1

People Flee

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The ancient Roman calendars record that on July 5 – that is, on the *fifth* day of the *fifth* month of the old ten-month calendar[1] – there were celebrated the rites of the Poplifugia. At face value, the name of the festival simply, and with little revelation, denotes the 'flight of the people'. On the nomenclature, Dumézil remarks:[2]

> As for the Poplifugia, they are for us only a name, notable in that, unlike the singular *regifugium*, the form is plural. This is also the only festival of the year to be placed in that part of the month that precedes the Nones. The first point urges an interpretation of *-fugia*, following that of the ancient writers, as 'multiple flights, disorderly and in confusion' . . .

As Dumézil notes, the festival's placement within the Roman calendar is a conspicuous one: it is the *only* festival marked in large capitals that occurs between the Kalends and the Nones[3] in any month of the year.[4] The uniqueness

[1] That is, the primitive (Romulaean) calendar of Rome, said to have been expanded to twelve months by Numa Pompilius. See Boyle and Woodard 2004 *passim*.

[2] Dumézil 1980:242; reprint and translation of Dumézil 1975:272:

> Quant aux Poplifugia, ils ne sont pour nous qu'un nom, remarquable en ce que, à la différence du singulier *regifugium*, il a une forme plurielle. Cette fête est aussi la seule de l'année à être placée dans la partie de mois qui précède les Nones. Le première fait engage à comprendre *-fugia*, comme le faisaient les anciens, « fuites multiples, désordonnées, dans la confusion » . . . ."

[3] These days, along with the Ides, stand as prominent temporal landmarks in the calendar of each month, the Kalends being the first day of the month, the Nones the seventh day in months of 31 days, otherwise the fifth day, and the Ides the fifteenth day in 31-day months, otherwise the thirteenth day.

[4] A state of affairs long noted by scholars: see, for example, Warde Fowler 1899:174, with reference to still earlier work that is referenced by WF in note 5 of that work.

and markedness of its calendrical positioning must certainly be of considerable import for understanding the ritual significance of the occasion (see §5.3.3).

1.2 THE POPLIFUGIA: PEOPLE FLEE

The Poplifugia came to be associated with various events, historical – or mythic-historical – in much the same way that the Regifugium, the 'Flight of the *Rex*' (celebrated annually on February 24) was secondarily attached to the driving out of the Etruscan king (*rex*).[5] According to Varro (*De lingua Latina* 6.18), the Poplifugia commemorate the retreat of the Romans when neighboring peoples marched against them subsequent to the Gallic conquest of Rome in 387 BC (see also §2.2.3):

> *. . . ut Ficuleates ac Fidenates et finitimi alii, contra nos coniurarunt. Aliquot huius diei vestigia fugae in sacris apparent, de quibus rebus Antiquitatum Libri plura referunt.*
>
> . . . such as the Ficuleans and Fidenians and other neighbors, [who] conspired against us. Some vestiges of the flight of this day appear in the rites, about which matters the *Books of the Antiquities*[6] have more to report.

Though as Warde Fowler pointed out long ago (1899:175): ". . . the large capitals in which the name Poplifugia appears in the fragments of the three calendars which preserve it are sufficient evidence that it must have been far older than the Gallic invasion" (for the three calendars, see §2.2.4). For Varro, then, the hostile peoples are Rome's neighbors in Latium; he names two. One force is that of the people of Fidenae, the town located some five miles north of Rome on the Via Salaria, a perpetual enemy subjugated by Rome in 498 BC,[7] but with later insurrections.[8] The other is that of the people of Ficulea, about whom relatively little is recorded in antiquity: Dionysius of Halicarnassus

[5] On the Regifugium as fundamentally the flight of the Rex Sacrorum, see Woodard 2011 *passim*, but especially pp. 329–332.

[6] The reference is to Varro's *Antiquitates rerum humanarum et divinarum*: "In Varro's work, the *Antiquitates* in particular, which was hailed as a revelation by Cicero, nearly the whole inheritance of Latin civilization was illustrated and given order: the purpose was a systematic review of Roman life in its connections with the past, as evidenced by language, literature, and customs" (Conte 1994:212). On the structure of the work, see §2.4.1.

