

1

POLITICAL
WORDPLAY

OVID uses wordplay of various kinds in the *Metamorphoses* not simply as an exercise in verbal skill for its own sake but to add dimensions to individual episodes and to his narrative as a whole. Each story tells, simultaneously, both "itself" and several other things: one meaning is contained within another in an almost infinite series. And Ovid's scale of wor(l)ds within wor(l)ds ranges from the microscopic to the cosmic.

Among the various semantic levels of Ovidian narrative is the political. The earnestness of the *Metamorphoses*' comments on Ovid's contemporary political milieu should be no surprise, since the poet spent many years of his life in banishment for a mysterious "song and mistake," *carmen et error*. So we will consider, in this chapter, Ovid's use of wordplay for political purposes. Such play does not always proclaim itself from the topmost levels of the narrative. Often it is, like so much else in Ovid's art, concealed. It is, then, with the very cosmic art of concealment that we will begin our enquiry.

Ars Est C(a)elare Artem

Varro gives us several etymologies of *CAELum*. In *Lingua Latina* 5.20, he says that *CAelum*, "sky," derives from *CAvum*, "hollow," and ultimately from *C(H)Aos*, "chaos":

quare ut a CAVo CAVe a CAUllae et CONvallis, CAVata vallis, et CAVernae a CAVatione ut CAVum, sic ortum, unde omnia apud Hesiodum, a C[H]Ao CAVo CA[E]lum.

Just as from *CAVo*, "hollow, *CAVe*," come *CAVe a*, "CAVity," *CAUllae*, "hole," *CONvallis*, that is, *CAVata Vallis*, "hollow valley," and *CAVernae*, "CAVerns," from *CAVatione*, "exCAVation," and *CAVum*, "a hollow," so then *CA[E]lum*, "sky," derives from *CAVo*, "hollow," which itself comes from *C[H]Ao*, "C[H]Aos," which, according to Hesiod [*Theogony* 123], is the origin of everything.

In 5.18, he says that *CAELum* derives from *C(A)ELare*, which, when spelled with an "a," means "to engrave" and, when spelled without an "a," "to conceal":

CAELum dictum scribit Aelius, quod est CAELatum, aut contrario nomine CELatum quod apertum est. non male, quod impositor multo potius CAELare a CAELO quam CAELum a CAELando. sed non minus illud alterum de CELando ab eo potuit dici, quod interdum CELatur, quam quod nocte non CELatur.

Aelius writes that *CAELum* is so named because it is *CAELatum*, "engraved," or from the opposite of what it appears to say—*CELatum*, "concealed"—because it is there to be seen. It was no bad idea when someone suggested that *CAELare*, "to engrave," came from *CAELum* rather than *CAELum* from *CAELando*, "engraving." But this alternative etymology could just as well be made from *CELando*, "concealing," because it is concealed during the day and is not concealed at night.¹

Varro, in a fragment of his *Menippeae* (Buecheler-Heraeus 420), reaffirms this etymology: *appellatur a CAELatura CAELum*—"CAELum [sky] is so called from CAELatura [engraving]." Pliny concurs: *CAELum quidem haut dubie CAELati argumento diximus, ut interpretatur M. Varro, "sky indeed is so named, doubtless, from the sense of 'engraving,' as Marcus Varro explains" (NH 2.8)*. Varro, then, expands etymological possibilities rather than contracts them, as we tend to. Although *CAELare* describes the creation of art, it is also, simultaneously, the concealment of art. We may glimpse the meaning of the famous adage *ars est C[A]ELare artem*. Art is not generated simply by hiding something: art is the simultaneous creation and burial of itself—art engraved.

Ovid uses all the above-mentioned etymologies and adds a few of his own. He shows us early in the *Metamorphoses* that, as words are derived, so worlds are born, and vice versa (1.5–7):

1. For further discussion of *CAELum*, see Chapter 5 and P. Krafft, "Stilo's Etymologie von 'caelum' im Urteil Varros (ling. 5, 18)," *CM* 31.1–2 (1970): 98–119.

ante mARE ET TERRAs et quod tegit omnia C[A]ELum
 unus erat toto naturae vultus in orbe,
 quem dixere C[H]Aos. . .

Before the sea and land and *sky*, which *covers* everything, there was one face upon the whole world, which they called C[H]Aos.

The description of *CAELum* as that which *tegit*, "covers, conceals," everything shows Ovid's Varronian approach. And before the sentence ends, we find C(H)Aos. Ovid has, however, suggested rather than shouted the etymological connection. If he had juxtaposed *CAELum* with the etymologizing verb, *CELAt*, the effect would be less subtle. Lucan makes a similar play: *C[A]ELO tegitur qui non habet urnam* ("He who has no urn has the sky for a grave" [*Pharsalia* 7.819]).

In his first usage of *CAELum*, Ovid plays on the notion of sky *conCEALing* everything. He also merges land and sea with the almost palindromic *mAR[E] ET TER[R]A*. He is, after all, describing chaos: land and sea, as well as other things, are not clearly separated from one another.

It was god, or nature, that, with artistic eye, forced shape upon the world, thereby dividing the oneness of C(H)Aos (1.21–88). Hence Ovid's reference to him or her (god or better Nature) as the *opifex rerum*, the maker of things (1.79). The deity separated earth from sky and then hid (*secrevit*) sky (C[A]ELum) away from air (1.22–23).

As life begins to emerge, Prometheus becomes an artist. He molds a model (*effigiem*) of man: in other words, he engages in an act of C(A)ELatura (1.76–88). Not only does his creature retain "seeds of the iGNeous sky that was born with it"—*coGNati . . . semina C[A]ELi* (81)—but it is ordered to look up to the sky (C[A]ELum), to contemplate god's other handiwork, that which has been created, if you will, in the heavens by god's *CAELatura* (85–86). We may gain an insight into Ovid's notion of divine craftsmanship not only from the *Metamorphoses* but from his other works. Consider, for example, his description of the constellation of the Dolphin in the *Fasti* (2.79): *C[A]ELatum stellis Delphina* ("the Dolphin, graved in stars upon the sky"). God (or Nature) has made C(A)ELum something other than a confused and hidden covering for things, as it was in line 1.5. It has become a masterwork, which Prometheus creates man to contemplate. Thus man is created in the divine image so he can contemplate the divine, in the *Metamorphoses* as in the Old Testament.

Man himself is, in Ovid's terms, an artifact that gradually develops

into an artificer. He comes to rival the gods in his skills and techniques. But his attempts to rival the divine or even to claim his heavenly heritage do not always produce felicitous results. Phaethon, son of Clymene and the Sun, finds his way up to his father and exacts the promise that he may drive the chariot of the sun. Phaethon hopes his quest will not offend the deity and that his mother Clymene was not "diSGUIsing her sin beneath a facade that she devises," *culpam sub imaGINE CELat* (2.37). The play on "sky" is appropriate here. Phaethon's reputed father is, after all, dominant in the sky. And his mother, in saying that her lover was the Sun, is "enskying" her child's paternal line. Were she doing so, she would, of course, be artistically embellishing the story a little too, exercising her creative art—C(A)ELARE.

Artistic C(A)ELatura is, strictly speaking, engraving or etching in metal. Whenever Ovid uses C(A)ELare by itself, the primary, "surface" meaning is of engraving or embossing a design. Vergil leaves us with much the same sense of its connection with metalwork in the *Aeneid*, where *CAELare* is always used in a metallic context, as we see in the account of Aeneas' *CLIPeus*, "shield," in *Aeneid* 8.626–731. Here Roman history has been worked in metal by Vulcan, and Rome's father-god, Mars, whom Vulcan has every reason to dislike as his wife's lover, is *CAELatus ferro*, "engraved in iron" (807). Vulcan, "the master of fire," *IGNipotens*, is not "IGNorant," *IGNarus* (627–28), of what his IGNeous art inscribes on this divine miniature of the Roman world. Aeneas as he shoulders it, however, is pointedly described as *rerum IGNarus*, "IGNorant of the events" (730). Now, *CLIPeus*, "shield," as we have seen, was related by Varro and earlier poets to *CLEPere*, "hide"; it conceals its bearer. In this case the meaning of the celestial artwork (*CAELatura*) is concealed from the man who carries it. For Aeneas' shield, like Numa's, was made in the sky. Livy (1.20.4) explains that the special name for Numa's shield and its copies, *ancILE*, was applied because the manufacture and design were CELEstial: *CAELestia arma quae ancILia appellantur*. Vergil himself echoes this etymology in his description of Vulcan's shield. One of the artistic motifs on it is "shields falling from the sky"—*lapsa ancILia CAELO* (8.663).²

2. It will be objected that Aeneas' shield is described as a *clipeus*, not as an *ancile*. But see Juvenal *Satire* 2.126, *clipeis ancilibus*, in reference to the sacral shields; *ancilibus* stresses their heavenly origin, *clipeis* the fact that they were shields. Other references to *caelatura* in metal in the *Aeneid* are 1.640, *caelataque in auro*, "embossed with gold"; 5.307, *caelatam argento*, "embossed with silver"; 7.792, *caelataque urna*, "from an em-

The early story of man upon which Ovid embarks is described in metallic terms: his technology, his ability to work metals, his *CAELatura*, his ages of gold, silver, bronze, and iron. Man's growing abilities to create, to become godlike, then, are matched by the increase in his equally godlike abilities to destroy himself and his fellow men. This is the situation we find in *Metamorphoses* 1. Jupiter feels obliged to destroy the human race. He announces his intentions to the assembled gods and narrates the story of his descent to earth in *disGUIse* to be a guest of the criminal LYCaon.

Celestial Society

In *Metamorphoses* 1.163, Ovid takes us to heaven, where we watch Jupiter's anguish at the behavior of mankind in general and of one human in particular: LYCaon. Jupiter summons a council of the gods to announce his view of the problem and his plan of action (1.168–76):

Est via sublimis, C[A]ELo manifesta sereno
LACTEA nomen habet, candore notabilis ipso.
hac iter est superis ad magni tecta Tonantis
regalemque domum: dextra laevaue deorum
atria nobilium valvis CELEbrantur apertis.
plebs habitat diversa LOCis: hac parte potentes
C[A]ELiCOLae cLARique suos posuere penates;
hic LOCus es, quem, si verbis audacia detur,
haud timeam magni dixisse Palatia C[A]ELi.

There is a path beyond earth's limits, which is obvious to the eye when the sky [C(A)ELo] is clear. It is called the Milky [LACTEA] Way: it is remarkable for its whiteness. This is the pathway for the gods above, and to the buildings, the kingly palace, of the great Thunderer. On the left and right the mansions of the nobility CELEbrate [CELEbrantur] with open houses. The lower class is turned away to live in different places. This is the area where the powerful, bright [cLARI] CELEstial residents [C(A)ELiCOLae] have placed their household gods. This is a LOCALE [LOCus] that, if boldness were added to my words, I would not be afraid to call the Palace of the great sky.

bossed urn" (the reference here is to a motif on Turnus' shield that depicts Inachus pouring his waters from an embossed urn); 10.499, *caelaverat auro*, "had embossed with gold"; 10.527, *caelati argenti*, "of embossed silver"; *Eclogues* 3.37, *caelatum . . . opus*, "[a cup that is] engraved work."

