any number of more focused studies might fit into a larger picture, I adduce a selection of examples from the *Heroides*, the *Metamorphoses*, and the *Fasti* to suggest how the characteristic concerns of prose mythographers inform all three poems and of how Ovid transforms what he borrows. In the process, I identify two aspects of Ovidian poetics, complementarity and contradiction, that greatly enrich his treatment of mythographic material. Finally I offer some tentative conclusions and raise a few questions to indicate what I think are some productive avenues of further investigation.

2a. Lists, part 1: The Loves of the Gods

Let us begin with a deceptively simple structural element, the list. Various kinds of lists are almost ubiquitous in Ovid’s poetry. They are also highly characteristic of mythography as a genre, whether in poetry or prose, from the very beginning. It stands to reason that

---

<sup>1</sup> On the relationship between Ovid’s poem and actual calendars see D.C. Feeney, *Caesar’s Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History* (Berkeley, 2007). Ovid’s dynamic adoption and redeployment of elements inherited from the tradition of aetiological elegy (J.F. Miller, *Ovid’s Elegiac Festivals* [Frankfurt 1991]) may suggest that Callimachus’ use of prose mythographers such as Xenomedes of Ceos in the *Aetia* (fr. 75.54–77) finds a parallel in the *Fasti*.


<sup>3</sup> R. Tarrant, ‘Ovid and Ancient Literary History,’ in P.R. Hardie (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* (Cambridge, 2002) 13–33 at 15–7 on literary-historical lists (and, incidentally, on their relation to other kinds of list).

<sup>4</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.52 raro adsurgit Hesiodus magnaque pars eius in nominibus est occupata.
some Ovidian lists should offer insight into his use of the mytho-
graphic tradition; and in Heroides 19 we find a list that does just that.
In this letter Hero, writing to Leander, apostrophizes Neptune and
pleads with him to permit her lover to swim the Hellespont on the
grounds that the god, too, had known the pangs of love. To prove
her point she recites a list of the women with whom Neptune had
dallied (Her. 19.129–38):

at tibi flammarum memori, Neptune, tuarum
nullus erat ventis impediendus amor:
130
si neque Amymone nec, laudatissima forma,
criminis est Tyro fabula vana tui,
lucidaque Alcyone Calyceque Hecataeone nata,
et nondum nexit angue Medusa comis
flavaque Laudice caeloque recepta Celaeno
135
et quarum memini nomina lecta mihi.
has certe plusque canunt, Neptune, poetae
molle latus lateri conposuisse tuo.

But you ought to impede no love affair, Neptune, if you remember
your own passions: if neither Amymone nor Tyro, so celebrated for her
beauty, is an empty and fictitious charge against you, and bright
Alcyone and Calyce, daughter of Hecataeon, and Medusa before her
tresses were entwined with snakes, and blonde Laodice and Celaeno
who has been welcomed into the sky, and those whose names I
remember from my reading. Surely the poets sing that these and
more, Neptune, laid their soft bodies side-by-side with yours.

Hero’s concluding observation that she encountered these ladies’
names in her reading and that it is the poets who made them and
others famous is a classic example of the ‘Alexandrian footnote,’ a
device by which a poeta doctus signals his engagement with one or
more works of literature that had previously handled a particular
theme or motif. But this approach is more elaborate than the delib-
erately offhand dicunt or fertur that is usually employed in such con-
texts, and it ought to alert the reader to an unusual sort of reference.
What is Ovid trying to tell us?

Hero’s emphasis on poetae (138) could be seen as validating the
aforementioned tendency to emphasize Ovid’s poetic predecessors
as the appropriate frame of intertextual reference. However, even if
Hero says she knows the names of Neptune’s lovers from the poets,
er her list actually agrees very closely with another one preserved in a

prose source written not too long before Ovid composed the Heroi-
des. It was known for some time that most of Hero’s names also occur
in a longer list incorporated into a treatise On piety by the Epicurean
philosopher Philodemus of Gadara. More recently Dirk Obbink has
argued convincingly that all of the girls named by Hero appear in
Philodemus. So it is clear that Hero’s list is neither original to Ovid,
nor an allusion to other poetry, but a borrowing from the mytho-
graphic tradition.

But is Philodemus Ovid’s immediate source? Apparently so: Ob-
bbink makes a good case that the first and last elements in Hero’s list
are the same as in Philodemus, as well. If that is the case, then it
ought to suggest that Hero’s list was taken directly from Philodemus.
But there is something else: in addition to Hero’s catalogue Obbink
adduces a second Ovidian list. In Metamorphoses 6 Arachne weaves
her famous tapestry that illustrates the erotic adventures of a num-
ber of gods. Prominent among them is, once again, Neptune (Met.
6.115–22):

\[
\begin{align*}
te \ quoque \ mutatum \ torvo, \ Neptune, \ iuvenco \ 115 
\virgine \ in \ Aeolia \ posuit; \ tu \ visus \ Enipeus 
gignis \ Aloidas, \ aries \ Bisaltida \ fallis, 
ete \ flava \ comas \ frugum \ mitissima \ mater 
sensit \ equum, \ sensit \ volucrem \ crinita \ colubris 
mater \ equi \ volucris, \ sensit \ delphina \ Melantho: 
onnibus \ his \ faciemque \ suam \ faciemque \ locorum 
reddidit. \ 120
\end{align*}
\]

She put there you as well, Neptune, transformed into a fierce bull in
the maiden daughter of Aeolus (i.e. Canace); appearing (to Iphimedeia)
as the river Enipeus you beget the Aloidae, in the guise of a ram you
deceive the daughter of Bisaltis (i.e. Theophane), and the blond-

\footnotesize

A. Schober, ‘Philodemi De pietate pars prior,’ Cronache Ercolanesi 18 (1988) 67–125,
a posthumous, revised and expanded version of ‘Philodemi Iεπi ευοβεβελάς libelli
partem priorem,’ (Diss. Königsberg, 1923)

D. Obbink, ‘Vergil’s De pietate: From Ehoiae to Allegory in Vergil, Philodemus,
and Ovid,’ in D. Armstrong et al. (eds.), Vergil, Philodemus and the Augustans (Austin,

See Obbink, ‘Vergil’s De pietate,’ 197.

Iphimedeia and not Tyro is the mother of the Aloidae on the authority of
Homer (Od. 11.305–20), but Homer also celebrates Tyro for her encounter with
Poseidon under the guise of the river god Enipeus (Od. 11.236–59). Ovid in effect
conflates two of the figures whom Odysseus sees in the Homeric ‘Catalogue of
Women,’ much as (e.g.) Vergil conflates Scylla the daughter of Nius with Scylla the
daughter of Phorcys (Ecl. 6.74–7; cf. Ciris 54–91).
tressed mother of grain (i.e. Ceres), most mild, felt you as a horse, the mother of the winged horse, betressed with vipers (i.e. Medusa), felt you winged, Melantho felt you as a dolphin: she gave to all of these their proper appearance and that of their settings.

Both Hero and Arachne, then, recite or depict a variety of Neptune’s conquests; so the possibility that the two lists are more than casually related is great. Might they both derive from the same source?

Arachne’s source is not as obvious as Hero’s. Of the ladies depicted on the tapestry, two also appear in Philodemus (Iphimedeia, 9-10 and Medusa, 22). But the other three (Canace, Ceres, and Theophane) do not; and it seems likely, thanks to the efforts of Obbink and previous editors, that we have all the names that did appear on Philodemus’ list. How then to explain the relationship between Hero’s list and Arachne’s tapestry in terms of sources? The most economical answer is that Philodemus did not compile the list, either, but that he found it in the work of some earlier researcher, and that he did not bother to mention all of the names that he found in this source. These assumptions are strongly supported by a statement on Philodemus’ part suggesting that his source is the mythographic encyclopedist Apollodorus of Athens (PHERC 1428 fr. 5 = FGrHist 244 F 103):

καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ τὰ περὶ θεῶν εἰκόσιν καὶ τέτταρα συντάξας καὶ τὰ πάντα σχεδὸν εἰς ταῦτ’ ἀναλώσας, εἰ καὶ μάχεται ποιὶ τοῖς συνοικείουσι, οὐ διαφέρει.