[7] Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Antiquitates Romanae* 5.60.3–4.

[8] On the Roman conflicts with Fidenae, see Forsythe 2005:241–246. On the site of Fidenae, see Quilici and Quilici Gigli 1986.

(*Antiquitates Romanae* 1.16.5) writes that the town was founded by the Ἀβοριγῖνες 'Aborigines'; Livy (1.38.4) identifies it as one of the ancient Latin towns that had been subdued by Tarquinius Priscus – to which claim Alföldi responds: "Ficulea lost its independence in the same years as Fidenae, and not under King Tarquinius Priscus."[9]

Macrobius (*Saturnalia* 3.2.14), on the other hand, in a passing mention of the festival, links the celebration of the Poplifugia with the retreat of the Romans from an Etruscan force – a trope reminiscent of that of the Regifugium with its aetiological associations with the expelling of the Etruscan Tarquins. In describing this commemoration, Macrobius conflates the day of the Poplifugia with the Nones of July – that is, July 7 – as do other ancient authorities (see Chapter 2). The ritual events of the Poplifugia (July 5) and the Nones (July 7) are undoubtedly conceptually related, as we shall see, and as has often been observed. Dumézil, for example, here referring to the Nones of July as the *Nonae Caprotinae* (on which see immediately following) writes, following upon his remarks cited above (see §1.1):[10]

> . . . the second [point (in other words, his point that the Poplifugia are the only festival preceding the Nones)] invites the scholar to see in the Poplifugia a prelude to the festival that immediately follows them, the Nonae Caprotinae, which are themselves exceptional if not anomalous, as they are the only festival during the year attached to the Nones.

Thus, not only is the placement of the Poplifugia between the Kalends and the Nones an anomaly, but the in-some-way affiliated Nonae Caprotinae follow suit in their aberrant temporal positioning: there is something markedly peculiar about the calendrical assignment of these ritual events (see §5.3.3).

1.3 NONAE CAPROTINAE: PEOPLE ADVANCE

In Roman tradition as preserved by Plutarch in his *Life of Camillus* 33.1–7 and *Life of Romulus* 29.3–6, these Nones of July are linked with the previously mentioned hostility of Rome's neighbors following the Gallic

[9] Alföldi 1965:132; see his bibliography at note 7. On Ficulea as mentioned by literary sources, see also the summary in Burn 1876:393–394. On the site of Ficulea, see Quilici and Quilici Gigli 1993.

[10] Dumézil 1980:242; reprint and translation of Dumézil 1975:272:

> . . . le second [fait] engage à voir dans les Poplifugia un prélude à la fête qui les suit immédiatement, les Nonae Caprotinae, elles-mêmes exceptionnelles sinon anormales, puisqu'elles sont dans l'année la seule fête fixée à un jour de Nones.

incursion. In *Life of Camillus* 33.1, Plutarch identifies three Italic-speaking groups as invading Roman territory – Aequi, Volsci, and Latins – and writes of Tuscans attacking the city of Sutrium in Etruria, a place that Plutarch identifies as an ally of Rome's. In *Life of Romulus* 29.3, the hostile force is composed of Latins led by Livius Postumius. In addition to his *Etruscan* aetiology mentioned earlier (*Sat*. 3.2.14; see §1.2), Macrobius (conflating the Poplifugia and the Nones) also knows and rehearses the tradition of a *Latin* threat, making reference to Fidenae and the *dictator* Postumius Livius (*Sat*. 1.11.37).[11] At *Life of Camillus* 33.2, Plutarch rehearses how the Latins demanded that the Romans surrender to them all free Roman virgins (παρθένους ἐλευθέρας γυναῖκας); at *Life of Romulus* 29.4, it is virgins and women without husbands – an arrangement that the Latin commander likens to Romulus's abduction of the Sabine women. For Macrobius (*Sat*. 1.11.37), the demand is for *matresfamilias . . . et virgines* 'married women and virgins'.

