that, in resembling *crepundia*, evoke infancy and early youth (*a crepundiis* is equivalent to *a pueritia*).[5]

There is specific reason for the role given the *bullae* in the recognition of Pallas, who is here (and only here) accordingly designated as a *puer*: *notis . . . cingula bullis/Pallantis pueri*. For *pater* Aeneas, the infantile *bullae* inevitably bring with them the memory of the violated *puer* (*notis*!)—a recognition underlined by the sound-effects of verses 942–3, *BALteus . . . BULLis/PALLantis PUeri*.[6] If at the death of Pallas the reader has seen the *impressum nefas* of bridegrooms cut down in their prime, here, through the eyes of Aeneas, we catch a glimpse of that same belt's glistening *bullae*, which are objects evoking the *felicitas* and good fortune of a *puer*.[7]

As Heyne has already concluded, 'verendum non erat, ne otiosus esset versus': the adding of *cingula* and *notae bullae* is no mere 'pleonasm'.[8]

Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa A. CUCCHIARELLI
cucchiarelli@sns.it

[5] Cf. Daremberg-Saglio, 1.2.1561a–b, s.v. *crepundia* (fig. 2065); cf. also 1.1, esp. 666, s.v. *balteus*; 754–5, s.v. *bulla*. In his note, Henry, 77, *ad Aen*. 10.496, makes reference to modern usage (emperor Maximilian): 'The "bullae," as appears from these statues, were either hollow balls, inside of which a smaller ball rattled at every motion of the bearer [. . .] or actual bells with tongues. They were attached by rings which passed through holes, at short distances from each other, along the lower edge of the "balteus," in its whole length.'

[6] The father/son theme is of decisive importance in the last books of the *Aeneid* where it is reflected also at the divine level. I refer to the scene in Book 10 where Jupiter, the father, seeks to console his son, Hercules, when he is saddened by the imminent death of Pallas; one observes here a reduplication of the filial connection featured in the scene's Homeric model, in which it is his wife, Hera, who dissuades Zeus, in words far more harsh, from attempting to save his son, Sarpedon (*Il*. 16.431–61); cf. *Aen*. 10.466 *tum genitor natum dictis adfatur amicis*. Moreover, already in the Theocritean model of Heracles saddened by the loss of a boy (Hylas), the hero's sadness is cast not only as a lover's emotion, but a father's: *καί νιν πάντ' ἐδίδασκε πατὴρ ὡσεὶ φίλον υἱέα* (*Id*. 13.8). Near the end of the *Aeneid*, young heroes are figured consistently as virgins 'ravished' in their deaths (*ἄωροι* and *ἄγαμοι*); cf. D. P. Fowler, 'Vergil on killing virgins', in *Homo viator. Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol, 1987), 185–98; Ph. Hardie, *Virgil. Aeneid Book IX* (Cambridge, 1994), 14–18.

[7] The *bulla* of Cic. *Verr*. 2.1.152 (the case of the young son of Publius Junius) plays a comparable emotive role: *neque te tam commovebat quod ille cum toga praetexta quam quod sine bulla venerat* [. . .] *quod ornamentum pueritiae pater dederat, indicium atque insigne fortunae, hoc ab isto praedone ereptum esse graviter tum et acerbe homines ferebant*; the father/son relationship is referred to already at Plaut. *Rud*. 1171 *bulla aurea est, pater quam dedit mi natali die*; cf. in addition Plin. *HN* 33.10.

[8] In contrast, Page, loc. cit.: 'The second clause *et . . . bullis* merely amplifies the first.'

THE RAPE ATTEMPTS ON LOTIS AND VESTA

The similarities between the lines on Priapus' attempted rapes of Lotis and Vesta at Ovid, *Fasti* 1.393ff. and 6.321ff. are obvious and numerous,[1] but the explanation of the extensive correspondence is problematical and controversial. Generally scholars have felt that one of the two accounts would have been omitted in a final revised version of the poem, and most have written off the passage on Vesta (for example, as

[1] See e.g. E. Fantham, 'Sexual comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*: sources and motivations', *HSPh* 87 (1983), 203; A. Richlin (ed.), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome* (Oxford and New York, 1992), 171; and C. E. Newlands *Playing with Time* (Ithaca, 1996), 127–8.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.622 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a weakly derivative doublet of the Lotis story, or as an inferior earlier version of the same basic tale, or as a closural device that undermines the authority of the didactic poet) and have felt that it was the most likely candidate for omission.[2] They may be right. But a closer look suggests that in fact 6.321ff. work rather well where they are and that they are deliberately provocative.

For a start there appears to be a decided element of impudent audacity there. Ovid seems to be taunting and mocking his readers, and one can hardly believe that he has the effrontery to produce one after another of these outrageously close coincidences.[3] In addition, the order in the poem of these two anecdotes conjures up a risible picture of Priapus not having learnt his lesson, trying exactly the same kind of furtive approach to a sleeping female yet again, and being foiled in exactly the same way yet again (why didn't the idiot check for the ass and remove it, one wonders).

However, a closer look reveals distinct differences. Ovid also seems to be challenging himself to ring the changes in a display of ingenuity and challenging us to spot and savour those changes, to get extra stimulation and enjoyment by thoughtfully measuring the verses on Vesta against those on Lotis. The introductory couplet at 6.319–20 highlights the two major areas of divergence—brevity and added humour. Whereas the passage on Lotis (an *aetion* for the sacrifice of the ass to Priapus) was introduced with *causa pudenda quidem, sed tamen apta deo* (1.392), at 6.319–20 after mentioning Priapus' disgrace, Ovid adds the words *est MULTI fabula PARVA ioci*.

