

THE LUPERCALIA AND THE ROMULUS AND REMUS LEGEND

by P.M.W. Tennant
(University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg)

The earliest Greek speculations concerning the identity of Rome's founder provide no evidence of an indigenous (i.e. Etrusco-Italic) foundation legend before the middle of the 4th century B.C., when the historian Alcimus spoke of 'Rhomylos' and 'Alba' (the latter as a person rather than as a place).¹ The 'Hellenocentric' character of the Greek tradition gave rise to a variety of founders — all Greek in origin or association — of Rome and the Latin race, and explanations of their genealogies which for the most part took no cognizance of any local legend.² Yet, in view of Rome's importance before the middle of the 4th century, it is difficult to believe that the Etruscan and Latin influences on the city's development failed to produce some sort of indigenous tradition relating to the city's origins.

While the available evidence³ suggests that the 'twin' motif, with its consequent influence on the shape of the foundation legend (e.g. the themes of fraternal rivalry and fratricide) did not develop until the end of the 4th century B.C., and while it is clear that Greek influences were predominant in the development of the canonical version,⁴ there is reason to believe that certain features of the legend were both early and indigenous in origin rather than mere Greek imports.⁵

The fact that the earliest mention of 'Rhomylos' and 'Alba' appears in a Greek source of the mid-4th century B.C. must not be assumed to provide a reliable basis for dating the emergence of a local tradition: the highly subjective nature of the Greek tradition required nothing more than a suitable eponym of its own devising (sc. 'Rhome') in order to facilitate the myth of Rome's direct connections with the Greek world; and early Greek writers could exercise their inventiveness outside, or perhaps more accurately, in ignorance of the framework of the local (oral) tradition while it was in its formative stages in the latter part of the 5th and early 4th centuries B.C.

A feature of central importance in the Romulus and Remus legend and one which probably owed much to indigenous (i.e. Etrusco-Italic) influences was the appearance of a she-wolf as foster mother to the twins. There are indications that the idea of she-wolves suckling human beings already existed amongst the Etruscans — and possibly amongst the Latins — before the development of the Romulus and Remus legend.

The earliest incontrovertible evidence of the 'wolf-mother' motif dates from the first half of the 4th century B.C. and appears on a stele from Bologna which

depicts a she-wolf suckling a single child.⁶ Its remoteness from Rome makes it unlikely that the motif had any direct connection with the Roman legend, but it possibly had some reference to the tradition of an Etruscan city or family, or even to the character of the deceased.

The famous Capitoline wolf may provide evidence of an even earlier existence of the motif in the vicinity of Rome itself. It is generally agreed that it is a product of Etrusco-Italic art⁷ but it is uncertain whether or not it originated in Rome. The two factors of importance here are first, that the statue can be dated to the first half of the 5th century B.C.;⁸ and second, that the wolf is represented in suckling condition. The latter feature provides good ground for believing that one or more human figures originally formed part of the statue⁹ or that the wolf itself in that condition had some symbolic significance.

Rosenberg¹⁰ believes that commercial ties between Tarquinii and Miletus — the leading cities of Etruria and Ionia respectively — led to the adoption of the she-wolf legend connected with Miletus by the Etruscan city. If indeed a similar tale had grown up around Tarchon, the legendary founder of Tarquinii, it would help to explain the existence of the Capitoline wolf in Rome — since Tarquinii undoubtedly played the leading Etruscan role in Rome's development. It is also possible that the motif on the Bologna stele has some reference to Tarquinii, since the latter claimed that its own founder (Tarchon) was responsible for the foundation of all cities north of the Apennines.¹¹ However, considering the remoteness of Tarquinii and the orientation of the southern Etruscan cities in general towards Campania and the Greek south it is more logical to see a connection between Felsina (i.e. Bologna) and one of the northern cities.

While a connection between Tarquinii and Miletus provides an attractive explanation of the origin of the Etruscan or Etrusco-Italic motif of the she-wolf, it is also possible that this mythical idea emerged from the broader context of Man's superstitious awe of wolves — the only type of animal which constituted a real threat to the community in the northern Mediterranean region. Physical fear of this unique threat was bound to have translated itself into superstitious beliefs about the 'powers' of wolves. An illustration of this very type of development was the belief in the efficacy of wolf's fat against evil spirits when smeared on the door post by the bride.¹²

To return to the Roman legend, it would appear then that the she-wolf as foster-mother had a special significance for certain Etruscan communities, perhaps Tarquinii in particular. There is also some evidence to suggest that the wolf may have enjoyed particular status amongst other Italian peoples: the Hirpini (an off-shoot of the Sabines), for example, were said to have named themselves after the animal (Sabine 'hirpus') after being led to a new home by one.¹³ If this veneration of wolves could be corroborated with specific reference to the inhabitants of archaic Rome, it would help to explain how the she-wolf came to play so central a role in the Romulus and Remus legend. Even if the earliest appearance of the she-wolf motif at Rome is to be connected with the Tarquinian presence (e.g. as a symbol of the 'parent' city or of the Tarquin family), its

adoption into the Latin foundation legend, which developed after Rome's break with Etruria, was probably stimulated by factors of special significance to the Latin community itself.