While the Roman magistrates were at a complete loss (ἀπορέω; *Cam*. 33.2; *Rom*. 29.4) as to what they should do in the face of such a demand, an unlikely deliverer stepped forward: a clever and competent slave-woman, Philotis or Tutula (*Cam*. 33.3; Tutola at *Rom*. 29.4; Macrobius [*Sat*. 1.11.38] attests the name as Tutela), who persuaded the Roman magistrates to send a group of Roman female slaves in the place of the free women. Dressed as "well-born brides," the slave-women were conducted to the camp of the Latins (*Cam*. 33.2–4), where the women plied the enemy warriors with wine (Macrobius *Sat*. 1.11.39), exhausted them τῇ ἀλήκτῳ συνουσίᾳ 'with constant

[11] As Plutarch's account shows, and as we shall see more clearly farther along, the two versions – Latin and Etruscan – are not at all mutually exclusive. This would be even more so were the tradition altered so as to remove the fourth-century sacking of Rome by the Gauls as a chronological benchmark. The Etruscan city of Veii long influenced Fidenae, which town Mommsen (2006:40 [a reprint of the 1868 English translation of *Römische Geschichte*]) referred to as "the *tête du pont* of the Etruscans on the left bank of the Tiber." According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom*. 2.53.4), Fidenae was founded by the eldest of three brothers from Alba Longa at the same time that the Albans founded Nomentum and Crustumerium. Romulus fought against and defeated the Fidenians, who τρέπονται πρὸς φυγήν 'were put to flight'; pursuing them, Romulus συνεισπίπτει τοῖς φεύγουσιν εἰς τὸ τεῖχος 'rushed into the walls of the city along with those fleeing' (*Ant. Rom*. 2.53.3–4). As a consequence of Romulus's capture of Fidenae, Dionysius reports (*Ant. Rom*. 2.54.3), Etruscan Veii went to war against Rome. Livy, in his account of the episode (1.15.1), writes of the Fidenians being themselves Etruscan. Rome destroyed Veii in 396 BC and enslaved the free members of the populace (Livy 5.22.1; see, *inter alia*, Forsythe 2005:250).

copulation' (Ps-Plutarch *Parallela Graeca et Romana* 30[12]), and then disarmed them during the night as they slept. What happened next is summarily rehearsed by Macrobius in these words: *ex arbore caprifico quae castris erat proxima signum Romanis dederunt* 'from a wild fig tree [literally 'goat fig'] which stood near the camp, they gave a signal to the Romans' (*Sat*. 1.11.39–40). Plutarch provides the details: the architect of this plan and leader of the slave-women, Tutula (Tutola/Tutela) or Philotis, climbed into a tall wild fig tree (a *caprificus*) and hoisted a torch toward Rome (εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην), having extended her cloak (τὸ ἱμάτιον) behind her – understand, so as to prevent the enemy forces from seeing the flame (*Cam*. 33.4). In the corresponding account in the *Life of Romulus* (29.5–6), Plutarch writes that Philotis shimmied up the fig tree –

> . . . περισχοῦσα προκαλύμμασι καὶ παραπετάσμασιν ὄπισθεν, ὥστε τοῖς πολεμίοις ἀόρατον εἶναι τὸ φῶς, τοῖς δὲ Ῥωμαίοις κατάδηλον.
>
> . . . holding out coverings and hangings behind her, so that for the enemy the light was unseen, but to the Romans it was visible.