No one has seriously disputed that this passage makes an overt comparison between the heavenly Milky Way and the Roman Palatine and thus, implicitly, a comparison between Jupiter and Caesar Augustus. But scholars have paid hardly any attention to the wordplays that abound. Some are just nice little touches which add a humorous depth to the narrative: the bright (cLARI) gods themselves have household gods. And complementing this motif of gods within gods there is a descriptive epithet, cLARI, evocative of the other usual spirits of the Roman household, the LARes.

The gods Jupiter has summoned to meeting ascend to his palace by the Milky Way, *Via LACTEA*, which is *manifesta*, that is, not hidden, when the sky, C(A)ELo, is clear (1.169–71). This CELEstial *Via LACTEA* is itself an anagram of C(A)ELAT, and it is represented with art. Manilius describes a variant tradition of the Milky Way's origin in similar fashion (*Astronomica* 1.750–54): "I must not conceal" (*nec mihi CELAnda*), he says, "an ancient tradition that is gentler than the popular one. It tells how a stream of milk flowed from breast of the queen of the gods and stained the heavens [C(A)ELum]. So it is called the circle of milk [LACTEus]."

Ovid's aristocratic gods live well. They have appropriately CELEstial CELEbrations. *CELEbrare* is often used in connection with festivals in honor of the gods in the *Metamorphoses*: with feasts of Bacchus (5.113, 9.642); of Ceres (10.431); and of Hyacinth (10.218). Heavenly gods simply honor themselves—or perhaps their household gods! There is no *conCEALment* in their heavenly festivals and no *mysteries*, as there would be on earth. Hence the open doors: *valvis apertis*. The divergent lot of the common gods is nicely caught by Ovid's inversion of COLAE—itsself an anagram of CAELO—to obtain LOCis. The aristocrats, if you like, reside. The *plebs* lives.

Wolfman

Jupiter tells the assembled gods, to whom the *hidden* truth about LYCaon has not yet been revealed, how he visited LYCaon in *disguise*. This touch is particularly nice: a CELEstial being *conCEALed* in a *false* appearance, *imagine* (1.213). Jupiter wishes to see whether reports about LYCaon's savagery are true. He describes his journey across a landscape already bristling with wild beasts (and destined to have one more *after* his visit); the very name MAENALA suggests a place that breeds madness (MAEN- means "mad"; AL- means "nourish" [1.216–17]):

MAENALA transieram latebris horrenda ferarum
et cum CYLlene gelidi pineta LYCaei . . .

I had crossed the Madlands, bristling with the hiding places of beasts;
CYLlene too, and the pine forests of icy LYCaeus.

LYCaon's name is based on the Greek *LYKos*, "wolf," transliterated into Latin as *LYCus* or *LUCus*. His ultimate metamorphosis into a wolf, Latin *LUPus*, presents little problem. The problem of transformation is, rather, one for modern linguistics: why the Latin for "wolf" is not itself *LUCus* or *LUQUus* rather than *LUPus*.³ The Roman reader would have had no difficulty seeing the wolf in LYCaon or in other names based on *LYC*. In Plautus' *Poenulus*, for instance, the greedy pimp LYCus comes in and announces that he has sacrificed six lambs (449–67). In fact, he is obsessed with sacrificial meat (a theme I shall explore later). This is the first subject he mentions at each of his first three entrances (449–67, 615–20, 746–50). Collybiscus, trying to snare LYCus, comments: "The dogs are cleverly driving the wolf [*LUPum*] into the nets," *canes compellunt in plagas lepide LUPum* (648). The play between *LYCus* and *LUPus* is obvious even to LYCus himself: "They think they are going to snatch the lamb from the wolf," *LUPo agnum eripere postulant* (776).

Let us return, then, to Ovid. Mount LYCaeus, where the story of LYCaon is set, is itself suggestive of LYCaon, the "wolfman" who lives in the area. And the first syllable of *CYLlene* is the anagram of its wolfiness. Whichever way you look, the wolf is already hiding there.

LYCaon, determined to test the divine credentials of his visitor, kills a Molossian hostage. Now, the MOLOSSians, who lived in Epirus—a good distance from Arcadia—have a name syllabically suggesting the grinding (*MOL*) of bones (*OSSa*). But they were most famous in antiquity for their *dogs*, as their own coins proclaimed.⁴ *MOLOSSus*, as often as not, means a "bone-grinding" MOLOSSian *dog* rather than a MOLOSSian *man*. We should, then, translate MOLOSSus as "German Shepherd," "Alsatian," or (more accurately in geographical terms) "Dalmatian." In Vergil *Georgics* 3.405 and in Silius *Punica* 2.683–91, the MOLOSSian is clearly a *sheepdog* who boldly defends the flock; the sheepdog, as Lindsay Watson shows, is a symbol of the satirist in Horace and other poets.⁵ Similarly, in Horace *Epodes* 6.1–10, there is

3. A. Ernout observes: "la forme [sc. *lupus*] venant sans doute de parler oscumbriens" (*Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Paris, 1951, p. 660).

4. See D. R. Sear, *Greek Coins and Their Values*², vol. 2, *Asia and North Africa*, London, 1979, p. 193, no. 1977.

5. L. Watson, "The Iambist as Sheep-dog: Horace *Epodes* 6.7–8," *Mnemosyne* 4.36 (1983): 156–59 and the sources cited there; cf. Vergil *Georgics* 3.405.

a clearly defined opposition between the MOLOSSian and the marauding wolf. We will return later to the theme of wolf, dog, and satire.

LYCaon softens (*MOLLit*) the bone-grinding MOLOSSian, whom we will render as "DALmatian," in a cauldron (1.228–29):

pARTim ferventibus ARTus
MOLLit aquis, pARTim subiecto torruit igni.

He softened, *AL dente*, some pARTs of the ARTiculated limbs in water; pARTs he put fire beneath, and roasted.

LYCaon uses the primal pair of elements, fire and water, to do his cooking. In fact, his dismemberment of the Dalmatian reminds us of Ovid's description of the partition of primal chaos in 1.32–33:

sic ubi dispositam quisquis fuit ille deorum
congeriem secuit sectamque in membra coegit . . .

So when whichever of the gods it was had differentiated this mass, sliced it up, and shaped it into limbs once it was sliced . . .

There lurks the suggestion of a primeval culinary ART as well as cosmic regeneration. We may compare Seneca's description of the wretched Pelias, dismembered and cooked by his daughters after the Argonauts' return with the golden fleece. The girls, tricked by Medea, think they are going to restore him to youth (*Medea* 666–67):

USTus accenso Pelias aeno
ARSit angUSTas vagUS inter undas.

Pelias, seared with skill above the heated cauldron: a steward wandering upon the narrow straits of pain.⁶

If there is something both cosmic and canine about the MOLOSSian, there may be a touch of the Dogstar, Canis, in him, whose fiery heat Manilius compares with that of the sun itself and with that of the fiery conflagration marking the end of the universe (*Astronomica* 5.206–12). As the Dogstar "is born, not even the water of the sea can quench it," *nascentem . . . nec pelagi restinxerit unda* (*Astronomica* 5.219).

6. Seneca plays upon the "burning" in *UST* and the "tasting" in *GUST*. For the cooking of the ritual sacrifice, see W. Burkert, *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, trans. P. Bing, Berkeley, 1983, p. 89 and n. 29. See also C. H. Greenewalt, Jr., *Ritual Dinners in Early Historic Sardis*, University of California Publications: Classical Studies 17, Berkeley, 1976, *passim*, and M. Détienné and J.-P. Verant, *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays gree*, Paris, 1979, especially pp. 215–37.

When the Dalmatian is served to him, Jupiter reacts by hurling a thunderbolt at LYCaon's house, a house worthy (*dIGNos*) of so fiery a fate (1.230–31). Jupiter's *dIGNity* is, predictably, prone to igneous expression (cf. 1.166, 1.181, 1.194). LYCaon flees into the silent countryside—*silentia RURis* (1.232); when he tries to speak, he howls, *EXULulat* (1.233). The verb is well chosen, since it carries within it *EXUL*, "exile": he runs howling into exile, where his transformation into a wolf is completed (*Metamorphoses* 1.236–39):

in villos abeunt VESTes, in cRURa lacerti:
fit LUPUS et veteris servat VESTigia formae;
CANities eadem est, eadem violentia vultus,
idem oCULi LUCent, eadem feritatis imago est.

His clothing *diVESTs* itself into hair, his arms become legs—more useful in the country [*cRURa*]. He becomes a wolf yet keeps *VESTigia* track of what he used to be. His aged and dogged look [*CANities*] is just the same. There's the same urge to violence in his face. Hidden in his eyes the same wolf-light howls [*oCULiLUCent*], the same image of bestiality.

I have tried to catch the multiple force of Ovid's language here: the presence of *RURAL* countryside in *cRURAL* legs, of *VEST* in *VESTiges*, of *CANinity* in the *CANDor* of hair, of the Greek wolf, *LUCus*, howling (recall *exULULat*) in the *LUCid* gleam hidden in his *oCULAR* vision.⁷

Little has changed. LYCaon now eats sheep and cattle raw rather than cooked, and he tracks down his former fellow humans; he still acts as he did when he was human. Wolves, like LYCaon, eat people, though they dispense with cuisine. Further, Jupiter is himself closely associated with the wolf in Arcadia, in the cult of Zeus LYCaesus.

Pausanias (8.3.1) tells us LYCaon was changed into a wolf at the festival of Zeus LYCaesus, and that, ever since, a man has been changed into a wolf at that festival. Pliny *NH* 8.80–84 and Varro cited by Augustine (*City of God* 18.17) tell how a person named Daemonetus was turned into a wolf after eating the sacrifice made there by the Arcadians but was returned to human form ten years later. Isidore

7. The idea of "light" in the "eye" is also present in *LUMEN*, which is used by poets to mean either "light" or "eye"—that which sees the light or that which is the source of light. The light is more hidden in *oCULus*, since the *LUC* is reversed. But since *OCULus* is itself a play on *OC(C)ULTus*, "hidden," the additional disguise is not very surprising. As for the interchange of dog and wolf, compare Tereus' rape of Philomela, who is compared to a lamb wounded by a (dog) gray-white wolf: *cani . . . lupi* (6.527–28).

refers to the same myth in *Etymologies* 8.9.5. Varro also mentions another version of the story, according to Augustine (loc. cit.): Arcadians, chosen by lot, *used to swim across a certain lake and were there metamorphosed into wolves: traNAbant quoddam stagnum atque ibi convertabantur in lupos*. They regained human shape *by swimming back across the lake—reNATato stagno*. We note the play on *NAT*, meaning both "birth" and "swimming." Werewolves, even in Renaissance times, were reputed to fear water (*aquam perhorrescunt*, and suspected witches and werewolves were subjected to the notorious "test of cold water," *iudicium aquae frigidae*).⁸

The twin-peaked Mount LYCaesus was reputed to be the place where Jupiter was born (Pausanias 8.36.2–3, 8.38.2), just as the twin-peaked Parnassus is where Deucalion and Pyrrha later regenerate humanity. Jupiter's birthplace, however, is fatal to humans. Pausanias (8.38.6) says that anyone entering the precinct of Jupiter LYCaesus' temple cannot live more than a year and that anything, man or beast, entering the area casts no shadow. We are, then, reminded of that most persistent European tradition of human metamorphosis: the *versiPELLis*, or werewolf.