The link may lie in the obscure rites of the Lupercalia. Authorities, both ancient and modern, agree that the ceremony is of the greatest antiquity. Cicero¹⁴ describes the Luperci as follows: 'fera quaedam sodalitas et plane pastorica atque agrestis germanorum Lupercorum, quorum coitio illa silverstris ante est instituta quam humanitas atque leges. . . .'

'a sort of wild brotherhood of Luperci, completely pastoral and rustic, whose banding together in that woodland pack was started before civilisation and laws'.

The rites themselves, involving inter alia the sacrifices of goats and a dog¹⁵ and the smearing of the sacrificial blood on the foreheads of the participants, are indicative of a magico-religious purpose. The ancients looked upon the Lupercalia as essentially a purificatory rite,¹⁶ but the beating of bystanders with thongs of goat skin is reminiscent of a fertility rite and was also interpreted as such in ancient times.¹⁷

It is not intended here to embark upon a detailed discussion of all the theories put forward concerning the nature of the Lupercalian rites, but rather to attempt to establish a connection between the rites and the appearance of a she-wolf in the Romulus and Remus legend. The basic hypothesis is that originally wolves played a central role in the ceremony, but that in the course of time the importance of that fact was almost totally obscured by the changed nature and interpretation of the rites. Gjerstad,¹⁸ on the other hand, does not believe that there is any connection between the words 'Luperci' and 'lupus': 'There is not a single trace of a wolf in the rites of the Lupercalia in spite of all that has been written about the association of wolves with this festival. . . .' However, while the dress of the Luperci (i.e. goatskin girdles) and their concern with purification and/or fertility seem to be at variance with the idea that they were 'wolf-men', the obvious root of the word must still be 'lupus'.¹⁹ Of all the features of the primitive cult it is likely that the name itself was the most permanent, especially since the cult was connected with a specific locality (i.e. the 'Lupercal') which probably had important associations from the time of the earliest communal habitation on the Palatine: the fact that Bronze Age people in Italy sometimes lived in caves²⁰ suggests that the Lupercal may have been the focal point of the Lupercalian rites from the outset. For this reason it is unlikely that the names 'Lupercal' and 'Lupercus' were suggested in the first place by the legend of the she-wolf and twins — as explained, for example, by Ovid.²¹ The names, rather, already existed before the development of the Romulus and Remus legend.

It cannot be assumed that 'Lupercus' etc. are derivations of 'lupus' without attempting to establish a link between wolves and the archaic Lupercalian rites. In the light of the character of the Luperci in historical times and the fact that no writer actually describes them as 'wolf-men',²² one is forced to adopt the view that the names 'Lupercus' and 'Lupercal' were remembered over the centuries (see above) while their original significance was forgotten as the nature and under-

standing of the rites themselves changed. Ogilvie²³ aptly points out that ‘with the transition from a pastoral to an urban society, the original character of the ceremony will also have undergone change, until it came to be thought of as a fertility rite’. That the interpretation of very ancient rites could alter in the course of time is shown by the Romans’ ignorance of both the meaning of ‘Poplifugia’ and ‘Regifugium’ and the significance of the rites involved;²⁴ and yet the names survived.

Two clues to the original nature of the Lupercalian rites are first, that the festival fell in the middle of the three ‘dies parentales’ (propitiation of the dead),²⁵ and second, that the course run by the Luperci marked the boundary of the primitive sepulchrum in the forum²⁶ and did not encircle the Palatine, as originally thought. Kirsopp Michels²⁷ believes that the Luperci possessed the power to control wolves or spirits of the dead manifested as wolves. However, if the wolf was venerated for physical and supernatural powers (e.g. the belief, mentioned above, in the efficacy of wolf’s fat as a charm against evil, and the belief in werewolves),²⁸ the Luperci may have been ‘wolf-impersonators’²⁹ who, by some ritual process, acquired the necessary ‘awesomeness’ to keep evil spirits at bay. Altheim³⁰ refers to ‘the double nature of the Lupercalia, which not only contained the ritual of fertilization, but also to avert mischief threatening from the side of the dead.’

Exactly how the Luperci could have ‘acquired’ wolf-like ‘powers’ cannot be determined with any certainty, but a clue may lie in Plutarch’s reference to the sacrifice of a dog at the Lupercalia.³¹ The discovery of the remains of a dog in an Iron-Age tomb possibly provides evidence of the use of these animals in primitive Roman ritual.³² The appearance of a dog would certainly tend to confirm the connection between the Lupercalia and evil spirits, since dogs were believed to be chthonic creatures — as shown by the sacrifice of dogs to Hecate and Ares.³³ Because of the obvious similarity between dogs and wolves³⁴ and considering the simple but important fact that wolves would have been difficult to obtain and to handle as sacrificial victims, would it be fanciful to suggest that dogs were originally used — or came to be used — in the Lupercalian rites because of their wolf-like characteristics?³⁵