[12] The author is not unaware of criticisms regarding the source. The *Parallela Graeca et Romana* is among modern scholars commonly considered to be not only of spurious authorship but an inferior work, based upon judgments of literary and historical quality and linguistic usages, though the work found staunch and intelligent support in the 1931 dissertation of Schlereth (*De Plutarchii quae feruntur Parallela Minora*) and was accorded a reputable status in earlier periods. Boulogne takes a favorable stance in the 2002 Budé edition, for which he has been robustly criticized. Regarding the *Parallela*, Cameron (2004:128), for example, who espouses a harsh view, writes, "For sheer triviality, gross ignorance, and irresponsible fabrication no other ancient work I can think of (not even the *Historia Augusta*) comes even close to the *Parallela*. Not to mention individual historical blunders, ..." On the other hand, one might see the *Parallela* as a source of unique information and wonder if it may have been too quickly dismissed by many in the last century for the sake of academic conformity or vogue in matters of canonicity. And one is keenly aware that unconventional linguistic usages and reporting do not, in and of themselves, make of an author a fool but quite often reveal simply an idiosyncratic or individualistic cognitive apparatus – or a penchant for linguistic and stylistic deviation (on occasion even judged to be a mark of "literary genius") or for documenting the unusual. I leave aside the matter of source citations in the *Parallela*, numerous of which sources are not otherwise known: one familiar with the vast quantity of documentary evidence surviving from the ancient Near East would scarcely find it surprising that many authors are hardly known or completely unknown among the relatively meager quantity of literary materials that have survived from Greco-Roman antiquity. In any event, such matters are of little concern in regard to the two *Parallela* examined herein, which are in fundamental agreement with the traditions as otherwise attested – if providing interesting alternative specifics – including traditions attested by non-Classical, cognate Indo-European sources – and, so, reminiscent of linguistic archaisms that often present themselves as the invaluable exceptions.

The noun τὸ προκάλυμμα[13] can identify various types of 'covering' – curtains and protective covers. Similarly τὸ παραπέτασμα[14] denotes various implements that can be spread out – for example 'tapestry,' 'curtain'. The described maneuver is surely an awkward one at best, if not practically ineffectual; but it is a salient element of the tradition as attested by the care exercised by the author in detailing the event. The torch was a fire-signal to waiting Roman magistrates, who immediately mustered the army; the Romans advanced on the camp and slaughtered the exhausted and disarmed sleeping Latins.

In *Parallela Graeca et Romana* 30, Ps-Plutarch varies the account to make the enemy force Gallic rather than Latin, led by a Gallic king, Atepomarus.[15] Ovid (*Ars amatoria* 2.257–258) embraces this variant as well, writing of this day, the Nonae Caprotinae day, calendrically designated as the *Ancillarum Feriae* 'Festival of the Slave-Women' (see §2.2.3):

Porrige et ancillae, qua poenas luce pependit
Lusa maritali Gallica veste manus.

Offer [a gift] to the slave-woman too, on the day when
Tricked by a bridal gown the Gallic hoard paid the price.

The adept leader of the slave-women is given the name Rhetana by Ps-Plutarch, who also records a variant signaling event: rather than clambering up a wild fig situated at some distance with torch in hand and a makeshift screen stretched behind her, Rhetana uses the *caprificus* to pull herself εἰς τὸ τεῖχος καὶ μηνύει τοῖς ὑπάτοις 'onto the wall and disclose [matters] to the consuls' – a tête-à-tête conducted by the wily seductress rather than a distant signal by means of fire.

1.3.1 RITUAL REHEARSALS

The component elements of the aetiological event are re-enacted ritually on the Nones of July (July 7). The rites thus entail throngs of people (ἀθρόοι) exiting the

[13] Τὸ προκάλυμμα is derived from τὸ κάλυμμα (from the root of καλύπτω 'to cover, conceal'), typically denoting a 'veil' or a 'hood', but also, *inter alia*, 'fishing net', and in this sense is used to name the garment with which Clytemnestra snares Agamemnon in his bath (Aeschylus *Choephoroi* 494).

[14] And τὸ παραπέτασμα is derived from τὸ πέτασμα (from the root of the verb πετάννυμι 'to spread out'), denoting 'that which is spread out'. Both words have solid primitive Indo-European pedigrees.

[15] Atepomarus is otherwise attested as a Celtic divine epithet, perhaps meaning 'great horseman': for example, Mercury Atepomarus at Rennes (Woolf 1998:224); Apollo Atepomarus at Mauvières (Green 1992:208).

gate of the city, and who, as they go, πολλὰ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων καὶ κοινῶν ὀνομάτων βοῇ φθέγγονται, Γάϊον, Μάρκον, Λούκιον καὶ τὰ τούτοις ὅμοια 'enunciate with a shout many of the local and common names – Gaius, Marcus, Lucius, and ones similar to these'. Plutarch (*Cam.* 33.5) states that the enunciative act replicates an earlier such calling out (ἀνάκλησις) conducted in haste; the reference is plainly to the tumultuous mustering of Roman soldiers, who called to one another as they arranged themselves in formation and set out in response to Tutula's signal, which Plutarch has described a few lines prior (*Cam.* 33.4). We shall encounter this enunciative act again in a slightly different setting (see §2.3; 7.5.1).