Apollodorus as well, who composed his twenty-four books On the gods and put practically all of these [stories] into them, even if he quarrels a bit with the allegorists, is no different.

Philodemus’ list, then, is probably a subset of a longer one that he found in Apollodorus. So it seems quite likely that Ovid worked directly from Apollodorus’ list, at least where Arachne’s tapestry is concerned, but in the case of Hero’s letter perhaps had Philodemus’ more circumscribed list in mind, as well.

12 It should be admitted however that the evidence does not appear to be conclusive, because very little survives of the first ten lines of the passage. Obbink (‘Vergil’s De pietate,’ 193), positing that Philodemus cited Hesiod at the head of his list, suggests that some such initial phrase as [ὁ Ἰοῖόδος μιχὴν] [φην᾽ Ἀμυ] was found in lines 7-8, with Ἱοῖόδος also occurring somewhere in the vicinity (perhaps in line 6 or 9). But even if something like Obbink’s suggestion must have occurred, it might have come earlier and so left room for one or more additional names of Poseidon’s partners.
I will return to the importance of Ovid’s possible double source momentarily. First, I would like to make a point about Hesiod’s *Catalogue of Women*. It is tempting to think of the *Catalogue* not just as the ultimate source of both of Ovid’s lists, but as also in some sense actively involved in their intertextual design—even if only in general terms, to the extent that such lists per se might establish a direct relationship to Hesiodic poetry and to the theme of ‘the loves of the gods.’ But however true this may be, there are good reasons for thinking that the *Catalogue* is in important ways distant indeed from Ovid’s immediate purposes in the *Heroïdes* and the *Metamorphoses*. It seems likely that the concerns of his more proximate sources, Apollodorus and perhaps Philodemus, played a bigger role in determining the contents of Ovid’s two lists and influenced their thematic import as well.

To begin, we can be quite sure that Ovid never found either of his actual lists or anything very much like either of them in Hesiod. This is because, whatever uncertainties may still exist regarding the structure of Hesiod’s *Catalogue* in whole or in part, it was not in general organized as if its main theme were, like that of Hero’s list and Arachne’s tapestry, or indeed like the lists of Apollodorus and Philodemus, ‘the loves of the gods.’ In fact the *Catalogue*, like the *Theogony* (which ancient scholars regarded the *Catalogue* as continuing), was organized primarily on genealogical principles. The *Catalogue* in particular was arranged in terms of human families and gave special attention to the (mostly) mortal women who bore heroic children rather than to the gods who fathered them. The poem does, of course, contain information about the offspring of various male divinities, including Poseidon; but this information is not found in single, discrete lists. Rather, it is distributed in the form of the several regional genealogies that occur in succession throughout the poem.13

To illustrate this point, consider the figure of Canace, one of two lovers of Neptune to appear both in Arachne’s tapestry (*Met. 6.116*) and in Hesiod’s *Catalogue* (frr. 10a.34). In the *Catalogue* Canace appears not with other women who had borne children to Poseidon

---

13 The fragmentary condition of the *Catalogue* makes it impossible to give a thorough account, but Poseidon’s affairs are liberally distributed among the major genealogical groups (*Aeolids*, frr. 9, 17a-b, 19, 30.32, 31.1, 43a-c, 87; *Inachids* frr. 148a, 150.27; *Atlantids*, fr. 188a; etc). If, as is now generally agreed, the structure of the *Catalogue* was based on heroic genealogy, then Poseidon and his lovers would have been scattered from one end of the poem to the other.
but with her sisters, Peisidice, Alcyone, Calyce, and Perimede, in a section of the poem that is dominated by the daughters of Aeolus and their offspring. After (presumably) introducing all five daughters by name (fr. 10a.33–34) Hesiod goes on to discuss their contributions to Aeolid genealogy, possibly reversing the order in which he had introduced them. By this logic Canace, who appears fourth in the introductory list, ought to have appeared second in the lengthier account of the sisters’ respective broods. But there is no sign of her in that position; instead, she must be the ‘well-tressed daughter of Aeolus’ (Ἀιολίς ἡμύκομος 101) who was loved by Poseidon and then gave birth to children whose names are lost to a break in the papyrus that preserves the rest of the passage. It is a reasonable inference, then, that Hesiod deferred his account of Canace’s children from its expected position because those children were fathered by Poseidon, a fact that gives them a vastly more distinguished lineage than any of their cousins. So it may be that Poseidon influences the order of Hesiod’s recitation at least to this extent. But Poseidon’s influence may be merely apparent; for, as Martin West points out, ‘It is noteworthy that the families of Aeolus’ daughters [in the order that is followed in Cat. fr. 10] make a geographical series, extending

14 Merkelbach and West consider frr. 10–76 (and perhaps 77–122) as comprising a distinct section of the poem’s architecture that is devoted to Aeolid genealogy. But whether they are right or not, it is clear that frr. 10–11 in their edition form a continuous sequence of more than one hundred lines dealing with the offspring of Aeolus.

15 In R. Merkelbach and M.L. West (eds.), Fragmenta Selecta, in F. Solmsen (ed.), Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum (Oxford, 1990), West’s supplement (‘supplementa longiora excogitavit West’) (115a ad fr. 10a) to lines 33–4 ( Penisίδηκην τε καὶ ᾿Αλκυόνην Υ[αρ]ικέσουν δύοις / [καί Καλόκην Κανάκην τε καὶ εὐεδε[δ] Περιμήδην) is reasonably convincing: Perimede’s name was very probably preceded by those of her sisters in a pair of lines that introduce the genealogies that follow; Penisίδηκη and ᾿Αλκυόνη are metrically similar and could exchange positions in line 33 as West reconstructs it, as could Καλόκη and Κανάκη in line 34, but more extensive rearrangement of the names would be difficult. The grouping of names in the ensuing genealogies suggests that they began with the descendants of Perimede (55–57) and Calyce (58–c. 79). Note that, as Stephen Trzaskoma points out to me, in Ps.-Apolodorus’ Bibliotheca too the name of Perimede stands last in an introductory list but first in the genealogies that follow. Lines 77–82 are lost to a lacuna that obscures the next transition, but the text resumes with the story of Ceyx and Alcyone, naming them both (94, 96; cf. 91) as well as Peisidice (100); on Canace see what follows. So, even if there is room for debate about matters of detail, the basic structure of the entire passage seems reasonably clear.
in an arc from west to east. However one accounts for the structure of the passage, though, it is obvious that this section of the Hesiodic poem is organized not as a catalogue of women with whom Poseidon produced children, but rather as a catalogue of the five daughters of Aeolus whose offspring peopled the region of Thessaly. All of these women have different husbands or lovers, and only one, Canace, has children by Poseidon.

It also appears as though Ovid were working with a list compiled not just from the Catalogue, but from other sources, as well. Two of Neptune’s liaisons as depicted on Arachne’s tapestry (Ceres and Medusa) have not been found in the fragments of the Catalogue. One could argue that this is a particularly anemic form of the argumentum ex silentio, were it not for the fact that there is really no reason to expect that these names would have appeared in that poem. Poseidon made neither Demeter nor Medusa the matriarch of a heroic lineage, which is the material in which the Catalogue deals. Indeed,

17 Note that two of Canace’s sisters, Alcyone and Calyce, have the same name as two women who appear in Hero’s list (19.133–4). But Hero’s Alcyone (like Celaeno 135) is a daughter of Atlas (as Philodemus makes clear: μιχθείναι φητον...,προς δὲ ταύτας Ἀλκυόνη καὶ Κέλαινοι ταῖς Πλεῖσιν 7–15), who is known as a consort of Neptune/Poseidon from Ps.-Apollogodorus 3.111 [3.10.1] and also from a passage of Hyginus (Fab. 157) that Heinsius used to restore the words Calyceque Hecataeone at Her. 19.133, where the paradox offers ceuceque (or celiceque) et aveone or (according to E.J. Kenney, Ovid Heroides XVI-XXI [Cambridge, 1996] 64) less probable readings.
18 Demeter bore to Poseidon a horse called Arion and a mysterious daughter who was not to be named lightly, but was sometimes called simply Despoea (Paus. 8.25.5–7, 8.37.9, 8.42.1). A different version of this myth identifies Poseidon’s partner as an Erinyes or a Harpy (Σ Hom. Il. 23.346 Ab, 23.347 T, Call. fr. 652 Pf.;) Apollodorus (Bibl. 3.77 [3.6.8]) reconciles the two versions by stating that Demeter likened herself to an Erinyes, presumably to evade his advances, and also supplies the information that Arion was ridden by Adrastus in the war against Thebes, as is the case in Statius. Lactantius Placidus adds the detail that one of Arion’s right feet was human (ad Theb. 6.301) but also knows a story according to which Neptune produced Arion and another horse called Scyphus not by intercourse with Ceres but by striking the ground with his trident (ad Theb. 4.43, probably taken from a Vergilian commentary ad Geor. 1.12). The former version seems to agree more closely with Statius’ own account of Arion’s training by his pater, Neptune (Theb. 6.302–3), and of his service to Hercules before coming into the hands of Adrastus (302–15).