For metrical reasons (*versiPELLis* will not fit in a Latin hexameter), the werewolf proper does not appear in the *Metamorphoses*. But he lurks everywhere: in 12.381, for instance, Dorylas, a combatant in the battle of lapiths and centaurs, is described as having temples covered with "wolf hide," *PELLe lupi*. Beast and man, however, are not so very dissimilar. In *poPULUS*, "people," lurks the anagrammatical *LUPUS*, a predator that depopulates with its ravages: *poPULatur*. When Jupiter destroys the human race, he has, in the front of his mind, LYcaon's behavior and that of mankind in general in the age of bronze. But we should not forget that Jupiter himself, as Plautus' Mercury notes in *Amphitryo* 123, can "make a werewolf of himself when the urge comes over him," *Ita versipellem se facit quando libet*.

The rites associated with Jupiter LYCaesus, Pausanias comments cryptically (8.38.7), are *secret*, and he offers no elaboration beyond a rather ominous and ritually formulaic observation: ἐχέτω δὲ ὡς ἔχει καὶ ὡς ἔσχεν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ("Let them be as they are and have been from the beginning"). Plato is more explicit. Socrates' companion in the *Minos* (315C) explains that the people in LYCaesus, like the Carthagi-

8. Petrus Salius, *De affectis particularibus*, Bonn, 1583, pp. 339–77 (344). For other sources see M. Summers, *The Werewolf*, New York, 1966, pp. 46–49 and passim; cf. Burkert, *Homo Necans*, pp. 84–90.

nians, θυσίας θύουσιν; "sacrifice sacrifices"—human sacrifices, in fact. Let us transliterate the Greek so that we may recall it later: *THYsias THYousin*. For one of Greek myth's most terrible stories is that of the feasting of *THYestes*, "the Sacrificer," upon the flesh of his own children.

Jupiter *LYCaesus*, then, is Jupiter at his most primitive and terrible: the Jupiter of a barbaric and uncivilized age of human sacrifice and cannibalism. But he is not the only god whose cult is found on Mount *LYCaesus* (one of whose peaks the Arcadians called "Olympus" [Pausanias 8.38.2]). Phoebus Apollo and Pan share the mountain with him, as they share Ovid's first book of the *Metamorphoses* with him. And Ovid links the Caesar and Octavian of his own day with this primitive and barbaric Jupiter.

Caesar, Hair, and Slaughter

Ovid gives man's passion for slaughter, for civil war, and for family strife a very *Roman* hue in the *Metamorphoses* despite his abundant use of Greek myth. The strife among men in the age of "bronze offspring" (*AENEAE proles*) not only makes guest unsafe from host, and brother from brother, but *father-in-law from son-in-law* (1.125, 144–45). The obsessive paradigm of civil war in Roman literature matches father-in-law against son-in-law, *socer* against *gener*.⁹

Rome's earliest wars pitted Romulus against his father-in-law, Titus Tatius. And Romulus' nurse was a *she-wolf*. But Ovid does not focus our attention on Romulus and the wolf in the *Metamorphoses*, nor does he use the word for a female wolf, *LUPa*—which also means "whore."¹⁰ Romulus himself is not mentioned until the final books, and then he is treated only briefly. I do not mean that Ovid is avoiding the possibly sensitive parallel between the wolf god Jupiter and the wolf people. On the contrary: there was a no less famous conflict between father-in-law and son-in-law much closer to Ovid's own day, that between Caesar and Pompey. In *Aeneid* 6.826–35, Anchises does not even identify Caesar and Pompey by name in his parade of the future warriors of Rome: it is

9. See F. Bömer, *P. Ovidi Nasonis "Metamorphosen"*, Heidelberg, 1969–80, vol. 1, on *Metamorphoses* 1.125.

10. Livy's comments in 1.4.6 and 1.4.7 make the confusion between *lupa* as she-wolf and whore quite explicit: Romulus and Remus were nurtured either by a she-wolf who came down from the mountains or by Larentia, the shepherd Faustulus' wife, who made her body available to the public at large (*vulgato corpore*) as a she-wolf among shepherds (*lupam inter pastores*).

enough (for the reader, if not for Aeneas himself) to mention a *socer* and a *gener* poised for civil war.

Ovid, like Vergil, directs attention to the civil wars of Caesar's and Octavian's day, to Aeneas' offspring rather than to the nurslings of the wolf. In the concealment of Ovidian wordplay, the children of the degenerate Bronze Age whom Jupiter destroys, the *AENEAE proles* (1.125), are associated by their very name with *AENEAs*, founder of the house of Caesar and of the Roman race. The age of bronze is the *AENEAn* Age, characterized by the damage it causes with *iron* weapons and by its production of "*gold*, more harmful than iron," *ferroque nocentius aurum* (1.141). This is hardly the idea Octavian had in mind when he sought to spread the word of his new "Golden Age." But Ovid uses the notion here and in book 15, where he also treats the *Caesars*: Venus, "Aenean Aeneas' golden mother," is upset at the prospect of Caesar's murder, *quod ut AUREA vidit / AENEAE genetrix* (15.761–62).

The degeneracy of humans in the *AENEAn* Age, then, is closely linked in Jupiter's mind with the story of *LYCaon*. And not without reason. We may recall the tradition reported by Dionysius of Halicarnassus that, seventeen generations before the Trojan War and *AENEAs*' migration to Latium, settlers arrived in Italy under the leadership of Oenotrus, son of an Arcadian called *LYCaon*; Italy's earliest settlers then, are the Oenotrians who were previously called *LYCaonians* (*Roman Antiquities* 1.11.2–1.12.1). The wolfish nature of Italy predates Romulus. The Roman historical figures Ovid associates with *LYCaon* and Jupiter are Caesar and Octavian. Ovid's first step is to establish the link between Jupiter and Octavian, which he does with wit and ingenuity. He compares heaven, and the dwellings of the gods upon the Milky Way, with the Roman Palatine, and thus, by implication, he compares Jupiter and his regal mansion upon the heavenly Palatine with Caesar Octavian and his palace upon its earthly counterpart (1.168–76). By setting the palace in the Milky Way rather than, more traditionally, upon Olympus, Ovid recalls a common ancient myth: that the Milky Way was created by the catastrophic disintegration of Phaethon's solar chariot—destroyed, we should add, by Jupiter.¹¹

Once the gods are assembled in the palace's "marbled recess," *MARMORE . . . recessu* (1.177)—a description more tombl-like than palatial, as we shall see in Chapter 6—Jupiter takes a heavenly place more elevated (*CELSior*) than that of the other gods and frightens them:

11. See below, pp. 183–84.

TERrificam capitis concussit TERque quaTERque
CAESARIem, cum qua TERRam, mare, sidera movit.

Seizures shook his terrifying hair three and four times, the hair which, shaking, shakes the territories of earth, eases the sea around, and replaces the stars.

The syllabic soundplay here is astonishing: the reiterated *TER* variously suggests "TERRain" (earth), "TERRor," "three times," and "four times." Further, when *QUA* is juxtaposed with *TER*, as it is twice here, the ensuing *QUATER* yields not only "four times" but an echo of *QUATERe*, "to shake," which nicely reinforces the notion of shaking in *concussit*, "shook," and *TER*—meaning "earth" or "fear." In *Metamorphoses* 15.71 we see a further extension of this soundplay. Pythagoras is said to have explained to men what it is that "shakes the earth," *quid quaTEREt TERras*. The unsettling effect is enhanced by the chaotic anagram that mingles earth and sea, *tER[R]AM in MARE*, and by *sidera movit*, "he moved the stars," which might almost as easily be *sidera amovit*, "he removed the stars."

Given the parallel between Caesar Augustus and Jupiter, we must note the presence of CAESAR within *CAESARies*, "hair," just as surely as there is a god, *AESAR*, in *CAESAR* (Suetonius *Augustus* 27). In fact, Ovid produces the Latin equivalent, in anagrammatical form, of Suetonius' Etruscan wordplay in *Fasti* 6.455: *nunc bene lucetis SACRAE sub CAESARE flammae* ("Now you SACRED flames will shine well beneath CAESAR"). In *Metamorphoses* 1, it is CAESAR who lurks within the hair of god—the hair of god that shakes the earth and moves the seas and skies around.

The suggestion of Caesar in Jupiter during the prelude to Jupiter's annihilation of the human race is very daring. If Ovid's Jupiter were a wise, rational, competent governor of the cosmos, the comparison might flatter Octavian. But he is not. We see him as man's destroyer, not as man's creator or restorer—a role belonging to Deucalion and Pyrrha. When Jupiter declares with gerundival zeal before the assembled gods, *perdendum est mortale genus* ("The human race must be destroyed"), he seems to be rivaling the oft-stated and oft-quoted remark of the elder Cato about the destruction of Carthage. Jupiter goes on—before any discussion occurs—and swears by the flowing waters (*FLUMINA*) of the Styx that he will annihilate man. An oath by the river of the dead is appropriate enough in advance of a divine decision to flood the world.

Although Jupiter claims that the punishment is a *last* resort (*cuncta prius temptata*), it is the *first* thing he does in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1.188–90). The son of Saturn describes the condition of humanity in 1.190–91:

inmedicabile corpus
ense recidendum, ne pars SINCERA trahatur

an incurable *body* that must be cut back with iron to prevent harm to the healthy *part*.

Jupiter's medical ideas are reversed. So it is not surprising that his notion of punishing an individual, guilty human is the destruction of the entire human race, not surgically or militarily, but by means of a flood. Jupiter, in this respect, is clearly no Aesculapius. In fact, we can, if anything, now better understand why, in myth, he would *destroy* Aesculapius. The surgeon removes the unhealthy *part* to keep the rest of the *body* from infection. Jupiter would be more likely to butcher than to heal his patient. What part is left when the body is removed? One cannot be sure.

We become uneasy, besides, when the son of Saturn, who castrated his father, the Sky, talks of trimming parts and bodies and adopts the terminology of Aesculapius, whom Statius (*Silvae* 3.4.25) calls the gentle god, *mitis deus*, and who, in the poet's conceit, castrated the imperial favorite Earinus, who was destined for a Palatine love, *Palatino . . . amoris* (ibid. 39, 68–71). The unease increases when Ovid's Jupiter, after talking as if he were a surgeon amputating an infected body, goes on, in line 192, to express his concern for his "half-gods," his *semidei*. Latin frequently suggests "eunuch" by means of the word *semivir*, "half-man." That, for example, is how Iarbas insults Aeneas in *Aeneid* 4 when he calls the hero "that Paris with his eunuch band" (*ille Paris cum semiviro comitatu*). Ovid's parallel between the gods and the Roman imperial establishment hints that the surgically minded Jupiter's host of half-gods were his major concern, the eunuch slaves and freedmen of the divine Palatine.