To attempt to elaborate on this idea is perhaps hazardous, but it is possible that the practice of smearing the blood of the victims on the foreheads of the Luperci³⁶ was a survival of the primitive ritual,³⁷ and that the dog’s (or perhaps originally wolf’s) blood was used in this manner to ‘transform’ the celebrants. Furthermore, since whipping is not only connected with fertility, but may be, in a general sense, the driving away of evil,³⁸ this may be another feature of the ceremony in historical times which had its roots in the primitive ritual. The custom of whipping men as well as women³⁹ — which is at variance with the idea that the ceremony was intended to promote fertility in women⁴⁰ — possibly stemmed ultimately from a magical ritual intended to protect the inhabitants against evil spirits, but eventually acquired a wider significance — i.e. as a ceremony to avert evil influences in general from the members of the community. Such a development

would have encouraged the identification of the 'Lupercalia' with ceremonies such as the Arcadian festival in honour of Pan, during which boys whipped statues of the god with squills to encourage fertility in times of famine.⁴¹ Once the passion for 'interpretatio Graeca' began to exploit such similarities, the Lupercalia inevitably came to be thought of as a fertility ceremony. One might venture to suggest that the goat — which rarely appears as a sacrificial beast in Roman ritual⁴² — was introduced by analogy with the Arcadian rites, and that the animal originally sacrificed at the Lupercalia was the dog (or perhaps even a wolf, as mentioned above).

The association of the Lupercalia with the Arcadian festivals is clearly shown by the belief, *inter alia*, that the deity at the centre of the Roman ceremony was Faunus (i.e. Pan)⁴³ and by the legend that the Arcadian Evander once inhabited the Palatine.⁴⁴ Furthermore, the Arcadian cults of Zeus and Pan were based on Mt. Lykaeus, which would have facilitated still further a link with the Roman Lupercalia. This would also help to explain how the name 'Luperci' persisted even though the participants in the rites were, in historical times, more 'goat-like' than anything else. Since the goat was symbolic of fertility⁴⁵ and since the Luperci wore goat-skin girdles, this could confirm the suggested etymology of the name 'creppi' by which the Luperci were also known;⁴⁶ it would appear from Festus⁴⁷ that 'creppi' = 'capri'. Finally, another point of similarity between the Lupercalia and the cult of Pan may have been the existence of cave-shrines in Greece in honour of Pan (e.g. the one at Athens, dedicated in the year of Marathon⁴⁸).

Most of the ideas put forward here are obviously highly conjectural — as all theories concerning the Lupercalia are bound to be — but they aim to do no more than establish the likelihood that the words 'Lupercus' and 'Lupercal' stem from 'lupus'; and that, however incongruous it might seem in the light of the extant accounts of the ceremony, the 'Luperci' were originally 'wolf-men' and the Lupercal was the focal point of a type of wolf-cult.

If indeed the wolf was of central importance in the primitive Lupercalian rites and this association had not been made obscure by the time that the Romulus and Remus legend was taking shape, this would surely have been an important factor behind the choice of a she-wolf as foster-mother to the twins. Further support for this view is given in the next section where the role of Mars in the foundation legend is discussed.

In telling of Ilia's (i.e. Rhea Silvia's) rape in a grove consecrated to Mars, Dionysius mentions the following explanations of the identity of the father of Romulus and Remus: 'Some say that the author of the deed was one of the maiden's suitors. . . ; others say that it was Amulius himself. . . . But most writers relate a fabulous story to the effect that it was a spectre of the divinity to whom the place was consecrated.'⁴⁹ While the first two explanations almost certainly stemmed from attempts to rationalize the tale, one must allow the possibility that the original story did not contain any element of divine involvement and that the role ascribed to Mars was a later development as well. However, little more can be said in this regard except to refer to the probable existence of an early

indigenous legend in which Amulius and Alba played some part; the failure of the earliest Greek accounts (e.g. that of Alcimus) to refer to such a personality or, for that matter, to Mars does not preclude the existence of either in the contemporary local tradition, since these Greek writers for the most part focused attention on the patriarchal role of Aeneas or Rome's Trojan ancestry and would naturally have rejected any version in which Rome's founder was descended from a Latin father. For the Greek tradition adequate recognition of the fusion between the Latin and Trojan elements could be achieved by claiming that Rhome married Latinus — as evidenced by Callias' account.⁵⁰ Latinus was a simple and obvious choice, since — as already pointed out — he was the eponymous hero of the Latins in the Greek tradition as early as Hesiod.

There is reason to believe that Mars' role in the local foundation legend had its protagonists before the time of Naevius and Ennius, since the latter in a passage quoted by Cicero⁵¹ extols Romulus' divine ancestry:

simul inter
sesè sic memorant: "O Romule, Romule die
qualem te patriae custodem di genuerunt!
O pater o genitor o sanguen dis oriundum!"