Demeter is the mother of Plutus by the hero lason or Iasius (Hes. Theog. 969–74; cf. Cat. fr. 185.6 MW; cf. Hom. Od. 5.125–8), son of Zeus and the Atlantid Electra (Apd. Bibl. 3.138 [3.12.1]) and so a brother of Dardanus. Plutus is not named as the patriarch of an important heroic lineage but rather seems to express the idea that wealth
Ovid could be alluding to this fact, in his typical arch fashion, when he designates Ceres as *mater frugum* (Met. 6.119) and Medusa as *mater equi volucris* (121). But at any rate, such titles show that there is no reason why Poseidon’s liaisons with Demeter and Medusa would interest the author of the *Catalogue*, which deals in heroic genealogy and not in crops and horses. On the other hand, the affair with Medusa at least did interest the author of the *Theogony*, as it did whoever it was—possibly Apollodorus, although he no doubt had predecessors—who first set about compiling a list of Poseidon’s paramours from Hesiod and other ancient sources, thus producing the list from which Ovid eventually worked.

It seems quite likely, then, that Ovid’s names do not go back to Hesiod directly, but that both his lists derive from Apollodorus’ much larger one; and in addition, Hero’s list appears to have been influenced by an intermediate model, the selection of names that Philodemus also took from Apollodorus. Moreover, Ovid’s two lists do not appear to be closely related at first glance because they contain almost entirely different names; the only one that they actually share is Medusa’s. But this in fact guarantees the relationship. ‘It is,’ writes Dirk Obbink, ‘as though Ovid has carefully avoided repetition, leaving only the duplication of Medusa as a cross-reference’ between the two passages.

The strange relationship between these lists makes both of them much more interesting. The technique of ‘divided allusion’ is a familiar element in the repertoire of the *doctus poeta* and one that generally involves some purpose beyond that of providing a sort of cryptic entertainment for especially well read (or obsessive) readers. Often, the division of a single source is a form of analysis or commentary that reflects some division that is thought to inhere in the source itself.

In fact, Ovid’s double elenchus of Neptune’s love affairs does involve a double perspective on their meaning. Hero argues that the repeatedly love-struck Neptune should have sympathy with her

---

19 Thus a form of what has come to be called ‘window reference’ after R.F. Thomas, ‘Virgil’s *Georgics* and the Art of Reference,’ *HSCP* 90 (1986) 171–98 at 188.

20 Obbink, ‘Vergil’s *De pietae,*’ 195.
plight and not permit his watery domain to stand between her and her lover. Arachne on the contrary fashions her entire tapestry as a reproach to Neptune and the rest of the randy Olympians for abusing their unlimited power. Hero's attitude corresponds clearly to the general thrust of Apollodorus' project, which Obbink characterizes as illustrating the true nature (δυνάμις) of divinity. On the other hand, Arachne's exposé corresponds to the very different concerns of Philodemus, who argues that Apollodorus' ideas are absurd. For Apollodorus, Neptune's erotic adventures are allegorical expressions of his elemental identity as water, and it is easy to see how these ideas underwrite Hero's appeal to Neptune both as god of the sea and as lover; for Philodemus, it is fundamentally wrong to think of gods as being subject to human passions, and this is reflected in Arachne's reproach of them for indulging rather than controlling their desires. Paradoxically, though, it is Hero's list that, while agreeing with the general principals espoused by Apollodorus, corresponds in form quite closely to the more circumscribed list of Philodemus; and, on the other hand, Arachne's catalogue, which seems ethically closer to Philodemus, goes outside the list that he gives in De pietate and so gestures towards the more expansive catalogue of Apollodorus that was his source. This odd set of correspondences would be puzzling if we had not already learned to expect such things from Ovid. As it is, such an intricate and unexpected set of relationships virtually guarantees that Ovid carefully designed these passages not merely as two contrasting ways of treating the theme of 'the loves of the gods' but as a reference to the philosophical debates occasioned by such material.

2b. Lists, part 2: Genealogy and Kingship

I have not yet mentioned one further, curious feature of Ovid's Neptunian catalogues. As we have seen, a single woman, Medusa, appears in both. But she is, so to speak, not quite the same woman. When Hero mentions her, she notes quite specifically that Neptune had her before she got her snaky tresses (nondum nexis angue Medusa comis, Her. 19.134). On Arachne's tapestry, though, we see that the encounter took place after Medusa acquired her horrific hairdo (sensit volucrem crinita colubris / mater equi volucris, Met. 6.119–20). The discrepancy is striking, but easily explained. Hero (as Obbink, once again, has noted) is careful to stress the attractiveness of Neptune's
ladies rather than their fecundity, which is a characteristic concern of the mythographers who dealt in heroic genealogy.\textsuperscript{21} This change assimilates all of these women, including Medusa, to an elegiac environment. Physical attractiveness is also at home in the *Metamorphoses*, but it is well known that in doubles such as these Ovid often emphasizes wondrous and uncanny elements over erotic or sentimental ones.\textsuperscript{22} Here it is the titular theme of the poem, metamorphosis itself, that takes center stage in the image of Medusa transformed.\textsuperscript{23} The sharp contrast between the way Hero and Arachne present Medusa is encoded in the generic and thematic distinction between the *Heroides* and the *Metamorphoses*.

Our understanding of these motifs comes mainly from scrutiny of the relationship between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*. And if we turn to those poems we find another pair of lists that are related to one another somewhat as Hero’s and Arachne’s are, but with a curious difference; and in this case it is more difficult to explain the difference in terms of genre or thematic focus.

In the *Metamorphoses* Ovid gives a list of the Alban kings who span the three centuries or so that separate Aeneas, a hero of the Trojan War, from Romulus, who founded Rome (according to tradition) in about 750 BCE (*Met. 14.609–22*):\textsuperscript{24}

\begin{align*}
\text{Inde sub Ascanii dicione binominis Alba} & \quad 1 \\
\text{resque Latina fuit. succedit Silyius illi.} & \quad 2 \\
\text{quo satus antiquo tenuit repetita Latinus} & \quad 3 \\
\text{nomina cum sceptro, clarus subit Alba Latinum.} & \quad 4 \\
\text{Epytus ex illo est; post hunc Capetusque Capysque,} & \quad 5, 7, 6 \\
\text{sed Capys ante fuit; regnum Tiberinus ab illis} & \quad 6, 8 \\
\text{cepit et in Tusci demersus fluminis undis} & \\
\text{nomina fecit aquae; de quo Remulusque feroxque} & \\
\text{Acrota sunt geniti. Remulus maturior annis} & \\
\text{fulmineo periiit, imitator fulminis, ictu.} & \\
\text{fratre suo sceptrum moderator Acrota forti} & \\
\text{tradit Aventino, qui, quo regnarat, eodem} & \quad 10 \\
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{21} Obbink, ‘Vergil’s *De pietate*,’ 197.

\textsuperscript{22} This is the formulation of R. Heinze, ‘Ovids elegische Erzählung,’ *Berichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 71.7 (Leipzig, 1919). Decades of increasingly adverse criticism eventually gave way to reaffirmation of Heinze’s idea, in a considerably subtler form, by S.E. Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-conscious Muse* (Cambridge, 1987).