A second ritual element also involves a movement through space accompanied by a verbal act. Brilliantly attired female slaves (θεραπαινίδες) go around παίζουσαι διὰ σκωμμάτων εἰς τοὺς ἀπαντῶντας (which one could translate literally, but stiffly, as) 'toying by means of jokes with all of the men' (*Cam.* 33.6). The word here translated 'joke', τὸ σκῶμμα, "generally implies," as Liddell and Scott phrase it, "scurrility":[16] this enunciative behavior of the slave-women must surely constitute a bawdy verbal commemoration of the aggressive sexual accomplishments of Tutula and her followers in the camp of the enemy warriors. In his Satire 1, Persius alludes to one of the ritual celebrants, or else proverbially to a woman who behaves in a comparable manner, when he writes (line 133) of a lascivious *nonaria* (literally a 'Nones-woman') tugging on a Cynic's beard: Persius typifies this as the sort of act that the small-minded find to be hilarious.[17] In addition to engaging in bawdy banter and whisker-wrenching, these erotically charged women engage in a mock fight (Plutarch *Cam.* 33.6), even throwing stones at each other (*Rom.* 29.6) – a spectacle looking to be the Roman equivalent of cat-fighting or mud-wrestling.[18]

On this day, Roman women, both free and slave, also present a sacrifice to *Juno Caprotina* beneath a *caprificus*, using the milky sap of the tree in their

[16] Liddell and Scott 1996:1618.

[17] And one might wonder if the image of a bearded Cynic may be meant to invoke the goat (Latin *caper* [masculine]; *capra* [feminine]) affiliations of the July Nones (*Nonae Caprotinae*); on which see more later.

[18] And there is no suggestion among the ancient sources that the fighting is meant to imbue fertility in the way that whipping with strips of goat hide during the Lupercalia was said to have so affected those struck, as some have speculated. Warde Fowler noted as much well over a century ago; referring to Varro's (*Ling.* 6.18) comment that "a rod (*virga*) was also cut from [a *caprificus*]," he remarked (1899:178–179 [with a footnote to Mannhardt 1884]: "[I]t has been ingeniously conjectured that it was with this that the handmaids beat each other, as Plutarch describes, to produce fertility, just as at the Lupercalia the women were beaten with strips cut from the skins of the victims (*amiculum Junonis*). But this is mere conjecture, ...:" On the Lupercalia, see Woodard 2006:86; Boyle and Woodard 2004:191–195.

sacrificial offering; hence, we are told, the day of the sacrifice is called the *Nonae Caprotinae* (Varro, *Ling.* 6.18; Macrobius *Sat.* 1.11.36, 40). Varro adds, without clarification, that the women *e caprifico adhibent virgam* 'use a branch from a wild fig tree'. Plutarch writes that the women feast while shaded κλάδοις συκῆς 'by branches from a wild fig' (*Cam.* 33.6; *Rom.* 29.6). The sacrifice takes place in an area of the Campus Martius called the *Caprae Palus* 'Goat's Marsh' (Plutarch *Rom.* 29.2; see also 27.6;[19] for the name of the place, see also Livy 1.16.1, Florus 1.1.1.16–17 [cf. Ovid *Fasti* 2.491]; Plutarch *Life of Numa* 2.1). Varro succinctly, and intriguingly, records that the sacrifice to Juno Caprotina occurs *in Latio* 'in Latium', unmistakably and enticingly suggesting that the rite is not unique to Rome. In this regard, Whatmough[20] interpreted an inscription (CIL I^2 2439–2440) reported to have been found in the vicinity of neighboring Praeneste as bearing a dedication to Juno Paloscaria, with the epithet derived from *palusca* (earlier **palosca*), naming a type of fig (*atra palusca* [*ficus*]; see Macrobius *Sat.* 3.20.1).[21]