We know, furthermore, that both Naevius and Ennius⁵² regarded Romulus as the grandson and not the son of Aeneas: could this hiatus in the genealogy of the twins be another indication that Mars had by that time found a place in the local tradition as the father of Rome's founder? On the other hand, the absence of any reference to Mars himself in the fragment quoted above might urge caution; it could be argued, for instance, that the divine ancestry attributed to Romulus by Ennius stemmed from his supposed relationship to Aeneas (i.e. the son of Venus). There is, however, another passage from Ennius, quoted by Cicero,⁵³ which may lend weight to the belief that Mars featured in Ennius' account; in this passage the Vestal Ilia describes her dream:

Excita quom tremulis anus attulit artubus lumen,
talia tum memorat lacrumans exterrita somno:
"Eurydica prognata, pater quam noster amavit,
vires vitaeque corpus meum nunc deserit omne,
Nam me visus homo pulcher per amoena salicta
et ripas raptare locosque novos. . . ."

The references to the 'homo pulcher' and to the bringing of a light ('attulit . . . lumen') are reminiscent of Dionysius' ⁵⁴ account of the most commonly held belief concerning the rape of Ilia: 'But most writers relate a fabulous story to the effect that it was a spectre of the divinity to whom the place was consecrated; and they add that the adventure was attended by many supernatural signs, including a sudden disappearance of the sun and a darkness that spread over the sky, and that the appearance of the spectre was far more marvellous than that of a man both in stature and in beauty.'

Clearly, on both the basis of these passages alone, one can do no more than establish the *possibility* that in Ennius' version Romulus was the son of Mars. In

any event, if this idea did originate before Naevius' and Ennius' time, it would seem that it did not become a widely accepted element of the tradition at the outset of Rome's literary era: Dionysius,⁵⁵ for example, states that some Roman historians⁵⁶ maintained that Romulus and Remus were the sons of Aeneas, others that they were the sons of a daughter of Aeneas, 'without going on to determine who their father was'.

The connection between Romulus and Remus and Mars undoubtedly arose from the fact that the wolf was sacred to Mars and that the latter, because of his exalted status amongst the early Latin communities, was a suitably august figure to be the father of Rome's founder. There can be little doubt that Mars' role in the legend was an elaboration subsequent to and, indeed, suggested by the story of the she-wolf, which itself was probably a very early element of the local legend.⁵⁷

It is clear that the worship of Mars amongst the Latins was both ancient and widespread: 'et tamen ante omnes Martem coluere priores';⁵⁸ and the association of this god with the archaic period of Rome's development is proved by the character of the *Salii* who at Rome were the priests of Mars.⁵⁹ Not only did the *Salian* brotherhoods exist at other centres throughout *Latium*,⁶⁰ but, as Gjerstad⁶¹ points out, 'there is archaeological evidence that sacred institutions of a similar kind existed in other parts of Italy during periods contemporary with the pre-urban epoch of Rome as shown, for instance, by figurative representations of war-dances on a bronze vase found in a tomb from the early 7th c. B.C. at Bisenzio and by armour, similar to that used by the *Salii*, found both in Italy and Greece and dating from the time of the early Iron Age, although in part derived from Bronze Age types.' A further indication of the antiquity of these rites at Rome is the fact that by the last century B.C. the words of the *Salian* hymn were unintelligible.⁶²

It is not intended to debate at length the question whether Mars was originally a god of agriculture or of war⁶³ — a problem similar to that concerning the original nature of the *Salii*.⁶⁴ However, the view that Mars originally determined the general prosperity of the primitive agricultural community would seem to have more to commend it, the main reason being that his role as god of war was a specialized function more in keeping with the community's ability to conduct warfare on an organized scale. The archaeological evidence relating to the pre-urban epoch of Rome does not suggest that the community was particularly war-orientated.⁶⁵ It is sufficient to observe that, in the light of existing evidence, Mars was a deity possessed of formidable powers, whether he is viewed as a war-god in origin or as a general protector of crops, herds, shepherds and farmers — as seen for example in the old prayer to Mars preserved by Cato⁶⁶ or in that of the *Arval Brethren*.⁶⁷ It has been argued that the magic procession around Roman territory was to propitiate Mars and so avert war: 'not a meagre harvest, but war was the real menace in those days, when looting bands and attacking armies were sweeping over the country again and again.'⁶⁸ It is possible, but cannot be proved, that the *Ambarvalia* were more concerned with the physical safety of the

community than with the well-being of crops and herds; on the other hand, we do know that the Iron Age inhabitants of Rome based their economy on agriculture and cattle-breeding.⁶⁹ However, in this context it is more important to observe that in either instance Mars is likely to have been the deity invoked.

The invocation 'Moles Martis Nerienemque Martis' appears in an ancient 'comprecatio' quoted by Aulus Gellius,⁷⁰ who explains the etymology of Nerio as follows: 'Nerio igitur Martis vis et potentia et maiestas quaedam esse Martis demonstratur'. Similarly, 'Moles Martis' could mean 'the might of Mars'. This attribute is further illustrated by the nature of the Salii whose archaic military dress indicates the 'war-like' character of the deity. It is also significant that until Augustus' time Mars was worshipped outside the pomerium — a custom that is understandable whether the god was connected with warfare *ab initio* or was predominantly a deity who had the power to avert and to inflict evil on the community.