\textsuperscript{23} Cf. Ceres as above and other transformations on Arachne’s tapestry.

monte iacet positus tribuitque vocabula monti;
iamque Palatinae summam Proca gentis habebat.

Then Alba and the government of Latium was under the jurisdiction of
double-named Ascanius. Silvius succeeded him, the son of whose old
age, Latinus, possessed an ancestral name along with the scepter, and
famous Alba succeeded Latinus. Epytus is born of him, and after him
Capetus and Capys, but Capys came first; Tiberinus received the
kingdom from them and after being sunk in the streams of the Tuscan
river gave the water a name; and from him were born Remulus and
fierce Acrota. Remulus when he was getting old died by thunderbolt
because he affected it himself. Acrota, more even-keeled than his
brother, left the scepter to brave Aventinus who lies buried on the
same hill where he had reigned and gives the hill its name; and then
Proca held the summit of the Palatine nation.

In the Fasti there is a comparable list that traces the line of Romulus
and Aeneas back through the kings of Troy to their divine progeni-
tors (Fast. 4.31–56):

Dardanum Electra nescire Atlantide natum
solicet, Electran concubuisse Iovi?
huius Ericthonius, Tros est generatus ab illo,
Assaracon creat hic, Assaracusque Capyn;
proximus Anchises, cum quo commune parentis
non designata est nomen habere Venus:
hinc satus Aeneas; pietas spectata per ignes
sacra patremque umeris, altera sacra, tuit.
venimus ad felix aliquando nomen Iuli,
unde domus Teucros Iulia tangit avos.
Postumus hinc, qui, quod silvis sutilis in altis,
Silvius in Latia gente vocatus erat.
isque, Latine, tibi pater est; subit Alba Latinum;
proximus est titulis Epytus, Alba, tuis
ille dedit Capyl repetita vocabula Troiae
et tuus est idem, Calpete, factus avus.
cumque patris regnum post hunc Tiberinus haberet
dicitur in Tuscae gurgite mersus aquae.
iam tamen Agrippam natum Remulmque nepotem
viderat; in Remulum fulmina missa ferunt.
venit Aventinus post hos, locus unde vocatur,
mons quoque; post illum tradita regna Procaec;
quam sequitur duri Numitor germanus Amuli;
ilia cum Lasso de Numitore sati;
ense cadit patru Lausus; placet Illa Marti,
teque parit, gemino iuncte Quirine Remo.
Who wouldn't know that Dardanus was born of Electra, daughter of Atlas, and that Electra indeed had lain with Jupiter? His son was Ericthonius, and Tros was born of him; he begets Assaracus and Assaracus Capys; next is Anchises, with whom Venus deigned to have in common the title of parent: from them was Aeneas born; his devotion, conspicuous amidst the flames, bore the sacred objects and his father, sacred as well, upon his shoulders. We have come at last to the propitious name of Iulus, through whom the house of Julius reaches its Trojan grandsires. From him came Postumus who, because he was born in the deep woods, had been hailed as Silvius among the people of Latium. And he, Latinus, was your father; Alba succeeded Latinus; Eypytus, Alba, was next in line for your title. He gave Capys a name that recalled Troy and also became your grandfather, Calpetus. And when Tiberinus was holding his father’s kingdom after him, he is said to have drowned in the swirling Tuscan water. But he had already seen his son Agrippa and grandson Remulus; they say that thunderbolts were launched against Remulus. After them came Aventinus for whom the place is named and the hill; after him the kingdom was left to Proca; and Numitor, the brother of hard Amulius followed him; Ilia and Lausus were born of Numitor: Lausus fell to his uncle’s sword, Ilia caught Mars’ eye and gave birth to you, Quirinus, twin to your brother Remus.

This list is thus more extensive than the one in the *Metamorphoses*, and in that sense the relationship between them is what the relationship of Arachne’s to Hero’s would have been if Arachne’s tapestry had included all of Neptune’s lovers as named by Apollodorus and Philodemus. But I am interested only in the names of the Alban kings that both lists share, which agree almost entirely—but not quite. Unlike Hero’s and Arachne’s lists, which share just a single name, the Alban king lists share every name except one. In the *Metamorphoses*, the ninth king is Remulus, son of Tiberinus, whose successor is his brother Acrota. In the *Fasti*, Remulus is the name of not the ninth but the tenth king and the grandson, not the son, of the eighth king Tiberinus; and he inherits the throne from the ninth king, whose name is Agrippa. Then Aventinus succeeds Remulus to become the eleventh king of Alba, bringing the two lists into harmony once again. The name Agrippa does not appear in the *Metamorphoses*, nor does the name Acrota appear in the *Fasti*. It is possible that the two names are just variant forms. But even if they are,

---

25 I mention in passing the variants Capetus (Met. 14.613) and Calpetus (Fast. 4.46) for the successor of Capys in both of Ovid’s and all other Alban king lists.

they occupy different positions in the two lists, as well. (It is also the case that, while Acrota is definitely Remulus' brother, Agrippa may be his son, although this is less clear.)\textsuperscript{27} Not momentous changes, perhaps, and certainly the chronology and generational structure of the Alban dynasty—the only feature of it that really mattered—are preserved in both cases. But why did Ovid feel that these changes were necessary?

In a purely formal sense, we may regard the lists of Neptune's lovers and the lists of Alban kings as permutations of the same device, i.e. variants of a single list that draw attention to a particular element, of agreement in one case (the name of one of Neptune's lovers, Medusa) and of divergence in the other (the name and position of one king, Acrota or Agrippa the predecessor or successor of Remulus). In the one case, agreement signals the existence of a relationship between the paired lists, and so calls the reader's attention to further possibilities, as I have suggested above. In the other, the relationship between the lists is obvious, so that the reader's attention is called rather to the surprising fact that they diverge at all, even if only to a very small extent. And in addition, the specific import of the two lists is a matter of real difference between them. Ovid's awareness that there existed a definitive list of Poseidon's lovers in Apollodorus' treatise \textit{On the Gods} is a matter of scholarly interest. The fact that Philodemus made it the subject of a philosophical polemic gives it added thematic interest, which Ovid exploits. But this is all fairly recherché. The list of Alban kings, on the other hand, was widely known in Ovid's time as part of the genealogical connection between Aeneas and his son Iulus, the eponymous ancestor of the \textit{gens Iulia} and so of Augustus, to Romulus, the founder of Rome. So it is very curious that Ovid would put two different versions of this list, even if they are only slightly different, into a pair of works that were composed during the same period of time and with more or less constant reference to one another. In the case of Neptune's lovers, Ovid might hope that at least some readers would notice that his two substantially different lists actually shared a common source. In the case of the Alban kings, he must have expected

\textsuperscript{27} Romulus (not Remulus; another spelling variant) Silvius is Agrippa's son at Livy 1.3.9, but Ovid's phrasing \textit{(Tiberinus} \textit{iam tamen Agrippam natum Remulumque nepotem / viderat, Fast. 4.49–50)} leaves open the possibility that Remulus is perhaps the nephew rather than the son of Agrippa.
many readers to notice that his two almost identical lists seem to
derive from different sources. Why would he do that?

One can only surmise what Ovid meant here, but the case of Neptuné’s
girlfriends provides a helpful point of contrast. In that case,
Ovid could work with a list that was, if not absolutely definitive,
extremely capacious and not complicated by issues of chronology or
succession. He could reasonably regard Apollodorus’ list as the most
complete and most authoritative available. But in the case of the Al-
ban kings, no such list existed. It was not possible merely to include
any and all names that one ever found in any and all sources: the
validity of the list depended, at least in theory, on its containing a
certain number of rulers presumed to correspond to the number of
generations needed to fill in the gap between the time of Aeneas and
that of Romulus. But the result is that we have several versions of
this list, none of them drastically different from the others, but none
establishing itself as a standard. Vergil responded to this situation
by giving only truncated versions of the succession and avoiding the
apparent specificity that a single, complete list would seem to sug-
gest.\(^{28}\) This is perhaps a way of acknowledging the multiform nature,
not only of this list but of all mythographic ‘facts,’ but of doing so
without drawing explicit attention to this endemic multiformity
within a politically sensitive context. Such an approach is eminently
characteristic of Vergil. Ovid, in a contrasting but equally character-
istic move, gratuitously shines a spotlight on a single point of incon-
sistency within the tradition.