These "half-god" viceroys are described as a pastoral assortment of rustic fauns and nymphs who are not allowed to live upon the divine Palatine. Jupiter is worried that they are threatened in the secure control of the lands "which we have given them," *quas dedimus*, by human savagery, exemplified by LYCaon (1.189–98). But it does not take us long to perceive that Jupiter's punishment of mankind—a

flood—will sweep the *semidei* away too. And those who survive will face humiliation, rape, and metamorphosis at the hands of the Olympians—including Jupiter himself.

It is the recollection of the personal threat posed by Lycaon that prompts Jupiter to his obliteration of mankind (1.197–98): *cum mihi, qui fulmen, qui vos habeoque regoque / struxerit insidias notus feritate Lycaon* (“since against me—I who have and who control the thunderbolt and you—he has constructed his treachery, this man notorious for his bestiality: Lycaon”).

The gods, understandably, react in surprise at the mention of Lycaon. Jupiter’s claim in 1.198 to the contrary, the hideous banquet of Lycaon is *not* generally known—*nondum vulgata . . . / foeda Lycaoniae . . . convivium mensae*—Ovid says, at the time Jupiter uses it as a pretext for destroying the human race (1.164–65). The assembled divinities, then, are confused (*Metamorphoses* 1.199–205):

confremuere omnes studiisque ardentibus ausum
taliam deposcunt: sic cum manus impia saevit
sanguine CAESAREO Romanum exstinguere nomen,
attonitum tanto subitae terrore ruinae
humanum genus est totusque perhorruit orbis:
nec tibi grata minus pietas, Auguste, tuorum
quam fuit illa Iovi.

They all shouted together and in burning rivalry asked who dared to do such a thing. So, when a handful of men attempted in brutish and disloyal violence to douse the fire of Rome’s name with the blood of a slaughtered CAESAR, the human race was thunderstruck by the great terror of a catastrophe that had moved up on them so unexpectedly. The wide world shivered in horror.

And the show of loyalty you got, August one, was no less pleasing to you than this show of loyalty was to Jupiter.

The implicit parallel between Octavian and Jupiter now becomes quite explicit. Further, Ovid is clearly extending that parallel to precise situations: Jupiter’s treatment by and of Lycaon, and Octavian’s behavior in the civil upheavals of first century B.C. The parallel says little good about Octavian, Jupiter, or the patrician gods who live on the Milky Way. The simile cited above compares the horror of the patrician gods at the threat on Jupiter’s life with the horror of the human race at the prospects of upheavals after the murder of a Caesar. Ovid’s irony verges on sarcasm. If Jupiter really is divine, and if there is an AESAR within CAESAR, why should either be con-

cerned about assassination? If they are gods, they are immortal: they cannot be killed.

The threat to one life, be it Caesar’s or Jupiter’s, becomes a pretext for—and more important than—the destruction of the human race. We can make little case for justice. Jupiter admits, in the opening line of his second speech (1.209), that Lycaon has already been punished for his crime by his metamorphosis into a wolf. Yet does this transformation make him more or less of a threat to humans? Who is the world being made safe for? Whose interests are served by the annihilation of the human race? Certainly those not of mankind. Jupiter regards all humans as *potential* Lycaons. Indeed he reasons, with perhaps a trace of paranoia, that all men are much the same: *in facinus iurasse putes* (“you’d think they had plotted [Lycaon’s] crime” [1.242]).

Jupiter’s, and probably Octavian’s, cures are, in Ovid’s judgment, a great deal worse than the diseases they seek to remedy. They amputate bodies to save limbs; they are butchers, not surgeons. As Jupiter’s destruction of humanity is his first act in the *Metamorphoses*, so civil war is Octavian’s first resort in avenging Caesar’s death. Indeed Ovid’s divine council, like the similar council in Statius *Thebaid* 1.197–302, suggests a senate meeting in imperial times. The gods, like the *patres*, are assembled not to debate matters of great importance, but to be told what is going to happen.

The gods react to the news in bewilderment. All of them are upset at the planned destruction of humanity, though their reasons are far from selfless (1.246–49):

est tamen humani generis iacTURA dolori
omnibus, et QUAE SIT terrae mortalibus ORBae
forma fuTURA ROGant, QUIS SIT laTURus in aras
TURA, ferisne Paret POPULandas tradere terras.

Before even attempting a translation here, we should note the following soundplays: first, the use of *terrae . . . ORBae* (“the bereaved earth”) as an unexpected variant of *terrarum . . . ORBis* (“the circle of earth’s lands”). Second, the use of *QUAE SIT* and *QUIS SIT* to introduce indirect questions governed by the verb *ROGant*, “they ask.” *QUAE SIT* and *QUIS SIT* sound like *QUAESIT*, “he asks.” Third, *ROGant*, “they ask,” itself suggests *ROGus*, a pyre for cremating the dead; it is the appropriate verb of inquiry about the impending fiery destruction of mankind. As we shall shortly see in more detail, there is fire in the syllable *AR* too. Fourth, we should note the presence of

TURA, "incense," in the noun *iacTURA*, "surge," and the participles *fuTURA*, "going to be" and *laTURus*, which describes the bringing of the incense. The insistent repetition of *TURA*, "incense," reminds us of what the gods will miss most if human beings are no more. Fifth, the earth (*IErras*) will become a place where ferocious beasts (*fERis*), not people, walk. Finally there is the implicit play between *POPULus*, "people," and *POPULARi*, "destroy." Both words, we should note, contain the anagrammatical wolf, *LUPus*.

So the translation might run as follows:

There is a SENSation of grief for the human race in all of them. They ask, IN CHOIR, for a SENSE of what shape things will have, given such a wide dEARTH of human life. In SENSible questioning, they burn to know who will waft inCENSE on altars, and if he's ready to change the earth's TERRain, erased of humans, so fearful beasts may reign.

Divine reaction to Jupiter's plan is ambiguous. Part of the heavenly group, admittedly, applauds; but the plurality of other parts assents to the plan by silence only (1.244–45). Where outrage is overtly expressed, it is at the audacity of any mortal in threatening Jupiter, not at Jupiter's decision to carry out cosmic genocide.

Within CAESAR lurks not only a god but also slaughter: we may compare the phrase "CAESARIAN [slaughtered] blood" (*sanguine CAESAreo*) in 1.201 with the expression in Ovid's *Heroides* 16.336: *CAESAque sanguineam victima planget humum* ("The slaughtered victim will strike the bloodied ground with grief"). Servius, commenting on *Aeneid* 1.286, makes the verbal connection between CAESAr and cutting quite explicit and in a context of Aesculapian surgery:

CAESAr vel quod CAESo matris ventre natus est, vel quod avus eius in Africa manu propria occidit elephantum, qui CAESAr dicitur Poenorum lingua.

[He is called] CAESAr either because he was born when his mother's womb was cut into [that is, by CAESARIAN section] or because his grandfather, with his own hand, killed an elephant—which is called CAESAr in Punic—when he was in Africa.

The comment is particularly interesting in the context of *Aeneid* 1.286 because it refers to CAESAr's birth: *nASCetur pulchra Troianus origine CAESAr* ("There will be born, Trojan in his fine origin, [a] CAESAr"). Aeneas, CAESAr's Trojan ancestor, as he is revealed to Dido in *Aeneid*

1.590, is notable for the beauty of his CAESARies, his hair. On this line Servius comments (and he has much the same to say of 8.659):

a CAEdendo dicta CAEsaries. Ergo tantum virorum est.

CAESaries is so called because it is derived from slaughtering. That's why it's only used as a word for men's hair.

Nor have we reached the limit of CAESARIAN wordplay in Servius. At *Aeneid* 11.743, Tarchon pulls Venulus from his horse and carries him away; Servius, commenting on this line, claims the episode is based on Julius Caesar's experience when he was fighting in Gaul. Caesar, like Venulus, was carried off. But then the story changes: *occurrit quidam ex hostibus qui eum nosset, et insultans ait, CAESAR, CAESAR, quod Gallorum lingua dimitte significat* ("One of the enemy who recognized him came up, and, mocking him said: 'CAESAR, CAESAR!' which in the Gallic language means 'Let him go!'"). This apocryphal story provides a fatal double entendre for the Gallic people! The speaker recognizes Caesar, but instead of suggesting the captured man be killed, as Latin wordplay might indicate, it suggests his release. And released he was, to cut Gallic power to pieces.

Plato's Lupine Tyrant

The parallel between the slaughtering Caesar, Jupiter, and Lycaon recalls Plato *Republic* 565D–66B, where we find a similar juxtaposition of the Lycaon motif with the theme of the human popular leader turned despot:

Τίς ἀρχὴ οὖν μεταβολῆς ἐκ προστάτου ἐπὶ τύραννον; ἢ δῆλον ὅτι ἐπειδὴν ταῦτόν ἄρξῃται δρᾶν ὁ προστάτης τῷ ἐν τῷ μύθῳ ὅς περὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Λυκαίου ἱερὸν λέγεται; . . . Ὡς ἄρα ὁ γευσάμενος τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου σπλάγχνου, ἐν ἄλλοις ἄλλων ἱερείων ἐνὸς ἐγκατατετημημένου, ἀνάγκη δὴ τούτῳ λύκῳ γενέσθαι. ἄρ' οὖν οὕτω καὶ ὁς ἂν δήμου προεστῶς, λαβὼν σφόδρα πειθόμενον ὄχλον, μὴ ἀπόσκηται ἐμφυλίου αἵματος, ἀλλ' ἀδίκως ἐπαιτιώμενος, οἷα δὴ φιλοῦσιν, εἰς δικαστήρια ἄγων μαιφονῇ, βίον ἀνδρὸς ἀφανίζων, γλώττη τε καὶ στόματι ἀνοσίφ γευόμενος φόνου συγγενοῦς, καὶ ἀνδρηλατῇ καὶ ἀποκτεινῇ καὶ ὑποσημαίνῃ χρεῶν τε ἀποκοπὰς καὶ γῆς ἀναδασμόν, ἄρα τῷ τοιούτῳ ἀνάγκη δὴ τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο καὶ εἵμαρται ἢ ἀπολωλέναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἢ τυραννεῖν καὶ λύκῳ ἐξ ἀνθρώπου γενέσθαι; . . . οὗτος δὴ . . . ὁ στασιάζων γίγνεται πρὸς τοὺς ἔχοντας τὰς οὐσίας . . . ἄρ'

οὖν ἐκπεσὼν μὲν καὶ κατελθὼν βία τῶν ἐχθρῶν τύραννος ἀπειργασμένος κατέρχεται; . . . ἔαν δὲ ἀδύνατοι ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὸν ὥσιν ἢ ἀποκτείνειν διαβάλλοντες τῇ πόλει, βιαίῳ δὴ θανάτῳ ἐπιβουλεύουσιν ἀποκτείνουσι λάθρα.