1.4 MATTERS OF FERTILITY

It is clear that the narrated events of the Nones of July, the Nonae Caprotinae, are intimately concerned with matters of fertility – from the ritual rehearsal of the Latin attempt to acquire Roman women and the consequent sexual activity of the slave-women to the conspicuous elements of goat (reminiscent of the fertility rites of the Lupercalia[22]) and of fig and the milk-like sap of the *caprificus* (reminiscent of the *Ruminalis ficus* 'Ruminal fig',[23] where a she-wolf suckled the infant Romulus and Remus[24]) used in offerings to Juno Caprotina: "both animal and plant contribute a great deal of sexual symbolism."[25]

[19] Plutarch renders the name in Greek as τὸ τῆς αἰγὸς ἕλος. See §10.5.1 for discussion of the site.

[20] Whatmough 1922:190.

[21] Compare Palmer's (1974:14–15) reading *Iuno(ne) Palost(ri)* (i.e., with an epithet *palostris*): "The epithet *palostris* might refer to a site like the Caprae Palus outside Rome," Palmer suggests.

[22] On the goat affiliations of the Lupercalia, see Boyle and Woodard 2004:191–195, and compare note 18.

[23] See Boyle and Woodard 2004:194.

[24] Commentators on these rites have not been slow to invoke, vis-à-vis the element of fertility, the ancient Roman practice of caprification (still in use today): the introduction of a branch from a wild fig into the presence of a domesticated fig for the purpose of fertilization. Frazer (1929:2:344) attributes the suggestion to Preller (1881–83:1:287); Frazer writes: "Palladius [*De re rustica* 4.10.28] recommended the solstice in June, Columella [*De re rustica* 11.2.56] preferred July for the operation . . . ."

[25] Dumézil 1996:294.

1.4.1 CONSUS AND THE NONES OF JULY

But there is more to this day that concerns fecundity. Tertullian (*De spectaculis* 5) records that on the Nones of July, sacrifice is also made to Consus (see §3.3.1), god of grain in storage, on his subterranean altar (buried in the Circus Maximus) by the *sacerdotes publici* 'public priests'. The god's principal festivals are the Consualia of August 21 and of December 15. At the former, Tertullian notes, the officiating priests were the Flamines of Quirinus, the Roman god principally embodying the ideological realm of the goods-producer and fecundity (Dumézil's *troisième fonction* 'third function'[26]), and the Vestal Virgins. Both the summer and winter Consualia are followed in four days time by a festival of Ops, goddess of abundant harvest – the *Opiconsivia* on August 25 and the *Opalia* on December 19 – which together with the two Consualia constitute a ritual nexus in celebration of Roman fecundity.[27] The rites of the Nonae Caprotinae align themselves with this nexus.

1.4.2 PALES AND THE NONES OF JULY

And there is yet more. The Republican era calendar from Actium marks the date of July 7, the Nones of July, with the entry *Palibus II* 'for two Pales'. The deity Pales,[28] associated with the fertility of domesticated animals and typically depicted as female,[29] is a figure of great antiquity, as revealed by the dedication to her of one of the twelve archaic priests called the Flamines Minores:[30] hers is

[26] On the "three functions" of Proto-Indo-European society, see, *inter alia*, Dumézil 1930a; 1996:156–161, 246–272; Benveniste 1932; 1969:1:279–292. For summary of the evidence, see Woodard 2006:11–20. On primitive Indo-European vis-à-vis historical Rome, see Woodard 2006:20–39. And see, especially §§1.4.2.1.1–1.4.2.1.3, for further discussion.

[27] See Boyle and Woodard 2004:210–211, with references.

[28] On Pales, see especially Dumézil 1969:274–287 and 1996:380–385.