One relatively innocent reason for doing this may be to incorpo-
rate into the Metamorphoses and the Fasti some of the very multi-
formity that is a constant feature of mythographic research. Vari-
ants like these were a fact of life, and Ovid may simply have wanted
to reflect the character of his sources accurately rather than give the
false impression that they all agreed. A somewhat more sophisti-
cated assumption is that the discrepancy between Ovid’s two lists is
thematically motivated. If we regard the Fasti as the slightly later of
two basically contemporary poems, we can regard the king list in
Book 4 as a revised version of the one found in Book 14 of the Meta-
morphoses. This idea of revision is of course thematized in the proem

\(^{28}\) But Vergil’s treatment of the Alban kings is not entirely straightforward,
either: see S. Casali, ‘The Development of the Aeneas Legend,’ in J. Farrell and M.C.J.
Putnam (eds.), A Companion to Vergil’s Aeneid and its Tradition (Malden, MA, 2010), 49,
with further references.
to Fasti 4 when Ovid confronts Venus over the issue of whether he, a poet once of love but now of monuments, religious festivals, and other more serious themes, is still her poet or not. Later in the same book, the story of Ceres and Proserpina is revised in comparison to the rendition it had received in the Metamorphoses. It is, once again, curious that it is the Fasti, not the Metamorphoses, that emphasizes this theme of change; but this is, once again, a familiarly Ovidian irony.

In a more general sense, it does seem difficult to avoid the idea that in emphasizing this theme with respect to the Alban king list in particular, Ovid is drawing attention to fictiveness not only in a banal sense as a property of all myth-making, but with respect to this list in particular. We have seen in the case of Neptune’s paramours that the genealogical element that was fundamental to Hesiod’s Catalogue of Women gave way in the research of Hellenistic mythographers to very different concerns, and that these different concerns informed Ovid’s account(s), as well. In the case of the Alban king list, too, genealogy has an obvious role to play. If Aeneas was to be an ancestor of Romulus, some three hundred years of shared intervening descendants (from Aeneas’ perspective) or ancestors (from that of Romulus) had to be invented. But this was just a matter of inscribing the Romans into the vast system of heroic genealogy that gave shape to the Hellenistic understanding of Mediterranean ethnicities and politics. After Augustus became sole ruler over all the inhabitants of that world, the matter of his descent from Aeneas took on quite a different aspect.

But it may not be that Ovid, by exposing the fictiveness of Augustus’ ancestry, means to undermine its significance. In the Metamorphoses he also makes the curious statement that Julius Caesar had to be made a god in order to become a worthy father to Augustus (15.760–1). This is certainly one of those statements that looks as though it were designed to annoy princely readers. But one can imagine that emphasizing the fictiveness of Augustus’ heroic genealogy, rather than exposing something that everyone must in any case have realized was not literally true, rather celebrates the almost unimaginable grandeur and importance of a prince so powerful that he confers dignity upon heroic ancestors simply by deigning to ac-

knowledge them as his own—and, in the case of the Alban kings, whether they actually existed or not.

3a. The Case of the Arcadians, part 1: The Fasti

With this we may turn to consider how Ovid handles the traditional materials of heroic genealogy. The topic is too vast to consider here in full, but an examination of one *ethnos*, that of the Arcadians, will be instructive. Here too I can begin with the very useful work of predecessors—specifically, that of Elaine Fantham and Mario Labate on the importance of Arcadian mythology in the *Fasti*. I propose, then, to examine the results of this work in light of the aforementioned principle of complementarity by asking what we can learn from comparing Ovid’s treatment of Arcadian material in the *Fasti* to the approach that he takes in the *Metamorphoses*. The results, I believe, will be very much in line with the general picture that has been reconfirmed in recent years of the peculiarly close relationship that exists between these two poems, but that emphasizes the differences between them in a way that inevitably raises some rather urgent questions.

There are three main clusters of Arcadian mythology in the *Fasti*. One centers upon the figure of Evander, who is closely associated with his mother Carmenta. The second involves cults devoted to the Arcadian divinities Mercury and Pan. The third cluster centers upon Callisto, the daughter of Lycaon and mother of Arcas, who suffered first transformation into a bear and then catasterism into the constellation Ursa Major. We will consider these figures associated with each cluster in that order.

As Elaine Fantham was the first to show in any detail, of all characters who appear in the *Fasti* it is Evander in particular who enjoys a certain, perhaps unexpected prominence, which she explains as serving a twofold program. First, an emphasis throughout the *Fasti* not only on Romulus but on Evander too as ‘founders of Rome’ allows Ovid to differentiate his poem on Roman origins from that of Vergil, which of course emphasizes the role of Aeneas above all others. The second factor that Fantham signals is an inverse relationship between the figure of Evander, himself an exile living on the site of what would be Rome, and the poet who revised the *Fasti* while living in exile from Rome. These insights have found wide accep-

---

tance, and it will be seen that they fit readily into two prominent ways of understanding Ovidian mythology: as the material out of which intertextual relationships are forged, and as an opportunity for authorial self-fashioning. In addition, Mario Labate has built upon Fantham's study in a way that is extremely germane to my argument here. In a paper on Greek and Roman elements of Augustan cultural identity in the poem, Labate adopts Fantham's interpretation of Evander as a kind of alternative 'ancestor' to Aeneas or Romulus (and therefore of Ovid as an alternative authority to Vergil) in Roman foundation myth, but emphasizes Evander's specifically Arcadian identity as a crucial part of his importance to Ovid's design. Here the extreme antiquity of the Arcadians in Ovid's mythographic sources becomes an element that underlines the anteriority of Evander to Aeneas as a founding hero, while also relating the foundation and subsequent development of the city of Rome to the foundation and development of civilization itself. This, too, is an extremely suggestive line of approach, and one that takes us closer to the characteristic themes of mythography as such.

It is worth emphasizing, with Fantham and Labate, that Evander's prominence in the Fasti is indeed great. He is among the most frequently mentioned human characters in the poem, comparable to Aeneas, Romulus, and Remus. Even Hercules, whose prominence in the poem is great, is named less often than Evander; so are Iulus, Anchises, Assaracus, or any other member of Aeneas' family prior to Augustus. Of course, Ovid's interest in Evander is most clearly at-


32 In the Fasti, the names of Romulus/Quirinus, Aeneas, and Remus occur thirty-nine, seventeen, and sixteen times, respectively. Gods in general are named much more often than humans, and several individual gods are the most frequently named characters in the poem. Jupiter, who alone is named over one hundred times, is followed by a train of thematically appropriate divinities, mainly Olympians, that includes Mars/Mavors/Gradivus (thirty-eight times), Vesta (thirty-five times), Bacchus/Liber (thirty-two times), Venus/Cytherea (twenty-seven times), and Janus (twenty-one times). Somewhat surprising are the rather low rates of appearance for Apollo/Cynthius/Sol/Titan (only nine times, not including about twice as many appearances of the sun without personification) and Diana/Cynthia/De- lilia/Luna/Trivia (sixteen occurrences, plus another thirteen for the unpersonified moon) and the comparatively high number for Faunus/Pan (twenty times); his case is discussed below.
tested in the major episodes in which he is involved. Still, Evander’s tendency to appear even in episodes where, if absent, he would hardly be missed, seems to call for some additional explanation.

Quite apart from the sheer number of his appearances, however, it must be important, as Labate in particular notes, that Ovid often refers pointedly to Evander’s Arcadian origins. In the Carmentalia episode (Fast. 1.461–585), the first in which he appears, Evander is introduced as an immigrant from Arcadia (hinc fuit Euander, 471–2). His departure from Arcadia is mentioned again just a few lines later (deserit Arcadium Parrhasiamque larem 478). Then, after Evander obtains a leading position in the Ausonian hills, Ovid calls him, simply, ‘the Arcadian’ (Arcade 542). And shortly thereafter, when Hercules visits Evander’s humble kingdom, the hero is said to enjoy the hospitality of Evander’s domus Tegeae (545), a reference to Tegea, an important political and religious center in Arcadia. The motif of Evander’s origins receives such stress that, in one sense, the hero never really does leave Arcadia behind—or at least, he never loses his Arcadian identity.