Φιλεῖ γοῦν, ἢ δ' ὅς, οὕτω γίγνεσθαι.

"How does this process of *turning* him round from champion [of the people] to tyrant begin? What controls it? Or does it become obvious when the champion begins to do the same thing as the man in the myth told about the shrine of Lycaean Zeus in Arcadia . . . : that anyone who has tasted human flesh, even though it is only one morsel sliced up along with all the others from all the other consecrated foods, must become a wolf. . . .

"It is the same, then, with someone who, as a champion of the people, gains a hold on the people whom he has persuaded and who now obey him. He does not keep away from the blood of his own folk. He brings someone to court on crooked charges—a favorite ploy—and kills him. He blots out a man's life; his tongue and his profane mouth get the taste of killing a fellow man. He sends men away from their homelands and murders them while hinting at redistribution of land and cutting up records of debt.

"Isn't the sequel to this inevitable and predetermined? He will either be destroyed by his enemies or rule tyrannically and change from man to wolf? . . . This is the man who stirs up hostility against the propertied classes. . . . If he is thrown out and comes back despite the efforts of those who hate him, doesn't he return as an absolute tyrant? . . . If they don't have the power to *turn* him out or to kill him after they have *turned* on him verbally and publicly, they get together and plot to kill him secretly?"

"That's the way it usually occurs, I think," he said.

I translate the Greek words containing *ballo* or *bolē* by the English "turn" to illustrate the common root that Plato uses in these references to exile, attack, and transformation. I have also tried, in the first sentence, to retain the multivalence of the Greek *archē*, which means both "beginning" and "rule."

Plato describes not a *particular* champion turned despot but the *habitual* metamorphosis of democracy into wolflike despotism and the consequences of that metamorphosis. This theme dominates *Republic* 562A–76B. Plato notes, in particular, the transition from the tyrant's gentle and well-meaning facade, his denial that he really has dictatorial powers, to his subsequent and vicious prosecution of opponents (565D–67E).

As usual in the *Republic*, the issue of justice in the state is indissociable from the issue of justice within the individual. Lycaon symbolizes the political brutality of the tyrant and tyranny and, in addition, the division in the soul between the rational and animal instincts. As political metamorphosis brutalizes the state, so man is brutalized by the dominance of the despotic elements in the soul over the rational, a correspondence that makes real the grotesque desires and fantasies of the dream (571C–D):

Τὰς περὶ τὸν ὕπνον, ἣν δ' ἐγώ, ἐγειρομένης, ὅταν τὸ μὲν ἄλλο τῆς ψυχῆς εὖδῃ, ὅσον λογιστικὸν καὶ ἡμερον καὶ ἄρχον ἐκείνου, τὸ δὲ θηριώδες τε καὶ ἄγριον, ἢ σίτων ἢ μέθης πλησθέν, σκιρτᾷ τε καὶ ἀπώσασθαι τὸν ὕπνον ζητῇ ἵεναι καὶ ἀποπιμπλάναι τὰ αὐτοῦ ἥθη· οἷσθ' ὅτι πάντα ἐν τῷ τοιοῦτ' ὁλμῶ ποιεῖν, ὥς ἀπὸ πάσης λελυμένον τε καὶ ἀπηλλαγμένον αἰσχύνης καὶ φρονήσεως. μητρὶ τε γὰρ ἐπιχειρεῖν μείγνυσθαι, ὥς οἶεται, οὐδὲν ὀκνεῖ, ἄλλω τε ὁτῶσιν ἀνθρώπων καὶ θεῶν καὶ θηρίων, μαιφονεῖν τε ὁτιοῦν, βρώματός τε ἀπέχεσθαι μηδενός· καὶ ἐνὶ λόγῳ οὕτε ἀνοίας οὐδὲν ἐλλείπει οὐτ' ἀναισχυντίας.

"Those that awaken when we sleep," I said, "when one part of our soul is at rest, the part that approaches things reasonably and verbally, with gentle clarity, the part that rules the other element of the soul. That other element is like a wild and ferocious animal, gorged on food and drink. It leaps up, pushes sleep away from it, and goes off on a lively search to satisfy the call of its particular nature. You know it is bold and stops at nothing at these times: for it is freed from—and unburdened by—morality and thought. Its lust, in fantasy, does not shrink at intercourse with its mother or with anything human, divine, or animal. It will kill anything and has no taboos against any kind of food. To put it in one succinct statement: it will stop at nothing we would regard as mindless or disgusting.

The part of our nature that awakens when reason sleeps, is, appropriately, nocturnal and wolflike: the Mr. Hyde in us, our propensity for lykanthropy. In short, both the individual and the state have their Lycaon-like forms.

Subsequent Greek writers generally translate the Latin *respublica* with the Greek *demokratia*. Plato's statement would thus be valid in Roman, not just Greek, historical experience. Ovid's Caesars, in fact, resemble Plato's wolfish tyrants not only because Ovid is so clearly talking about Jupiter Lycaeus, Lycaon, and the Caesars all in the same breath but also because the Caesars are instrumental in the fall of republican government. There is no more forceful way of implanting the idea firmly in our minds than by showing us the tyrannical "Wolf"

Jupiter punishing man for the wolf in him by effecting a catastrophe that renders both wolf and man insignificant and dead. Ovid knew this truth as well as Plato; in fact, he probably drew the idea from Plato.

In the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid is taking more than just a casual leaf from the Platonic book. The *Republic*, after all, concludes with the metamorphosis of human into animal and animal into human, described in the myth of Er (620A–21D). Ovid, like Plato, mixes the paradigms of the political and the psychologically mythical. The *Metamorphoses* tells of the lupine depredations of man's history and fantasy. So too does the *Republic*. In the Platonic idea of recurring historical patterns—the notion that democracy will degenerate into tyranny in a certain prescribed manner—we see a premise shared with myth. The pattern endures, and its results are predictable as it is reenacted in all of its countless individual manifestations. Similarly, the soul endures, though it too will assume different outward appearances in its cycles of birth and death.

Lycaon, the hairy wolf bent on slaughter and consecrated in the rites of Jupiter Lycaeus, may simply acquire another name—CAESAR, whose hairiness is in his CAESARIES, whose slaughter is in his CAESA, and whose divinity is in his AESAR. Politically, the situation changes from *RES publica* to a dismembered state as the result of the anagrammatical turmoil within the hair, CAESARIES, shaken upon the Caesarian, imperial head. The body politic is incurable, *imMEDICABILE corpus*—or, if we will allow Paelignian Ovid a bilingual Latin/Oscan wordplay on Oscan MEDDIKKia, “magistral rule,” the body is *ungovernable*. It must be cut away to save the *PARS SINCERA*. The remainder is the CAESARIAN part. The *respublica* will become the *RES CAESARIS*, the state ruled by CAESAR.

It is probably, from Ovid's point of view, of considerable poetic and political significance that Mark Antony thrice offered Caesar the kingly crown at Rome's ancient festival of the LUPercalia.¹² The

12. Plutarch *Caesar* 61.2–3; Suetonius *Julius* 79. On the Lupercalia generally, see E. Riganti, Varrone, “De lingua Latina,” libro VI, Bologna, 1978, pp. 100–104 and the sources cited there; B. Riposati, “Lupercali in Varrone,” in Varron: *Grammaire antique et stylistique latine*, Publications de la Sorbonne, Série “Etudes,” 14, ed. J. Collart, Paris, 1978, pp. 57–70; A. Kirsopp Michels, “The Topography and Interpretation of the Lupercalia,” *TAPA* 84 (1953): 35–39; G. Dumézil, *Archaic Roman Religion*, trans. P. Krapp with a foreword by M. Eliade, 2 vols., Chicago, 1970, vol. 1, pp. 346–50; Burkert, *Homo Necans*, pp. 84–90; E. Gjerstad, *Legends and Facts of Early Roman History*, Lund, 1962, p. 11, and B. Liou-Gille, *Cultes “héroïques” romains: Les fondateurs*, Paris, 1980, pp. 180–94 and the sources cited.

LUPercalia's rituals involved the sacrifice of a goat and a *dog*, a sacrifice whose purpose may have been either the protection of the community from *wolves* or the protection of the wolf community, that is, Rome itself.¹³ In fact, Caesar himself had, according to Suetonius, added a third team of LUPerci to the two already in existence, which dated back, so tradition suggested, to the time of Romulus.¹⁴

In complementary irony, there was also a cave called the LUPercal on the PALATine hill; there the kingly twins, Romulus and Remus, were nurtured by the she-wolf (*Fasti* 2.381–452). Evander, the Arcadian immigrant to Italy, points it out to Aeneas in *Aeneid* 8.343–44 immediately after mentioning the site of Romulus' place of refuge, the Asylum:

gelida monstrat sub RUPE LUPERcal
Parrhasio dictum Panos de more LYCaei.

He points out the LUPercal cave beneath PURE rock, named, in Parrhasian [Arcadian] manner, after LYCaeus Pan.

According to Augustine *City of God* 18.16, Varro said, “The Roman LUPerci grew, as it were, from seed of these Arcadian mysteries” (*Romanos etiam LUPercos ex illorum mysteriorum veluti semine exortos*). Ovid implies the same in *Fasti* 2.423–24:

quid vetat Arcadio dictos a monte LUPercos?
Faunus in Arcadia templa LYCaeus habet.

What prevents the LUPerci from being named for the Arcadian mountain? LYCaeus Faunus has his temples in Arcadia.

There is no question, then, that Ovid had pondered the connections between the Roman wolf on the PALATine and its Arcadian counterpart. Similarly, he associates the Latin god Faunus with Pan, another Arcadian deity linked to wolves and to Mount LYCaeus, whose goat was the other sacrificial animal at the LUPercalia. I shall say more on this point later.

Ovid is playing Plato against Roman ritual tradition throughout the LYCaon episode, and Plato is his perfect model. Plato, after all, wrote the *Cratylus*—our earliest Greek study of wordplay. But Ovid has gone a stage further than Plato: Ovid not only relates the microcosm

13. Suetonius *Julius* 76; Cassius Dio 44.6.2, 45.30.2.

14. Plutarch *Roman Questions* 111; *Romulus* 21.10–13; cf. Dumézil, *Archaic Roman Religion*, p. 348.

of the individual to the macrocosm of the state; he relates both microcosm *and* macrocosm to the gods and nature, to the cosmos itself.

Truths Palatable and Palatine

The comparison of the Caesars to Jupiter—himself called a tyrant in 1.276—is not the only instance of tyrannical earthly power compared to Jupiter's cosmic rule. Motifs of tyrannical power and its abuse run throughout the *Metamorphoses*, and quite often they are linked, as in the LYCaon narrative, with the eating of human and animal flesh. The motifs climax in book 15 with Pythagoras, who forbids the eating of *any* flesh and the unnecessary killing of living things. In 15.141–42 he cries:

cumque boum dabitis CAESorum membra PALATo,
mandere vos vestros scite et sentite colonos.