If, then, one accepts the likelihood that Mars from the earliest times was a deity whose power was 'awe-inspiring' and who was therefore to be 'kept at a distance', it is easy to understand why the wolf was regarded as his sacred animal. I am also inclined to see in this a link between Mars and the Lupercalia — a suggestion already put forward by Warde Fowler:⁷¹ 'The connexion with the Palatine, with the wolf, and with fructification, seems to me to point very closely in the direction of Mars and his characteristics.' More illuminating is the probable connection of the archaic ceremony with the spirits of the departed (see above) and the chthonic characters of Mars. Here the observations of Wagenvoort⁷² are most relevant: 'Mars was also a god of death and the underworld. . . . For Mars there is evidence both in the Roman and the Umbrian domain, while it is most manifest in Etruria. At the same time it should, however, be remarked that the Italic conception does not agree with the Etruscan. For we get the impression that in Etruria Mars is definitely a death daemon. He is not so from an Italic point of view: his power over death is only one side of his being, and the reverse side of his power is over life as a god of fertility. Otherwise it would not have been likely that a tribe should call itself by his name (Marsi) nor would the Latins and Oscans have called their sons Marcus, Mamercus after him. Without pretending to exhaust the subject at all I shall give a few data. The relation between Mars and Feronia, a goddess of the underworld, has already been mentioned. The woodpecker, a bird that might be touched by no one, was not only dedicated to Mars but also to Feronia. The wolf, another animal dedicated to Mars, has a distinctly chthonic character.'

We do not know to which deity the sacrifice was made at the Lupercalia. According to Ovid⁷³ it was Faunus, while Livy⁷⁴ speaks of an 'Inuus';⁷⁵ however, it is clear that both these names can be explained away as products of the later interpretation of the ceremony as a fertility rite and the influence of Greek cults. Warde Fowler makes the significant observation that the name of the god was possibly a secret, since 'there was a tendency to avoid fixing a god's name in ritual, in order to escape making mistakes, and so offending him.'⁷⁶ It is more

important to observe that the Lupercalia was a ceremony peculiar to the Palatine community⁷⁷ and that the rites took place in the vicinity of the burial area, which would have been beyond the existing pomerium — a factor in keeping with the idea that Mars' domain was outside the bounds of the community. Presumably the Lupercal, situated on the western slope of the Palatine, was also originally outside the habitation area of the settlement.

If Mars was indeed connected with the archaic ceremony, the failure of the tradition to allude to this connection can be attributed not only to the practice of keeping a deity's name secret and to a changed interpretation of the nature of rites, as discussed earlier, but also to the simple fact that, with the growth of the city and consequent extension of the pomerium, Mars' role would have become untenable. Added to this is the fact that Mars became increasingly a god of war — a function that clearly had no connection with the Lupercalian rites and also ensured that his worship would take place outside the pomerium.

It is thus possible to see in such a link between Mars and the Lupercalia a confirmation of the obvious etymology of 'Lupercus' (i.e. that it was derived from 'lupus'). While the connection between Mars and wolves was probably an extremely ancient one, it is likely that the animal acquired a more obvious symbolic significance when Mars came to be thought of more exclusively as a god of war, in the manner of Ares. It would be interesting to know when the statue of Mars and his wolves was set up on the Appian way: Livy mentions the statue group in connection with the portents alleged to have occurred in 217 B.C.⁷⁸ Alföldi⁷⁹ connects the statues with the shrine of Mars on the same highway, and this in turn with the boundary of 5th century Rome: 'Here also Mars was watching over the rural frontiers of early Rome.' It would seem likely that this statue-group dated from a period earlier than Ennius (b. 239 B.C.) and that the association of wolves with Mars was well established by the 3rd century, and probably considerably earlier.

There is, therefore, reason to believe that Mars made his appearance in the Romulus and Remus legend before Rome's literary era began, and that Ennius' references to the divine ancestry of Romulus ('Romulus die' and 'sanguen dis oriundum') support such a view. In addition, the following lines from the Aeneid⁸⁰ may provide more conclusive evidence:

fecerat et viridi fetam Mavortis in antro
procubuisse lupam. . . .

Servius⁸¹ comments: 'sane totus hic locus Ennianus est'. It is therefore possible that the phrase 'Mavortis in antro' is a direct borrowing from Ennius, thereby indicating that a close relationship between Romulus, Mars and the she-wolf already existed by Ennius' time.

Furthermore, if this association was established at an early stage, the simultaneous and inevitable appearance of the Lupercal in the story would have been a major influence on the localization and elaboration of the foundation legend.⁸² Quite apart from this particular localizing factor, one must take into account the importance of the Palatine from the earliest times — as shown by its association

with the most ancient religious rites and its obvious strategic situation overlooking the Tiber. Gjerstad,⁸³ however, believes that the Palatine was chosen as the locality for the legend because the legend itself included ‘that element of a migratory tale that consists in putting children in a trough to be carried down a river.’ But it was surely the very localization of the legend on the Palatine, for the reasons already mentioned, and the proximity of this hill to the Tiber which actually determined the form of the exposure story — i.e. that the infants were abandoned in the shallows of the river (cf. Neleus and Pelias) rather than on the hillside (e.g. Oedipus and Telephos) or simply in the wilds (e.g. Miletos and Hippothous).