Evander’s Arcadian ethnicity continues to be emphasized throughout the Fasti. Sometimes this happens casually, as when, in the Io episode, Ovid refers in passing to ‘Arcadian Evander’ (Arcadis Euandri 5.543). More often, Ovid ties Evander to other Arcadian individuals and symbols. In deriving the name of mensis Maius from that of the goddess Maia, for instance, Ovid emphasizes the Arcadian setting of Mercury’s birth and the importance of Mercury’s cult in Arcadia (Fasti 5.87–90):

haec enixa iugo cupressiferae Cyllenes
aetherium volucri qui pede carpit iter;
Arcades hunc Ladonque rapax et Maenalos ingens
rite colunt, luna credita terra prior.

Upon a ridge of cypress-bearing Mt. Cyllene she gave birth to him who speeds his airy path with winged foot; the Arcadians and (the people of) the swift River Ladon and of huge Mt. Maenalus, a land believed older than the moon, duly worship him.

33 Tegea is mentioned in the Homeric ‘Catalogue of Ships’ (ll. 2.607). Historically it was the site of an important cult of Athena Alea (Paus. 3.5.6). A magnificent ivory cult statue, the work of Enodeus, was removed by Augustus after his victory over Antonius, who was supported by most of the Arcadians (Paus. 8.46.1). It was eventually installed at the entrance to the Forum Augustum (Paus. 8.46.4).
Ovid then immediately takes the opportunity to reprise the story of Evander’s move to the site of Rome (Fast. 5.91–106):

exul ab Arcadia Latios Euander in agros
venerat, impositos attuleratque deos.
hic, ubi nunc Roma est, orbis caput, arbor et herbae
et paucae pecudes et casa rara fuit:
quo postquam ventum est, ‘consitiste,’ praescia mater
‘nam locus imperii rus erit istud’ ait.
et matri et vati paret Nonacrius heros.
inque peregrina constitit hospes humo;
sacraque multa quidem, sed Fauni prima bicornis
has docuit gentes alipedisque dei.
semicaper, coleris cinctutis, Faune, Lupercis,
cum lustrant celebras verbera secta vias;
at tu materno donasti nomine mensem,
inventor curvae, furibus apte, fidis.
nec pietas haec prima tua est: septena putaris,
Pleiadum numerum, fila dedisse lyrae.

Evander, in exile from Arcadia, had come to the fields of Latium and had brought the gods that he established there. Here, where Rome is now, capital of the world, there was tree and grass and a few cattle and the occasional hut; but after he arrived there, his prescient mother said ‘Stop, for that countryside will be a place of empire.’ And the hero from Nonacrinus obeyed his prophetic mother and took his stand, a newcomer on foreign soil; and he taught these peoples many religious observances indeed, but first those of twin-horned Faunus and of the wingfooted god. Half-goat Faunus, you are worshiped by the Luperci who hike up their tunics when the lashes that they have cut purify the crowded streets; but you [Mercury], a god fit for thieves, discoverer of the curved lyre, gave the month your mother’s name. Nor was this your first dutiful act. You are thought to have given the lyre seven strings, the number of the Pleiades.

This passage cross-references Evander’s first appearance in multiple ways (exul 5.91 : 1.539, orbis 5.93 : 1.517, imperii 5.96 : 1.532, etc.). In the process, it connects Evander to other Arcadian characters and motifs; and one begins to realize that these other motifs themselves form a network of associations that add up to a significant Arcadian presence in the poem.

The first of these associations is with Carmenta, the praescia mater of line 5.95. Evander’s mother has already appeared as the eponymous deity of the Carmentalia, the festival that gives Ovid the opportunity to narrate Evander’s arrival in Rome, and in which
Carmenta first assumes the vatic role that she plays in book 5 as well. The reasons behind Carmenta's importance in the poem are more obvious than in the case of her son. Etymologically, she is an important element of Roman cult and of the Roman landscape. Not only her festival, the Carmentalia, but a peculiar kind of conveyance called carpenta (1.619–620) and a major urban landmark, the porta Carmentalis (2.201), take their names from her. For such reasons, Carmenta's Roman credentials are beyond dispute. But, especially in her first appearance, it is again Carmenta's Arcadian identity that receives explicit emphasis. Ovid announces his initial Carmentalia episode (Jan. 11) as an account of the 'priestly rite of the Arcadian goddess' (Arcadiae sacrum pontificale deae 1.462). In the second episode (Jan. 15), Carmenta is the 'goddess of Parrhasia' (Parrhasiae deae 618) and of Mt. Maenalus (Maenali diua 634), both phrases built upon well-known Ardadian toponyms, as is 'mother from Tegea' (Tegeaea parenti 627). The same Arcadian emphasis is evident in Carmenta's final appearance as well. Playing a supporting role in the Mater Matuta episode of June 11, she appears both under her proper name and as the 'priestess from Tegea' (Carmentis 6.529; Tegeaea sacerdos 531).

So whenever Evander appears, his Arcadian ethnicity is stressed; and the same is true of Carmenta, so that association with her also emphasizes Evander's Arcadian origin and increases the presence of Arcadian mythology in the poem.

The pattern is repeated in the case of other Arcadian characters. Consider for instance the god Faunus, whose Arcadian identity is also stressed repeatedly. This might seem strange to say, since Faunus is above all a native Italian woodland deity. But of course the identification of italic Faunus with Arcadian Pan was very common. The name Pan appears only a few times in the Fasti, as we shall momentarily see. Faunus, on the other hand, as I mentioned in passing before, crops up a lot. In all cases, though, Faunus is unquestionably the same being as Pan; and he is emphatically Arcadian.

These factors are all present in the episode of the Lupercalia (2.267–302). In revealing the origins of this festival, Ovid stresses its Arcadian character: the passage contains the highest concentration

34 The district of Parrhasia in central Arcadia was named for Parrhasius, a son of Lycaon, and was the region inhabited by Lycaon's daughter Callisto. Maenalus is a range of mountains, also named for a son of Lycaon. On Tegea see the previous note.
35 Horace at Carm. 1.17.1–4 muses with evident pleasure on the fact that these two consummately local divinities were, after all, one and the same being.
of Arcadian ethnica and toponyms to be found in the Fasti, higher even than either episode of the Carmentalia. The episode also begins by stating unequivocally that the Lupercalia was a festival of Faunus (Fauni sacra bicornis 268), before tracing the celebration to the Arcadian cult of Pan (Pana 271; Pan...Pan 277); and it notes that it was, naturally, Evander who transferred the cult from Arcadia to the future site of Rome (2.279; cf. 5.99–100). Having established the festival’s Arcadian origin, Ovid reverts to using repeatedly the name Faunus (303, 306, 332, 361, 424) instead of Pan. But Arcadia remains an active and visible theme, as when Ovid explains the etymology of the name of the Luperci: quid vetat Arcadio dictos a monte Lupercos? / Faunus in Arcadia templi Lycaeus habet (423–4). Here Pan keeps his Italic name and, as Faunus, is said still to receive cult in Arcadia.

Faunus’ Arcadian character, which is established most explicitly in this passage, extends throughout the Fasti. In the following book (3), Ovid reminds the reader of what he has said about Faunus in the Lupercalia episode, that he is worshiped in Arcadia (pinigerum Fauni Maenalis ora caput [sc. colit] 3.84). And in the next book (4), Faunus appears in the Fordicia episode simply as ‘the god of Mt. Maenalus’ in Arcadia (Maenalio deo 4.650; cf. Fauno 653, Faunus 663). Finally, as we have seen, he appears in Calliope’s derivation of mensis Maius from Maia, a passage rich in Arcadian associations and one in which Faunus is again linked to the rites of the Luperci (5.101–2).