When you *SEIZE* your cattle and *cut up their limbs* for PALATal enjoyment, know and feel that you are getting your teeth into your fellow workers.

I have italicized *CAESorum membra* because the phrase is echoed later in the description of the murdered "CAESar's limbs" (*CAESaris . . . membra* [15.845]).

Slaughter, whether for the PALATe or for the PALATine, remains much the same activity in Pythagoras' judgment; he has no love either for the lupine eating of flesh, characteristic of man in general, or for the lupine tyrant who rules the state. We will recall that the gods are described as living in the PALATine of the sky, the *PALATia C(A)ELi* (1.176). And PALATine tables were proverbially gourmet (Martial *Epig.* 13.91). Augustine supplies the connection between aberrant conduct within the microcosm of the individual and within the macrocosms of the tyrant-ruled state and the tyrant-ruled universe in his discussion of Janus in *City of God* 7.8:

quod hiatus noster, cum os aperimus, mundo similis videatur: unde et PALATum Graeci οὐρανὸν appellant, et nonnulli, inquit, poetae Latini CAELum vocaverunt PALATum.

because when we open our mouths, the aperture created seems like the universe: hence the Greeks call the PALATe "the sky," and, he says, some Latin poets call the sky [*CAELum*] "the PALATe."

The "he" whom Augustine quotes is Varro. It is not only the words spoken, then, that make the aperture of the mouth like the universe as a whole: the opening, the yawning, the *hiatus*, the *CHAOS*. The connection between PALATe and sky, the PALATe and the PALATine, merges what we tend to regard as the "separate" realities of the cosmic, the political, and the individual.

Ovid reminds us that the political *LUPUS* is as much the enemy of the *poPULUS* as is nature's own wolf. But, as Plato observes, lupine dictatorship emerges from among the people. In Ovid's terms, there lurks an anagrammatical *LUPUS* in *poPULUS* just as surely as there lurks a trace of the old wolflike LYCaon in "the light of his eyes" (*oCULi LUCent* [1.239]), even when he is driven away howling into exile—*eXULulat* (1.233)—and the light, *LUX*, is reversed in *eXUL*.

Caesar, Aesculapius, and Pythagoras

Iamblichus tells us in his *Life of Pythagoras* 221 that Pythagoras' help enabled the citizens of Agrigentum to overthrow the notorious tyrant Phalaris. The philosopher offers some hope of escape from political tyranny, then, not just from the eating of animal flesh. The wolf may be driven out. But sometimes the procedure is reversed, and the philosopher is driven into exile by the tyrant. Ovid tells us that Pythagoras came to Italy because he fled "Samos and masters, exiled by his hatred of tyrants and tyranny" (*SAMON et dominos odioque tyrannidis EXUL* [15.61]). It is probably more than coincidence that *SAMON* reversed is *NOMAS*, "a wanderer, a *NOMAd*."

The exiled Pythagoras settled by the river AESAR in the Italian town of Croton (15.23, 54). The river's name yields a god, AESAR, without the slaughtering "c" that makes the god murderous: CAESAR. Still, as an Etruscan inscription shows, AESAR and TYRANNY, AISERA TURANNUVE, go easily together.¹⁵ So Pythagoras warns against cannibalism and tyranny in his exhortation to avoid the infamous banquet of Thyestes (15.462): *neve THYesteis cumulemus vISCERA mENSIS* ("We must not pile up soft entrails ripped out for our sickly tables of THYestean sacrifice"). Within *ViScera* lurk syllabic reminders of their violent removal: *ViS*; their waxlike softness, *CERA*; and, anagrammatically, C(A)ESAR and SACRifice. And *THYestes* in Greek means "the Sacrificer." Within the tables (*MENSIS*) upon which we dine—

¹⁵ See the discussions of Devoto and Pfiffig, cited in the Introduction, note 35; for the biography of Pythagoras, see K. von Fritz, "Pythagoras," *RE* 24.179–87.

which should properly hold what is harvested (*MESSIS*)—lurks the sword (*ENSIS*) with which we kill. There is, in short, something of the PALATial, PALATine, and PALATal wolfman in each of us: a little Jupiter, a little Caesar.

The city of Croton to which Pythagoras comes was founded, as Ovid tells us, by Myscelus of Argos (15.19–59). Ovid does not tell us that the god Apollo allowed Myscelus to choose the site on which to found his colony. The geographer Strabo explains (6.2.4) that Croton and the Sicilian city of Syracuse were founded in the same year and that their founders were to choose between health and wealth: health in Croton, wealth in Syracuse. Myscelus, whose name in Greek suggests “the leg of a mouse”—Strabo (6.1.12) says he was a hunchback—chose health.¹⁶ This contrast of health and well-being with wealth and power is very much the theme of *Metamorphoses* 15, not only in Pythagoras’ arrival in Italy, but also in the arrival of AEsculapius, god of medicine, in Latium itself (15.626–724). It is AEsculapius’ business to undo the damages caused by plague and warfare. The first letters of his name suggest, fittingly, an anagram of the slaughter in CAESar.

AESCulAPIUS is the child of Phoebus by CORONis, whom we will discuss later. He is ultimately metamorphosed into the snake that brings health and, as such, remains to this day the symbol of the medical profession. AESCulAPIUS is as expert in the medical arts as Jupiter is inexpert: AESCulAPIUS saves the body however badly mangled it is, even the pulped remains of Hippolytus. Jupiter, in contrast, would sacrifice the body to retain the healthy part. AESCulAPIUS was able to restore a being where there were “no parts in the body [*nullas in corpore partes*] which you could recognize: everything was one wound [*unumque erat omnia vulnus*]” (15.528–29). Thus the syllabic suggestion of PIety in his name seems quite fitting.

For metrical reasons, AESCulAPIUS’ name, however PloUS, cannot

16. Strabo tells us in this same passage that Croton is also the city where the Trojan women burned the fleet of their Greek captors. For more on the motif of ship burning, see R. Basto, “The Roman Foundation Legend and the Fragments of the Greek Historians: An Inquiry into the Development of the Legend,” Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1980, pp. 24–76. On the foundation of Croton, see also Diodorus 8.17.2; H. W. Parke, 1980, pp. 46–47; H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Greek Oracles*, London, 1967, pp. 46–47; H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, London, 1956, vol. 2, oracle no. 229; J. Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle*, Berkeley, 1978, pp. 278–79 (passages numbered Q28–Q32). The oracle, as Fontenrose points out (pp. 138–39), was not genuine; Croton was not founded until twenty-five years after Syracuse.

occur in a hexameter. In Ovid, the word closest to his name is AEscULus, a kind of oak tree (10.91). Significantly, Phoebus made garlands from this tree before the laurel came into being (1.449). The AEscULus provides CORONae, “wreaths,” not for triumphs—or, as we shall see, for near triumphs—but for that special crown the CORONa civica. This “civic crown” was awarded to those who saved the life of a fellow citizen (Pliny NH 16.17). The AEscULean CORONa is even more in keeping with AEscULapius than with CAESar—even though CAESar actually won the award (Suetonius *Julius* 2). For AEscULapius’ mother, we recall, was the nymph CORONis.

Curiously, just before Ovid’s Phoebus exchanges his AEscULean oak for the laurel, he kills a *snake*, PYTHon, with his arrows. And the serpent’s name suggests that of the philosopher especially associated with Apolline learning: PYTHagoras.

The Sacral Caesar

The parallel that Ovid suggests between the THYestean feast of the house of Atreus and the behavior of the Caesars is no accident. Ovid later compares Caesar and Octavian to, respectively, Atreus and Agamemnon (15.855). How flattering the comparisons are is debatable. Atreus’ wife was not above suspicion, and Atreus himself slaughtered the children of his brother THYestes and did the cooking for a Lycaon-like banquet. Would Octavian have found the comparison between himself and Agamemnon appealing, especially when we recall Agamemnon’s fate? There was, further, some doubt as to the identity of Agamemnon’s father: was it Atreus or his brother? Octavian was, of course, the adopted son of Julius Caesar, not Caesar’s child. Finally, Agamemnon destroyed Troy. Octavian, according to his own propaganda, was the descendant of Trojans and was restoring the new Troy in Italy. He might, of course, take consolation in the other examples of father-son relationships which Ovid adduces as parallels: that of Aegeus and Theseus or that of Peleus and Achilles. But Theseus was arguably responsible for Aegeus’ death because he failed to hoist white sails on his return from Crete, and Octavian’s longevity makes him seem more like Peleus than Achilles. Finally Caesar and Octavian are compared to Saturn and Jupiter. This comparison undermines the Augustan propaganda of a new Saturnian Golden Age under Octavian’s auspices (856–59).

Caesar, "the Sacrificer," was himself killed by the sword. The murder is presaged by portents described in *Metamorphoses* 15.783–802—portents full of slaughtering imagery for the slaughtered Caesar. The entrails of the sacrificial animal show a *CAESum caput*, "a split lobe," suggesting *deCEASE* (795). The murder is, appropriately, *CAEdem* (802). Foreseeing it, CAESar's mother, Venus, begs the gods to prevent it (15.777–78): *neve / CAEDE SACERdotis flammis exstinguite Vestae* ("Do not put out the fire of Vesta's SACRED priest in this RACE to slaughter").

While Jupiter is replying that nothing can be done to alter fate, CAESar is murdered. The king of gods tells Venus (15.840–41): *animam INTERea CAESo de corpore raptam / fac IUBAr* ("Now SEIZE from his slaughtered body the soul that meanwhile has gone on, and make a bright mane of light"). The play on *INTERea*, "meanwhile," and *INTERit*, "dies," is triggered by the fact that *CAESo de corpore*, "from his slaughtered body," is juxtaposed. *CAESo* reminds us that the slaughtered body is CAESar's.¹⁷ I have translated *IUBAr* as "mane of light" to suggest the *IUBA*, "mane, shaggy hair," within *IUBAr*. Ovid's choice of words is wonderfully apt. The astral form CAESar's soul takes as it escapes his body is that of a *comet* (15.848–50):

luna volat altius illa
flammiiferumque trahens spatioso limite CRINEM
stella micat. . .

Higher than the moon she [i.e., his soul] flies, tracking her flaming hair [*CRINEM*] across the far-stretching boundaries of the sky; she shines, a star.