NOTES

1. Festus 326 L. On the date of Alcimur see Jacoby, *F. Gr. Hist.* 3B, Kommentar, 518.
2. See Dionysius, *Roman Antiquities* 1, 72ff. The common belief underlying all these accounts was that Rome owed her existence directly to the Greek world. It was the Greeks alone in the ancient world who tried to reconstruct the prehistory of mankind, and their view of the world has been aptly described as ‘aggressive and Hellenocentric’ (E.J. Bickerman, *C.P.* 47(1952)77. For D.H.’s ‘Hellenocentric’ view of Rome’s origins see H. Hill, *JRS* 51(1961)88ff. For a general survey of the Greek sources see T.J. Cornell, *PCPhS* 21(1975)16–27.
3. In the absence of any earlier evidence, the appearance of the ‘twin’ motif in several media within a relatively short period of time suggests that the legend of the twins was established during the latter half of the 4th century B.C.: the account of Alcimur (mid-4th c.) does not reflect any awareness of a twin-relationship — ‘Rhomylos’ appears as the grandfather of ‘Rhomos’; but by about 300 B.C. we find Rhomylos and Rhomos as brothers together with Telegonos (Callias’ version). However, as suggested below, the value of Greek accounts as a reflection of the contemporary Etrusco-Latin tradition should be treated with caution. More important is the fact that at about the same period we find our earliest local evidence of Romulus and Remus as twin brothers, namely, the statue group of the Ogulnian brothers, referred to by Livy (10,23,12): ‘Cn. et Q. Ogulnii aediles curules . . . ad ficum Ruminalem simulacra infantum conditorum urbis sub uberibus lupae posuerunt.’ Dionysius (1,79,8) was obviously referring to the same statue when he spoke of ‘a she-wolf suckling two infants, the figures being in bronze and of ancient workmanship’. According to Livy’s evidence the unveiling took place in 296 B.C. Further evidence of the wolf and twin motif is to be found in Campanian coinage dating from the period c.335–321 B.C. (see A. Rosenberg, ‘Romulus’, *R.E.*, 35, 1080). For a full discussion of this topic and for an argument that the ‘twin’ element could have been both an early and indigenous feature of the legend, see R.G. Basto, *The Roman Foundation Legend and the Fragments of the Greek Historians: an Inquiry into the Development of the Legend*, Ann Arbor 1980, 169ff.
4. See R.M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5*, Oxford 1965, 46–47, for a brief summary. For detailed discussion see H. Strasburger, *Zur Sage von der Gründung Roms*, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 1968, 5 = *Studien zur Alten Geschichte* vol. 2, 9ff.
5. This contrasts with Strasburger’s view (above, no.4) 15: ‘Soweit die Römer sich bis gegen Ende des 4. Jahrhunderts überhaupt für ihre “Ktisis” interessiert haben — ist ein solches Interesse in Italien nicht auch bereits griechischer Import? — war ihre eigene offizielle Version höchstwahrscheinlich eben die von den Griechen erzählte und variierte: die von der trojanischen Abkunft.’ I agree with Ogilvie (*Early Rome and the Etruscans*, Sussex 1976, 33) who describes Strasburger’s dating of the main formation of the legend to the early 3rd c. B.C., as part of the propaganda of the Samnite and Pyrrhic wars, as ‘impossibly late’.
6. R. Bloch, *The Origins of Rome*, London 1964, plate 6; H. Scullard, *The Etruscan Cities and Rome*, London 1967, plate 92.