In line with this at 6.321ff. Ovid produces an adroitly condensed version of the rape attempt on Lotis. He reduces a passage of forty-eight verses to twenty-four verses, following all the main elements of the earlier story but consistently abbreviating them (for example, three couplets on the gods attending the feast are scaled down to one, and seven couplets on the festivities become three). He also omits several of the actions found at 1.393ff. (for example, the arrival of the rapist, overtures by him to his victim, and his discomfiture when his assault fails) and abridges others. This streamlining produces a swifter and snappier narrative.[4]

The most striking aspect of the humour at 6.321ff. is that there the tone is more irreverent, the situation is more scandalous, and Priapus is even more of a reprobate. This time he goes after not a nymph but Vesta herself, an august goddess synonymous with virginity (as Ovid has just reminded us at 6.283ff.), and Vesta of all people is very nearly raped, and by a crude rustic with an enormous penis at that. Hence the embarrassed (and, one may imagine, quite possibly lying) claim by Priapus at 6.335–6 that

[2] For further discussion and bibliography, see J. G. Frazer, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex* (London, 1929), II.171, IV.231; H. Le Bonniec, *P. Ovidius Naso Fastorum Liber Primus* (Paris, 1965), 75, Fantham (n. 1), 203ff.; G. D. Williams, 'Vocal variations and narrative complexity in Ovid's Vestalia: *Fasti* 6.249–468', *Ramus* 20 (1991), 197ff. (who speaks in defence of the Vesta account, but not convincingly); and Newlands (n. 1), 127ff.

[3] There is no extant version of this tale of Vesta in any earlier or contemporary authors, so it seems that readers would not have been able to predict the course of events in it. In addition, at 6.319 Ovid may be subtly bringing out his 'repetition' here of the earlier disgraceful tale by playing on the 'repeat' sense of *refero* (*OLD* s.v. 16).

[4] This has led to criticism that 6.321ff. is jejune and lacking in colourful details, and that 1.393ff. is more coherent and consistent (cf. e.g. Fantham [n. 1], 204 and Newlands [n. 1], 128). This is largely a matter of personal taste. I myself see no incoherence or inconsistency in the later passage. Given that Ovid was reproducing the main outline of events, he may well have felt that lots of minor points need not be spelled out all over again, and that repetition of many lesser details would have been tedious and excessive. Certainly the colourful lines on the nymphs at 1.405ff. would be far less relevant in the case of the assault on Vesta.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.622 Published online by Cambridge University Press

he did not know it was Vesta, as the god is amusingly dragged into the narrative; and hence the outrage of the company at 6.343–4 (where Priapus has to flee to avoid being beaten up rather than just being laughed at, as was the case with his failure with Lotis, so that with a droll twist here it is the failed rapist rather than the victim who runs off). On top of that, whereas in Book 1 Priapus had been attracted to Lotis alone and made approaches to her before attempting to rape her, in Book 6 the god only turns to Vesta after trying it on with various goddesses and nymphs, and he makes no initial advances to Vesta but has immediate recourse to rape. Furthermore, in the Lotis passage it was Priapus alone who lost his dignity, but here Vesta also loses hers. After 6.325ff., the picture of her falling asleep in 331–2 suggests that this normally staid goddess has partied to the point of exhaustion (quite possibly drinking too much), especially if she can sleep among all the noise and activity around her. It is also comically naïve of Vesta to enjoy such peaceful and carefree slumber (331) when surrounded by Priapus and other drunken lechers. And in 343 the goddess is terrified by the bray of an ass; and that when she had more reason to be terrified by Priapus, and the ass is in fact her saviour. There is particular piquancy in the fact that this time the levity extends to one of the *di consentes*, a venerable divinity who had long-standing connections with Rome (cf. 6.249ff.) and on whose worship Rome's permanence depended. And the fun at her expense might also be aimed specifically at the prominence that Augustus gave to that goddess.[5]

Other touches make for still more humour. At 6.319–20, in view of the immediately succeeding reference to Priapus' disgrace, it seems likely that *rubicunde* 'red' contains a pun and alludes not only to the red paint on Priapus' statue but also to his blushes. In 6.324 Silenus this time is not invited but crashes the party, and tantalizingly there is no mention of his ass at this point (leaving us wondering about it until 6.339). Line 325 in Book 6 (about it not being permitted and taking a long time to describe this banquet of the gods) is a cheeky little in-joke about his streamlining, as Ovid has already described such festivities at length at 401ff. in Book 1. This time (at 6.327) the poet gives a specific location for the party, and there is wit here, since Ida had all too apt amatory associations (the rape of Ganymede and the Judgement of Paris took place there, and it was the home of Paris' girlfriend Oenone[6]). At 6.335–6 the rather improbable suggestion that Priapus may have mistaken Vesta for a nymph is an arch reference back to his assault on Lotis. Finally, in 341 there may well be a *double entendre* in *ibat* (the verb was used of copulating and ejaculating), while *longi* in such a context surely conjures up the god's large erect penis.[7]

McMaster University P. MURGATROYD
murgatro@mcmaster.ca

[5] See Fantham (n. 1), 207–8; Newlands (n. 1), 130–1; and A. Barchiesi, *The Poet and the Prince* (Berkeley and London, 1997), 137ff.

[6] See e.g. *Fasti* 2.145, 6.15–16, 44, *Her*. 5.73, 138; Verg. *Aen*. 5.252ff.; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.6.

[7] See J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London, 1982), 144, 175, 190 and cf. Barchiesi (n. 5), 138.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.622 Published online by Cambridge University Press