Caesar joins Io and Callisto in the stellar world on the Ides of March (*Fasti* 3.698–710). The comet is, of course, named for its "long hair." But the word "hair" that Ovid chooses here is also an anagram of *CRIMEN*, "crime, accusation." As we have already seen, the long hair

17. In *NH* 7.47 Pliny says that the Roman first name *CAESO* derives from the fact that its holders were children born when the mother's womb was slit open, by what we would call a CAESarian section. We might note another detail about Ovid's use of *IUBAr*. Among Caesar's triumphs was one over the African king *IUBA*, Juba, on whom see my *Lucan: An Introduction*, Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 39, Ithaca, 1976, chapter 3. Ovid himself refers to this victory in *Metamorphoses* 15.755, less than a hundred lines before Caesar's apotheosis as a *IUBAr*, "mane" of light; cf., in more ambiguous terms, *Fasti* 4.377–488.

that Jupiter shakes, beginning the slaughter and metamorphoses of the world, is *CAESARies* (1.180).

Ovid seems to be playing upon the ancient idea of sacral kingship, with Caesar as the sacral king who may, Osiris-like, himself become the sacrificial victim. The god's representative on earth must himself be cut down in order to complete the ritual. After the expulsion of Rome's kings, in fact, the office of *rex sacrorum*, "king of the sacrifices," was instituted. This "king" was subordinate only to the chief pontiff, the pontifex maximus himself (Livy 2.2.1; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Roman Antiquities* 4.74.4).

The fact that Caesar held the sacral office of pontifex maximus when he was killed may, in itself, be of importance in Ovid's scheme of things, especially if we accept Varro's definition of a pontifex (*Lingua Latina* 5.83):

Ego a ponte arbitror: nam ab his Sublicius est factus primum ut restitutus saepe, cum ideo sacra et uls et cis Tiberim non mediocri ritu faciant.

I think the name derives from PONS ["bridge"]. For the Sublician Bridge was first built by them—and often restored by them too—and they carried out rites on either side of the Tiber with no mean ceremonial.

Not least among these rites at the Sublician Bridge was the sacrifice of the *ARGei*.¹⁸ The festival of the *ARGei* itself was held two months later, on May 14. Ovid treats it briefly in *Fasti* 5.621–62. Some people, he says, clearly thought that the ritual of throwing effigies of men made out of rushes into the Tiber from the wooden bridge (the Pons Sublicius) originated in a kind of human sacrifice. But Ovid introduces the Tiber itself to refute this charge. The river god claims that the practice began when *ARGive* followers of the *ARCadian* king Evander wanted their remains cast into the river, rather than buried, when they died. Their heirs refused to honor the request and instead threw rush images of them into the river.

The procession heralding these rites, however, took place on March 16 and 17—just after the Ides (*Fasti* 3.791–94):

18. See K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 5.4, Munich, 1967, pp. 412–14 and the sources cited there.

Itur ad ARGeos (qui sint, sua pagina dicet)
 hac si commemini, praeteritaque die.
 stella LYCaoniam vergit declivis ad ARCton
 Milvus: haec illa nocte videnda venit.

Now to the ARGei, who are celebrated on this day [March 17] and the preceding day, if I recall correctly. Who the ARGei are will be told on the appropriate page. The Kite Star is at this time moving down toward the ARCTic Bear [Callisto], the child of LYCaon.

The identity of the *Milvus*, the Kite Star, is not known. But the fact that it is described as moving in on LYCaon's daughter Callisto suggests it is linked in some way with Jupiter, who rapes Callisto after plunging the fiery Phaethon to his watery death (*Metamorphoses* 2.401–507). *Milvus*, however, is used by Romans to translate the Greek *hierax*, “hawk,” as well as *iktinos*, “kite.” It is the “sacred” or “sacral” bird, associated, Plutarch tells us, with Osiris, himself something of a sacral king-god.¹⁹ And the other Greek equivalent, *iktinos*, is, in Oppian, *Cynegetica* 3.331, the name of a wolf; furthermore, according to Aristophanes (*Peace* 1099 and *Birds* 892), the *iktinos* is dangerous to sacrifices.²⁰ We cannot, it seems, escape Jupiter and LYCaon.

The Sea Wolf

The flood Jupiter sends upon the world, of course, afflicts man and beast alike. So we may well want to argue that, in the ensuing universal devastation, the exiled wolfman is in as much trouble as any other land creature. The Nereids are amazed to observe *sub aqua LUCos*—“groves [slightly wolfish, perhaps] beneath the water” (1.301). And the wolf itself swims among sheep: *nat LUPus inter oves* (1.304); predator and prey are now in somewhat the same plight.

A *LUPus*, when swimming, however, is an altogether different beast in Latin. Varro tells us in *Lingua Latina* 5.77 that “lots of fishes have names transferred from creatures of the land” (*vocabula piscium pleraque translata a terrestribus*). And one such fish is the *LUPus*. When a Latin *LUPus* swims, it is no longer canine: it is the bass.

19. Plutarch *Isis and Osiris* 51; Horapollo 1.6; Clement of Alexandria *Stromata* 5.7.

20. See also Pliny *NH* 18.6 and D'Arcy Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds*, London, 1936, pp. 114–21; cf. *Metamorphoses* 2.716: *ut volucris visis rapidissima milvus extis*.

Isidore tells us that the “sea-wolf” bass and the “dog” fish (*canis*, *canicula*) are named “after the habits of their land counterparts” (*ex moribus terrestrium* [Etym. 12.6.5]). The *LUPi* “chase after others with horrendous voracity” (*improba voracitate alios persequantur*).

The lupine name for sea-wolf bass is especially Latin. Greek writers, such as Aristotle in *Historia animalium*, call it a *labrax*, a “grabber.”²¹ Romans were well aware of the relationship between *LUPus* (Greek *lykos*), “wolf,” and *labrax*, as we see from Plautus' *Rudens*, where the rapacious pimp is called *Labrax* (and a whore, we recall, is a *lupa*, “a she-wolf”). *Labrax* and his girls are wrecked *at sea*. Scepharnio describes them *swimming* to shore (164–78), where they take refuge at the shrine of Venus. At the same time a group of *fishermen* come to Venus' shrine, complaining that they will have to make do with shell-fish today because of the storm (289–305), although the storm has, in fact, washed up the equivalent of some rather prized fish. The pimp *Labrax* is dragged off, fishlike, at the end of a rope by Plesidippus (866–83).

Despite its voracity, the aquatic *LUPus*, or *labrax*, is not a wild and threatening creature as is the aquatic “dog,” which is, in English, a *shark* and whose epithet is *labros* in Oppian (*Halieutica* 1.642, 5.28). Pliny (*NH* 9.151–52) tells us in detail of the dangers these *canes* posed to sponge divers.²² Because it was a man-eater, some ancients objected to eating it, since doing so could be tantamount to cannibalism (Athenaeus *Deipnosophists* 163d, 310e). But no one objected to eating the *LUPus*. It was an extremely prized fish among the Romans, often kept in large privately owned ponds, according to Pliny (*NH* 9.28), Varro (*Re rustica* 3.3.9), Columella (*Re rustica* 8.16.2–5), Horace (*Satires* 2.2.31), and other writers, including Ovid himself in *Halieuticon* 113. In other words, it was much sought after and was even farmed, as catfish are today in parts of the United States.

In the marine world, then, the domestic *canis* and the wild *LUPus* have rather changed their relative positions. In fact, the marine *LUPus* takes on somewhat the role of the sheep upon which its land counterpart preys. Such ironic role inversions, in fact, are quite com-

21. For full citation of ancient sources on the *lupus* and *labrax*, see F. Capponi, *P. Ovidii Nasonis “Halieuticon,” Roma Aeterna II: Poetae Bucolici Cynegeticique Minores*, 2 vols., Leiden, 1972, vol. 2, pp. 481–84, and D'Arcy Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Fishes*, St. Andrews University Publications 45, London 1947, pp. 140–42.

22. The Red Sea was particularly notorious for its sharks: see Theophrastus *Inquiry into Plants* 4.7.2 and Pliny *NH* 13.139. For the shark see Thompson, *Fishes*, pp. 12–13, 39–42, 48, 106–107, 136–37, 144, 271–72.

mon in Greek and Roman terms for marine animals. On land the Greek *probaton* is usually a sheep; at sea it is a large fish.²³ The ram (Greek *krios*, Latin *aries*) is perhaps a killer whale.²⁴ The *milvus*, "kite," as we have seen, like the *hierax*, one of its Greek counterparts, when transposed to a marine environment becomes a flying fish.²⁵

One of Martial's epigrams (13.89) gives us, I think, the clue to Ovid's specially ironic humor about the sea wolf *LUPus* in the *Metamorphoses*:

Laneus Euganei lupus excipit ora Timavi,
aequoreo dulces cum sale pastus aquas.

The woolly white bass feeds in the estuary of the Timavus river,
grazing on fresh water mixed with the salt sea.

In the sea, the *LUPus* becomes man's food and takes on sheeplike characteristics, especially the most prized of all varieties, the *LANeus* (or, as Pliny in *NH* 9.61 would have it, *LANatus*) *LUPus*, the "woolly" wolf fish. The best *LUPi* were caught not at sea but in the Tiber near Rome. Pliny, Horace, and Macrobius say that they were taken "between the two bridges" (*inter duos pontes* [*NH* 9.169; *Satires* 2.2.31; *Saturnalia* 3.26]): the Aemilian Bridge and the same Sublician Bridge that the *pontifices* built and regularly restored, where the sumptuous and mysterious sacrifices were held. The plumpness of some "between the two bridges" fish, Macrobius adds (*Saturnalia* 3.16.17), owes something to their diet of dung. The great Roman sewer, the Cloaca Maxima, emptied into the river near the Sublician Bridge.

The *LUPus*, especially the woolly variety, had a commanding position (*praecipuam auctoritatem*) from Octavian's time until just before his own day, Pliny tells us (*NH* 9.61). But its authority is *culinary* rather than political and is shared with the *asellus*, the "donkey fish," or hake. The tyrannical, cannibalistic *LYCaon* is himself now food for the pot. He becomes, in texture as in name, a fitting companion for the woolly sheep, his erstwhile prey. *LYCaon* thus completes a culinary as well as a political cycle, first presiding over boiling waters, then swimming in the flood, and finally boiling in the cooking pot. A similar fate overtakes the pontifex maximus *CAESAr*, "the Slaughterer," who joins, in due course, "the Slaughtered," *CAESA*, almost as if he himself were to

23. Oppian *Halieutica* 1.146; Thompson, *Fishes*, pp. 218–19.

24. Aelian *Nature of Animals* 9.49, 15.2; Oppian *Halieutica* 1.372; Pliny *NH* 9.10, 9.145, 32.144.

25. See Thompson, *Fishes*, p. 90; Capponi, "Halieuticon," vol. 2, pp. 408–14.

be *ESCA*, "food." The wordplay adds a special irony to Macrobius' detailed description of the gluttonous pontifical banquet over which Caesar presided as king of the sacrifices, or *rex sacrorum* (*Saturnalia* 3.13); for, with the exception of the two last dishes of wheat and pulse, the remaining items at this elaborate feast use the flesh of animals—and more than half are fish.