So Evander is not only markedly Arcadian himself, but he is consistently associated with two other Arcadian characters, his prophetic mother who counseled him to settle on the site of what would be Rome, and the god Faunus, whose rites Evander transferred from Arcadia to Rome. And as I have shown, Ovid consistently stresses the Arcadian origins of all three characters. The result is that Ovid creates around these characters a network of associations that lends to the Fasti—and to the theme of Rome’s origins, its topography, and its cults—a quite substantial Arcadian frame of reference.

Now, it is true that Evander’s Arcadian origin is a standard part of the mythographic tradition followed by Vergil, Livy, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, so that there is nothing eccentric in any of this. But even so, Ovid’s stress on Arcadia is impressive. It is also the case that Ovid’s Arcadian references go beyond those items attested by Vergil and others that involve Evander’s settlement on the Palatine. In ad-

36 Arcades, Arcadiis iugis 271; Pholoë, Stymphalides undae 272; Ladon 274; nemoris Nonacrini 275; Tricrene, Parrhasiae nisius 276; Pelasgi 281; Arcades 290.
dition to the complex that involves Evander, there is another nexus of Arcadian myths that recurs in the Fasti. These center upon the story of Callisto, to which I now turn.

Callisto is well-known as a nymph who was raped by Jupiter and, ultimately, raised to the heavens as the constellation Ursa Major. Ovid tells this familiar story in connection with the rising of the constellation Arctophylax (more commonly known in English as Bootes) on Feb. 12 (Fast 2.193–242). There is no need to rehearse all the details. The main point—a familiar one by now—is Ovid's insistence on Callisto's Arcadian credentials, both before and after her catasterism. Within the story Diana addresses her as virgo Tegeaea (2.167)—an appellation that parallels phrases that Ovid uses to name Carmenta (Tegeaeae parenti 1.627; Tegeaeae sacerdos 6.531) and Evander's Arcadian hut on the Palatine (domus Tegeaeae 1.545). And after her elevation among the stars, Ovid calls her Maenaliam Arcton (2.192), another phrase with clear Arcadian parallels elsewhere in the Fasti, these involving Faunus (Maenalio deo 4.650; cf. 3.84), Mercury (5.89), and again Carmenta (Maenali diva 1.634).

Because Callisto, as both nymph and constellation, is so clearly and emphatically marked in the Fasti as Arcadian, her appearances connect with and extend the network of Arcadian associations emanating from Evander and extending to Carmenta, Pan, and Mercury. Significantly, it extends them beyond the sacral and antiquarian sphere of the poem and into the cosmic sphere as well. Here it is worth noting that the polar constellations are mentioned more often in the Fasti than any other group.\(^37\) They are, with the Pleiades and the Hyades, named by synecdoche for all the constellations in the proem to book 3 (105–10). Later in the same book, Ovid mentions the setting of Arctophylax (sive Arctophylax...sive Bootes 405); and still later he mentions Ursa Major again in connection with the festival of the Argei, the Agonalia (March 17). The date in question is the setting of the constellation Milvus, which on this date, Ovid says, 'descends towards Arctos, Lycaon's daughter' (Lycaoniam Arcton 793). This information seems relatively gratuitous, unless frequent men-

tion of Callisto is itself the point. Finally, it is noteworthy that Callisto is named here specifically as the daughter of Lycaon—a gesture towards the tradition of heroic genealogy that was the principal basis of ancient mythographic research, but one that is uncharacteristic of Ovid’s treatment of this same myth in the *Metamorphoses*, as we shall presently see.

3b. *The Case of the Arcadians, part 2: The Metamorphoses*

So far, we have seen that Ovid puts a lot of emphasis on a few Arcadian stories in the *Fasti*, and that he establishes an extensive network of connections among them. If we now turn to a consideration of this same theme in the *Metamorphoses*, we find a picture that is very different.

In the first place, Evander, who is one of the principal heroes of the *Fasti*, is named just once in the *Metamorphoses* (14.456). In fact, he is mentioned only in passing as just one among many individuals who welcomed Aeneas to Italy before Ovid turns his attention to Diomedes, whose story is told at some length (456–526). No mention is made here of Evander’s Arcadian background. By the same token, the name of Carmenta does not appear at all in the poem. Pan or Faunus, the third member of the Arcadian cluster that is so evident in the *Fasti*, does appear but in a rather different way from what we saw there. We find one passing reference to King Latinus, son of Faunus (*Faunigenae Latini* 14.449), by which the god as a specific individual must be meant. But the name Faunus usually occurs in the plural and in the company of nymphs; therefore, not as an individual divinity of any importance, and again never as one with a specific connection to Arcadia.

Appearances of the name Pan in the *Metamorphoses* are also restricted: twice in Book 14, Pan or Pans are mere symbols of the wild Italian landscape, whether Apulian (513) or in Latium (638). Pan is a somewhat more fully-formed individual in the Midas episode of Book 11, but this is set in Lydia, and any relationship between this story and the treatment of Arcadian Pan in the *Fasti* is difficult to discern. The only passage in the *Metamorphoses* where Pan appears as a specifically Arcadian deity is in the story of Pan and Syrinx—which is narrated by Mercury, himself a native of Arcadia (at the end of the

*In the following book the constellation appears again as Helice (4.580; cf. 3.108) when Ceres asks her whether she has seen the lost Persephone. In Book 5, Bootes sets once again (733), and in Book 6 Arcturus sets as well (235–6).*
episode, Ovid calls him *Cyllenius* 713). And Mercury’s narration is rich in local color. He begins by setting his tale ‘in the chill mountains of Arcadia’ (*Arcadiae gelidis in montibus* 1.689), which he populates with *hamadryadas Nonacrinas* (690), and he goes on to associate Pan with Mt. Lycaon (*redeuntem colle Lycaeo / Pan 698–9*) and Syrinx with the river Ladon (702). So here, at least, we have an episode that is comparable to several of those that we have examined in the *Fasti* with respect to a specifically Arcadian emphasis.

There are, of course, two other episodes of the poem that deal with important Arcadian myths. I have just mentioned Mt. Lycaeaum, which is the setting of the very first tale of human transformation, the story of Lycaon. An Arcadian mise-en-scène is specified at the beginning of the episode as narrated by Jupiter (*Met. 1.216–9*):

\[
\begin{align*}
Maenala \ transieram \ latebris \ horrenda \ ferarum \\
et \ cum \ Cyllene \ gelidi \ pineta \ Lycae \ i:
\end{align*}
\]

Arcadis hic sedes et inhospita tecta tyranni

*ingredior*

I had crossed the range of Maenalus, made fearsome by the lairs of wild beasts, and the pine groves of chill Mt. Lycaema, and Cyllene too: here I enter the dwelling place and the inhospitable home of the Arcadian tyrant.

The other major episode in question involves Lycaon’s daughter (2.401–96), the nymph Callisto. Following Phaethon’s disastrous ride, Jupiter feels great concern for his parched domain; but, we learn, his concern for Arcadia is especially great (*Arcadiae tamen est impensor illi / cura suae* 2.405–6): the emphatic position of *suae* reminds the reader that, in one version of the story, Arcadia was Jupiter’s birthplace, and Ovid’s choice of this version is consistent with the story that follows. An Arcadian focus is maintained in the introduction of Callisto, an Arcadian maid (*uirgine Nonacrina* 409) who hunts with Diana on Mt. Maenalus (415, 442). And eventually, of course, Callisto gives birth to a boy named Arcas—putatively, the eponymous ancestor of the Arcadians.\footnote{Cf. Apd. 3.102 [3.9.1].}

Other passing references to Arcadia are made from time to time, but none of them contradicts the impression made by these major episodes, which I can summarize as follows. In the first place, in the *Metamorphoses* Arcadian means Arcadian, not Italian or Roman. It refers to strictly epicloric myths, like those involving Lycaon, Cal-
listo, Arcas, and Pan, even though Pan and Pans, singular and plural, appear in Lydia, Apulia, and Latium as well as Arcadia. In the second place, the connections among these stories are not very strong. Pan is said in passing to haunt Mt. Lycaon, and Callisto is said in passing to be Lycaon's daughter; but (notoriously) little if anything is made of this connection. Third, and most important, Ovid does absolutely nothing to connect these Arcadian myths with the establishment of an Arcadian community on the Palatine under the leadership of Evander. Evander himself, as I have said, receives only fleeting mention in the poem, and his mother, Carmenta, appears not at all. Neither do the Luperci or any other 'Arcadian' customs that Evander is supposed to have brought with him to archaic Latium. Finally, it should be said that in the *Metamorphoses* such characters as Lycaon, Pan, Callisto, and Evander generally appear once (if, unlike Carmenta, they appear at all) and not, as in the *Fasti*, repeatedly. This difference might be explained in part by appealing to the contrasting chronological structures of the two poems, which are linear and circular, respectively. But we have seen that nothing actually requires Ovid to mention Evander repeatedly in the *Fasti* or to banish Carmenta from the *Metamorphoses*, other than an apparent desire to create a substantial Arcadian presence in the one poem, but not in the other.