[29] There are three ancient authors who identify the gender of Pales as male. Servius (*Georgics* 3.1) attributes the view to Varro (but contrast Varro's inclusion of the deity in a list of goddesses in his *Manippean Satire* Σκιομαχία, as preserved by Aulus Gellius [*Noctes Atticae* 13.23.4]), and both Arnobius (*Adversus nationes* 3.40) and Martianus Capella (1.50, 51) explicitly state as much. With the discovery of the *Fasti Antiates maiores*, some scholars took its notation of *Palibus II* on July 7 to point to the existence of both a male and a female Pales (see, for example, the comments of Rose 1960:163). Dumézil (1969:275–277; 1996:381) has argued that the evidence properly read reveals that in Roman religious practice, Pales is feminine only, and that the identification of a male god of the same name is merely an artifact of learned discussions invoking an Etruscan god of domesticated animals who was equated with the Roman goddess.

[30] As opposed to the Flamines Maiores, the priests of the three members of the Pre-Capitoline Triad (Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus), on which see §5.3.1.

the Flamen Palatualis (Festus pp. 244–245M; cf. Varro *Ling.* 7.45). Pales has a better-known festival, celebrated on April 21, day of the *Parilia* – also identified as Rome's foundation date[31] – when Romulus ploughed the perimeter of the Palatine city (see Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom.* 1.88.2–3; Ovid, *Fasti* 4.806–862). Athenaeus writes that in his time (ca. AD 200) the day had undergone a name change (*Deipnosophistae* 8.361): δὲ οὖσα ἑορτὴ τὰ Παρίλια μὲν πάλαι καλουμένη, νῦν δὲ Ῥωμαῖα 'being the festival called the *Parilia* long ago, but now the *Romaea*'. And the same day is also said to be by coincidence the birthday of Rome's second king, Numa Pompilius (see Plutarch, *Num.* 3.4).

1.4.2.1 THE PARILIA. The Parilia of April 21 are a celebration of and for the increase of livestock. Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 1.88.3) writes that οἱ γεωργοὶ καὶ νομεὶς 'cultivators and shepherds' offer thanksgiving sacrifices περὶ γονῆς τετραπόδων 'for the offspring of four-footed animals'. Ovid identifies the desired outcome of the rites of Pales in a prayer he would place on the lips of her worshippers (*Fasti* 4.747–776):[32] (1) protection of herds and herders (lines 747–748; see §§1.4.2.1.3–1.4.2.1.4); (2) forgiveness for unintended violation of sacred pastoral spaces and for disturbing the deities of such spaces (lines 749–762; see §1.4.2.1.1); and (3) health, nourishment, abundant fertility for flocks and herd, and thus profit and plenty for the herder (lines 763–774; see §1.4.2.1.2). The sentiments of the prayer, and their fundamental phrasing, must be rooted in remote antiquity, if the poet has adapted the words to his metrical needs and expressive ends.

The three-fold goal of Ovid's petition to Pales recalls that of the prayer preserved by Cato in *De agricultura* 141, as explicated by Benveniste,[33] reflecting the threefold ideological categorizing of primitive Indo-European society (i.e.,

[31] Frazer (1929:3:338) summarizes in this way: "The day is so marked (*Natalis urbis Romae*) in the calendars of Polemius Silvius and Philocalus; and in the Caeretan calendar under the twenty-first of April there is the note: 'Rome founded.'"

[32] Fantham 1998:233: "This is the only prayer in book IV which O[vid] dictates rather than reports. And to whom? To the (Roman) shepherd people named in 731." The referred-to line is *I, pete virginea, populus, suffimen ab ara* 'Go, *populus*, seek fumigant from the virginal altar' (the translation is that of Boyle and Woodard 2004:105, with modification), on which see §1.4.2.1.6. Fantham calls attention to Livy's use "in a prayer" of (nominative) *populus* as a vocative. The form occurs in Livy 1.24.7, in an enunciation of a fetial priest – an oath binding Rome and Alba Longa prior to the combat of the Horatii and Curiatii (during the reign of Rome's third king, Tullus Hostilius; see §8.7.2).

[33] Benveniste 2001[=1945]:441–443. The similarity has not gone unnoticed; Fantham (1998:233; following the quotation just given) writes: "Denis Feeney suggests [Ovid] may be imitating the authority as well as the manner of Cato, . . . The prayer is divided more or less equally between requests for pardon of inadvertent past offences 747–62, and for future material