Satirical Precursors

My discussion above, I think, provides a fair illustration of how the *Metamorphoses* toys with political motifs in a manner suggestive of satire and of cooking. Ovid was certainly not unique in doing so. He may well have, for example, a historical precursor in Herodotus, who tells of Gyges' accession to the throne of Lydia by killing Candaules (*Histories* 1.7ff.). Candaules is, according to Hipponax fr. 1, a Lydian name for Hermes, and means "dog choker"; and C. H. Greenewalt makes a good case for associating the Lydian name Kandaules or Kandaules with *kandaulos*, a kind of Lydian stew.²⁶

Ovid was certainly not the first among Romans to sail on this particular tack. A brief survey of the extant fragments of the first book of Lucilius, Horace's satirical predecessor who died at the very end of the second century B.C., should make the point clear enough. Lucilius begins, Varro tells us (*Lingua Latina* 5.17 = fr. 1 Warmington):

AET(H)ERis et TERRAE genitabile quaerere tempus . . .

Of AeT(H)ER and TERRA to seek out the time of birth . . .

AeT(H)ER and TERRA are anagrams of one another, and born, it appears, from the same kind of Hesiodic void, chaos, that we find in the *Metamorphoses*. This theme is developed in fr. 2 (Warmington), where Lucilius complains of the *emptiness* (*inane*) everywhere.

Lucilius goes on to treat the advantages of dog over man in snarling out the letter "r" (fr. 3–4 Warmington): *inritata canes quam homo planius dicit* ("a maddened bitch says it more clearly than a human"). The human is left with mere speech; the dog is elevated to canine communication. The matter of the dog takes us immediately to the stuff, according to Servius, of Lucilius' first satire. Commenting on

26. Greenewalt, *Ritual Dinners*, pp. 45–54.

the opening line of Jupiter's speech in Vergil's council of the gods (*Aeneid* 10.104–13), Servius observes:

totus hic locus de primo Lucilii translatus est, ubi introducuntur dii habere concilium, et agere primo de interitu Lupi cuiusdam ducis [or: iudicis] in re publica, postea sententias dicere.

This entire passage is taken from the first book of Lucilius, where the gods are represented as being in council. The first item of business is the death of Lupus, some leading man [or: judge] in the republic. Afterwards, they go on to express their opinions.

The scenario may well have been something like that of Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, where the deceased Claudius is tried by the gods for crimes against Rome and against humanity in general. The Lupus in question is Publius Cornelius Lentulus Lupus, consul in 156 B.C., censor in 147, who became leader of the senate, *princeps senatus*, in 131 B.C. Despite his distinguished list of public honors, he was tried for extortion. Lupus was clearly one of the chief objects of Lucilius' attacks, as we see from Persius *Satires* 1.114–15: *secuit LUCILius urbem / te, LUPe, te Muci, et genuinum fregit in illis* ("LUCilius sliced up the city: you LUPus, and you Mucius, and broke his jaw on them"). The Lucilian dog, like Horace's Molossian in *Epodes* 6.1–10, dined out on the senatorial wolf.

If Servius is correct in his observation that Jupiter's speech to the assembled gods in *Aeneid* 10 is drawn from Lucilius, it is possible that Ovid is basing his first council of the gods either on Lucilius or on Vergil, perhaps on both. Lucilius (805–11 Warmington), cited by Probus in his commentary on Vergil *Eclogues* 6.31, offers the following description of a judgment by Lupus:

hoc cum feceris,
cum ceteris reus una tradetur Lupo.
non aderit; ἀρχαῖς hominem et stoechiis simul
privabit, igni cum et aqua interdixit.
duo habet stoechia, adfuerit anima et corpore
(γῆ corpus, anima est πνεῦμα); posterioribus
stoechiis si id maluerit privabit tamen.

When you have done this, he will be passed on to Lupus to stand trial along with the others. Maybe he fails to appear. Lupus will deprive him of "the primal beginnings" and the "elements": I mean, he'll exile him, forbidding him "fire and water."

Maybe he *does* appear. Well, our man has two elements: soul and body. Now, body is earth and soul is air. If it takes Lupus' fancy, he'll deprive him of these last remaining elements instead: I mean, he'll kill him.

This passage makes it reasonably clear that Lucilius' rage is elicited by Lupus' savagery as a *judge*. If you jump bail, you go into exile. But you are probably worse off if you actually appear: then Lupus will have you executed.

These Lupine qualities seem very much present in Ovid's Jupiter as he sits in judgment of Lycaon and uses the primal elements of creation to destroy mankind. He deprives humans of body and soul, of earth and air; he obliterates life *with* fire and water. In short, Ovid's cosmic Jupiter who condemns Lycaon, as, presumably, Lucilius' gods condemn Lupus, is very like the wolfman he condemns.

But what was the doom of Lucilius' Lupus after the divine trial? Varro, citing Lucilius in *Lingua Latina* 7.47 (fr. 46 Warmington) observes: *occidunt, Lupe, saperdae te et iura siluri* ("Wolf [-fish]! salt mullet and sheatfish will serve you in court bouillon"). The play on *lupus* as wolf and fish we have already seen. Lucilius also puns on *ius*, "justice," and *ius*, "juice, sauce." In another fragment of Lucilius' first book, a suspiciously fishy dish is being served (fr. 50–51): Warmington):

ad cenam adducam, et primum hisce abdomina tunni
advenientibus priva dabo cephalaeque acarnae.

I will bring them to dinner, and upon their arrival, I will give each one the guts of a tunny and heads of sea perch.

Here, I think, we glimpse satire's culinary side: the "stew," or as some scholars call it, the "hodge-podge," *satura*. The grammarian Diomedes (*Grammatici Latini* 1.486.11K), however, notes that certain legal procedures, involving all kinds of different measures thrown in together, were called "stew law"—*lex satura*. Perhaps this is Lucilius' meaning when he observes (fr. 47 Warmington): *per saturam aedilem factum qui legibus solvat* ("who frees from 'stew law' a man who was made aedile by them"). Lupus cooked the law books to win election, so he is justly an ingredient cooked in the bookish satirical stew.

Cicero (*Natura deorum* 1.23.63), citing Lucilius (fr. 1138–41), classifies Lupus not only with other notorious men who defiled the law by their sacrilege and the gods by their impiety but also with Polyphemus, whose cannibalism rivals LYCaon's.

Epic and Satire: Some Larger Questions

The correspondences between Ovid's council of the gods in the opening book of the *Metamorphoses* and that of Lucilius' first *satire* are, I think, compelling. But they raise more questions than they answer. Most readers can, I think, accept the notion that the *Metamorphoses* contains some of the satirical stew. But what about the council of the gods in Statius (*Thebaid* 1.197–302)—a council clearly modeled on Ovid's? And what about the council of the gods in the *Aeneid*, where Jupiter's speech is, Servius assures us, taken from Lucilius' first *satire*?

Servius' outline of Lucilius' first *satire* offers a number of points that may help us. First, discussion of what to do with Lupus apparently continues *after* the lines that Vergil took from Lucilius. In the *Aeneid*, all discussion *precedes* Jupiter's words. The council of gods ends just after Jupiter swears by the Styx that things will be as he says. Yet Vergil's Jupiter makes no clear ruling about the rights and wrongs of the fierce fighting in Italy that prompted the council to convene in the first place. On the contrary, lines 104–13 are an exercise in divine fence sitting, ending with Jupiter's claim to impartiality: *rex Iuppiter omnibus idem* ("King Jupiter is the same for everyone"); "the Fates," not he, "will find a way" (*fata viam invenient* [*Aeneid* 10.112–13]). Jupiter will take no responsibility (at least publicly) for the outcome of the war. How differently he speaks in private, to Venus, in *Aeneid* 1!

In Ovid, the assembled gods do not even know why they are being convened; they have never heard of Lycaon, whose actions are to bring punishment not just upon him but upon the world, and they are given no opportunity to discuss the matter. The impartiality of Ovid's Jupiter means even-handed destruction: he wipes out all but two human beings.

Statius' Jupiter combines the Ovidian and Vergilian paradigms in the divine council in *Thebaid* 1.197–302. He complains of man's criminality and recalls that his previous destruction of humanity by fire and flood achieved nothing. Yet he is nonetheless resolved to try massive retaliation again. Oedipus, he argues, has asked, and deserves, to be avenged. This statement is only partly true. Oedipus has asked for vengeance, but his prayer was addressed to the Fury Tisiphone, not to Jupiter. Because Oedipus' children have trampled their father's eyes beneath their feet, however, Jupiter decides to destroy both Argos and Thebes. Argos he includes because he has not yet forgotten the cannibalistic feast of Tantalus.

In Statius, as opposed to Vergil and Ovid, Jupiter's decision triggers immediate and overt dissent. Juno objects and addresses her consort with scathing sarcasm. But she proves to be no champion of justice. Rather, she offers alternative sites for her husband's destructive zeal. Jupiter ignores her protests and swears by the Styx that his decree will be fulfilled.

It is entirely possible that all of the Lucilian variations have an ultimately epic ancestor. John of Lydia (*De magistratibus* 1.41) tells us that Rhinthon of Tarentum was the first poet to write "comedy" in hexameters, and that Lucilius was following in his footsteps when he "wrote 'comedy' in heroic verse" (ἐξ οὗ πρῶτος λαβὼν τὰς ἀφορμὰς Λουκίλιος ὁ Ῥωμαῖος ἡρωϊκοῖς ἔπεσιν ἐκωμώδησεν). John clearly includes satire in his generic term "comedy." The boundaries between epic and satire can be easily traversed and not necessarily only in one direction. Juvenal's response to an overdose of epic was, as he tells us in his first *satire*, to write satire, but epicists drew on satire and satirical techniques to build epics.

Vergil borrowed from Lucilius as well as from Ennius and other writers of "elevated" poetry. Even if we doubt that Lucilius is quoted verbatim in *Aeneid* 10.104, we must surely accept Servius' judgment on *Aeneid* 9.227. Lucilius writes, says Servius (ad loc. = Lucilius fr. 5 Warmington): *consilium summis hominum de rebus habebant* ("They held a council about the most important affairs of mankind"). Vergil writes: *consilium summis regni de rebus habebant* ("They held a council about the most important affairs of the realm"). Only one word, Servius observes, is changed: *uno tantum sermone mutato*. But that change alone is needed to recall the story and to redirect it, as in Horace's famous satirical mot: "change the name and the story is about you" (*mutato nomine, de te / fabula narratur* [*Satires* 1.169–70]). Vergil again echoes a passage probably taken from Lucilius' divine council about Lupus, this time in connection with Iulus' council of leaders, which dispatches the ill-fated night expedition of Nisus and Euryalus. The youths fail to find Aeneas, who is at this very time a guest of Arcadian Evander by the Luperca. But Nisus and Euryalus cause a great deal of slaughter. And the sword that CAesar's ancestor bestows upon them as they depart is the work of a Cretan artist named LYCaon (9.304–305).

ALSO BY FREDERICK AHL

Lucan: An Introduction

Metaformations

SOUNDPLAY
AND WORDPLAY
IN OVID AND OTHER
CLASSICAL POETS

Frederick Ahl

CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS

ITHACA AND LONDON