In short, almost everything about Arcadian mythology in the *Metamorphoses* differs from the *Fasti*, where all of this material is given great prominence both per se and in terms of its Arcadian character. Moreover, linkages in the *Fasti* among the various elements of Arcadian mythology are strong, to the point that we can and should speak of Arcadian mythology as a major theme in the poem. But such linkages are entirely absent from the *Metamorphoses*, in which it would be difficult to say that Arcadia constitutes a coherent theme at all.

The pattern by which Ovid treats the same material in complementary but also somehow contradictory ways in different poems should by now be reassuringly familiar. This is what we have seen in the case of Neptune's love interests and also in the Alban king lists. Something similar must be at work in Ovid's diverse treatments of Evander and Arcadia as well. If this is so, then it only makes sense to find Ovid treating the category 'Arcadian' one way in the *Fasti* and

---

40 The Lydian, Apulian, and Latian references do not contain Arcadian ethnica.
quite differently in the *Metamorphoses*. And at this point, a few simple
details may be capable of shedding some light.

In the *Metamorphoses*, one could say that mythology—or human
mythology, at any rate—begins in Arcadia. Earlier myths involving
Prometheus’ creation of humankind and the Myth of Ages are quite
general and feature no individual heroes or heroines. Only with the
story of Lycaon do human—or for that matter divine—personalities
enter the scene, and once they do, they quickly come to dominate
the poem. But one could hardly grasp at Evander’s cameo in Book 14
to argue that Arcadian mythology remains a theme almost to the
end of the poem; for we have already seen how fleeting this appear-
ance really is. And even if we could grant Evander more importance,
any Arcadian grace note at the end of the poem is soon drowned out
by a resoundingly Roman cadenza. The most we could say is that, in
the *Metamorphoses*, mythology begins in Arcadia and ends in Rome.

But in fact, just before we encounter any properly Arcadian my-
thology, we learn that on a cosmic level the universe is already im-
plcitly Roman, like the Milky Way that follows the route of the Via
Sacra up to the heavenly Palatine, or like the *concilium deorum* that
follows the rules and procedures of the Roman Senate (Met. 1.168–
76). When Jupiter speaking before this body tells of his encounter
with Lycaon, he tells of a world that, in effect, once was Arcadian,
but is no longer. Perhaps it is in this sense that Mercury’s tale of Pan
and Syrinx, too, is properly related by an internal narrator as a story
from the past, and the story of Callisto is only casually and fleetingly
connected to that of her father Lycaon, and Evander is mentioned
late and almost as an afterthought. In a world that is always already
immanently (or perhaps imminently) Roman, categories such as ‘Ar-
cadian’ have vestigial meaning at best, and very little of it at that.

In the *Fasti*, however, the category ‘Arcadian’ persists and gives
added significance to that of ‘Roman.’ The culture-hero Evander
comes as an exile to the site of Rome from his native Arcadia. His
mother Carmenta recognizes the place as a future seat of empire
before Rome itself even exists. Evander establishes there a number
of important institutions brought from Arcadia and still recognized
as Arcadian (by the poet of the *Fasti*) far into Roman times. His sem-
nal contributions are recognized repeatedly throughout the poem.
And crucially, Evander facilitates the arrival of others who contrib-
ute to the creation of a new, Roman identity. The most prominent of
these is of course Hercules, who establishes the cult of the Ara
Maxima (1.543–82). Thus Evander and Hercules stand at the head of a list of heroic arrivals in Italy that continues with the Greeks Odysseus, Telegonus, Halaesus, and Diomedes and then with the Trojans Antenor, Aeneas, and Solimus (4.61–81). So Arcadian Evander inaugurates a tradition that heroes from other countries follow. But Evander does not just establish a pattern for imitation: his Arcadian settlement plays an active role in welcoming other outsiders to Rome. Thus in connection with the festival of the Argei (5.621–62), we learn that Hercules while visiting Evander’s kingdom (643–7) put an end to a barbaric practice by throwing straw dummies into the Tiber instead of actual human victims (629–32). We learn as well that Hercules brought with him a number of Argive companions (651) who decided to remain in Evander’s proto-Roman community, and that the festival of the Argei takes its name from them (5.621–62). Similarly in the Matralia (6.473–568), Carmenta welcomes the Theban heroine Ino to the site of Rome, giving her hungry guest some cakes, which become a standard feature of the Matralia (529–34); and she changes Ino’s name, which has already been changed to Leucothea, to (Mater) Matuta, the name by which she will be known as the patron deity of the Matralia festival (545). Evander’s Arcadian settlement is not only the first Greek outpost in Italy; it is the instrument by which archaic Rome, already in the heroic age, shook off barbarism and became Hellenized. Once again, the fact that the Arcadians are emphasized in the Fasti, a poem that purports to be about Roman realities, but marginalized in the Metamorphoses, which is easy to regard as an encyclopedia of Greek myths, is a familiar kind of paradox that should reassure us that we are actually on to something.

4. Conclusion

In the Metamorphoses we encounter a world of Greek myth that is, in both the divine and the human sphere, from the very beginning already implicitly Roman and one that over time becomes more explicitly so; while in the Fasti we encounter a world of Roman institutions that remain, at their core, fundamentally Greek and, in large part, specifically Arcadian. In this respect, the differences between the two poems make perfect sense. Like Hero and Arachne, who reflect such different opinions about the nature of divinity, and like the ninth or tenth king of Alba, Agrippa or Acrota as his name may
be, who alerts us to the fictive nature of mythography and invites diverse reflections upon its meaning and purposes, Ovid's Arcadians represent dichotomous mythic perspectives on Roman cultural identity. That Ovid puts all these perspectives into dialogue with one another at a moment when rulers had become and were expected to continue to become gods; when genealogy, both in mythical terms and in the sense of actual family relations, whether by blood or by adoption, had become a basis of legitimizing the right to rule; when traditional Roman forms of government had lost almost all their meaning and had, in effect, been replaced with a hereditary Hellenistic monarchy more powerful than any that had ever been; all of this is readily understandable. In one form or another, these problems were of long standing; but they were difficult to discuss openly and frankly, all the more so in a period when restrictions on libertas—freedom of speech and expression—were beginning to be felt. In their myths the Greeks had identified and developed a discursive medium that, for generations, had allowed them to find their way in areas about which they had no effective medium of negotiation. The wealth of their mythographic tradition is, from one point of view, both the product and record of these negotiations and a discursive legacy of immense richness and diversity. Adapting this resource to specifically Roman purposes was a process that must have begun much earlier than the written record of Latin literature itself. But during the last century of the Republic, from Julius Caesar's claim of descent from Venus to the activities of scholars like Marcus Terentius Varro, the application of Greek mythographic discourse to a rapidly changing sociopolitical climate seems to have become more and more frequent and extensive. With the advent of the Principate, the appeal and the utility of this material seems only to have grown, and the assurance with which Ovid uses it as his preferred medium for thinking through what could not be openly addressed is itself sufficient commentary on how far the process of cultural metamorphosis had come.

41 Feeney, Caesar's Calendar.
Writing Myth:
Mythography in the Ancient World

EDITED BY

Stephen M. Trzaskoma and R. Scott Smith

PEETERS
LEUVEN – PARIS – WALPOLE, MA
2013