7. E. Gjerstad, *Early Rome* 4, Lund 1966, 580–1.
8. Friedrich Matz ('Zur kapitolinischen Wölfin' in *Studies presented to David M. Robinson*, 1, St. Louis 1951, 754ff — cited by Gjerstad [above, n. 7] 580) argues for a date within the period 475–450 B.C.
9. It is generally agreed that the existing twins can be assigned to the 15th or 16th centuries. See E. Gjerstad (above, n. 7) 492.
10. Rosenberg, 'Romulus', *R.E.* 35, 1082. In addition to Corinth, the Greek cities of Asia Minor exerted considerable influence on Etruscan culture. Miletus, the most important of the Ionian colonizers, had commercial contacts with Etruria through the port of Sybaris. See M. Grant, *The Etruscans*, London 1980, 49–59.
11. Scullard (above, n. 6) 198.
12. Pliny, *N.H.* 28, 142. Pliny, quoting Masurius Sabinus, adds: 'ideo novas nuptas illo perungere postes solitas, ne quid mali medicamenti inferretur'; but, as Warde Fowler (*Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic*, London 1899, 90) points out, the real reason was undoubtedly to keep away evil spirits.
13. Strabo 5, 4, 12; Frazer, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex* 3, London 1929, 11. cf. the Picentes (also an off-shoot of the Sabines) who were said to have called themselves after a woodpecker (picus) for the same reason (Strabo 5, 4, 2).
14. *Pro Caelio*, 26.
15. Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.* 68 and 111; and *Romulus* 21.
16. Varro, *de L.L.* 6, 13; D.H. 1. 80, 1.; Plutarch *Rom.* 21, *Numa* 19, *Quaest. Rom.* 68.
17. Ovid, *Fasti* 2, 425–452; Servius, *ad Aen.* 8, 343; Livy fr. 63.
18. Gjerstad, *Legends and Facts*, Lund 1962, 11.
19. 'Lupercus' has been derived variously from 'lupus' and 'parcere' (Varro in Arnobius 4, 3); 'lupus' and 'hircus' (W. Mannhardt, *Mythol Forsch.*, 78ff); 'lupus' + suffix '-erca': cf. 'noverca' (H. Jordan, *Krit. Beiträge*, 164ff., Warde Fowler [above, n.12] 311 and 318; W.F. Otto, *R.E.* 6, 2064); 'lupus' and 'arcere' (Servius, *ad Aen.* 8, 343, and supported by some modern authorities, e.g. Nilsson, *Latomus* 15(1956)133. For yet another, more recent, conjecture (lupo/sequos) see J. Gruber, *Glotta* 39(1961)273ff. and G. Binder, *Die Aussetzung des Königskindes Kyros und Romulus*, Meisenheim am Glan 1964, 91. While it appears that there can be no certainty about the etymology of the suffix, there is general agreement (*pace* Walde-Hofmann: 'zu *lupus* Bildung und genaue Bed. unklar') that the root word must be 'lupus': 'The name certainly contains the name for wolf, but the formation is not clear' (G. Dumézil, *Archaic Roman Religion*, Vol. 1, Chicago 1970, 347); 'Von *Lupus* nicht zu trennen' (W. Eisenhut, *Der Kleine Pauly* 3, 1969, 780); 'Whatever the exact etymology of the name, the Lupercus is, as Altheim puts it, "one who has some connection with the wolf"' (A. Kirsopp Michels, *TAPA* 84 (1953)57. See also H.H. Scullard, *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*, London 1981, 77.
20. Gjerstad (above, n.18) 6. On caves as the earliest cult localities see B.C. Dietrich, *The Origins of Greek Religion*, Berlin 1974, 76ff.
21. *Fasti* 2, 381ff.
22. Bloch's (*The Origins of Rome*, London 1964, 50) rendering of Cicero's 'germanorum Lupercorum' (*Pro Caelio*, 26) as 'priests dressed as wolves' probably does not accord with the popular perception of them during Cicero's time.
23. Above, n.4, 24.
24. Gjerstad (above, n.18) 30–31; Warde Fowler (above, n.12) 174–6 and 327–330; Scullard (above, n.19) 159 and 81–82.
25. Ovid, *Fasti* 2, 425–52; see Otto, *R.E.* 6, 2057–8.
26. A. Kirsopp Michels (above, n.19) 35ff.
27. Michels, *op. cit.*, 57–58.
28. Petronius, 62; Pliny, *N.H.* 8, 81.
29. Cf. Ogilvie (above, n.4) 31.
30. F. Altheim, *A History of Roman Religion*, London 1938, 208.
31. *Romulus* 21, 5. In historical times the chief sacrificial victims were goats.
32. Gjerstad (above, n.7) 334–5.

33. Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 290d; Paus. 3, 14, 9.
34. See Altheim (above, n.30) 209.
35. This is quite different from Plutarch's conjecture (*Rom.* 21) that the dog was slain because it was an enemy of wolves!
36. Plut. *Rom.* 21, 4.
37. Cf. Gjerstad (above, n.18) 10: 'The whole ceremony suggests remote antiquity and it is quite foreign to the usual Roman ritual.'
38. C. Bailey, *Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome*, Oxford 1932, 19.
39. Plut. *Rom.* 21, 5.
40. Ogilvie (above n.4) 51.
41. Theocritus 7, 106–8.
42. The main exceptions concern the cults of Veiovis (Aulus Gellius 5, 12, 12) and Juno Caprotina (Plut. *Rom.* 29).
43. Ovid, *Fasti* 2, 361. See Altheim (above, n.30) 207ff. for the argument that 'Faunus' is actually to be interpreted as 'wolf'.
44. D.H. 1, 31, 3; Vergil, *Aeneid* 8, 51–4; Livy 1, 5, 2. Ogilvie (above, n.4) 52 comments: 'The similarity of the Luperci to the cult of Ζεῦς Λυκαῖος in Arcadia facilitated the construction, probably in the fourth century, of the myth that the Arcadian Evander had inhabited the Palatine before the arrival of the descendants of Aeneas'.
45. Cf. Ovid, *Fasti* 2, 439–40.
46. 'Crep(p)os, id est lupercos, dicebant a crepitu pellicularum, quem faciunt verberantes' (Festus, 49 L).
47. Festus, 42 L: 'Caprae dictae, quod omne virgultum carpant, sive a crepitu crurum. Unde et crepes eas prisca dixerunt'.
48. Herodotus 6, 105.
49. D.H. 1, 77.
50. D.H. 1, 72, 5.
51. *De Rep.* 1, 64.
52. Servius, *ad Aen.* 1, 273 (Naevius); Servius, *ad Aen.* 6, 777; Ennius, 31 W.
53. *de Div.* 1, 20, 40.
54. D.H. 1, 77, 2. See also O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*, Oxford 1985, 197.
55. D.H. 1, 73.
56. D.H. prefaces his account by saying that the Romans have no 'ancient' historians or chroniclers, but that each has taken something out of accounts preserved on sacred tablets, presumably the 'annales maximi'. No mention is made of early poetical versions (sc. Naevius and Ennius).
57. Strasburger (above, n.4) 24 regards the uncertainty about the paternity of Mars in Livy's (1,4,1) account ('... seu ita rata, seu quia deus auctor culpae honestior erat. ...') as indicative that Mars' role in the legend was a comparatively late development. However, caution or scepticism on Livy's part does not preclude the possibility that Mars was an element of the local tradition before Ennius' time (see below).
58. Ovid, *Fasti* 3, 79.
59. At Tibur they were associated with Hercules (Servius, *ad Aen.* 8, 285).
60. e.g. at Alba, Lavinium, Tusculum and Aricia. See Bloch (above, n.22) 136; Gjerstad (above, n.18) 29; Ogilvie (above, n.4) 99.
61. Gjerstad, *loc. cit.*
62. Varro, *L.L.* 7, 3; cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2, 1, 86.
63. For Mars as an agricultural deity in origin see: *Roscher's Lexicon*, 2, 2399ff and 2420; Warde Fowler (above, n.12) 48ff; Bailey (above, n.38) 68ff. The latter takes the view that at the earliest stage of development Mars was 'primarily an agricultural deity' but that 'he was also, as far back as we can penetrate, a military deity'. He summarizes his view as follows: 'Perhaps we may see in him the protector of crops, cattle, and young men, of all young things, and suppose that his priests (i.e. the Salii) "leapt" for the prosperous growth of all, much as the Curetes did to Zeus in Crete'. See also Bailey's edition of Ovid's *Fasti* 3, pp. 33–47. For Mars as a god of war in origin see: Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 144ff; Dumézil, *Archaic Roman Religion*, Chicago 1970, 205ff.; Bloch (above, n.22) 140.

64. Bloch, (*loc. cit.*); Ogilvie (above, n.4) 99.
65. Gjerstad, (above, n.18) 14ff.
66. *De Agric.* 142.
67. Text: E. Diehl, *Altlateinische Inschriften*, Bonn 1911, p.118.
68. A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins*, Ann Arbor 1965, 299; Wissowa (above, n.63) 143.
69. Gjerstad, *Early Rome 4*, 335ff.
70. Gellius 13, 23.
71. *Roman Festivals*, 313. Furthermore, if Robigus was a form or 'indigitation' (*op. cit.*, 89) of Mars, the sacrifice of a dog at the Robigalia (Ovid, *Fasti* 4, 907ff) may be a further indication that Mars was associated with the Lupercalia, since the latter also involved the sacrifice of a dog.
72. H. Wagenvoort, *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion*, Leiden 1956, 210–211.
73. *Fasti* 2, 361. See also note 37. Binder (above, n.19) 82–3, argues that Faunus was the deity originally connected with the Lupercalia (cf. Dumézil, above, n.63, 344–50; Altheim, above, n.30, 136); however, it is not impossible that Ovid was the first to connect Faunus with the festival: see A.W.J. Holleman's analysis of Ovid's account of the Lupercalia, *Historia* 22 (1973) 260–8.
74. Livy, 1. 5.
75. The name remains a mystery. As a fertility god his name is probably connected with 'inire' (cf. Ovid, *Fasti* 2, 439–40: 'et dea per lucos mira locuta suos: / "Italidas matres" inquit "sacer hircus inito.'). Ogilvie (above, n.4) 53, suggests that the name may be pre-Italic. Gjerstad (above, n.18) 10–11 believes that Inuus was the original name of the god who was later identified with Lycaean Pan.
76. Warde Fowler (above, n.12) 313. Warde Fowler also refers here to Servius, *ad Aen.* 2, 351: 'Iure pontificum cautum est ne suis nominibus dii Romani appellarentur, ne exaugurari possint.'
77. Gjerstad (above, n.18) 27, points out that 'the fact that the gens Fabia was associated with cults on the Quirinal does not prove that the two groups of Luperci represent two originally separate collegia which were united . . . by means of a synoikismos between the Septimontium and the Quirinal. This is impossible because, as far as we know, there was no festival or cult similar to those of the Lupercalia on the Quirinal: this festival is alone and indissolubly connected with the Lupercal on the Palatine'.
78. Livy 22, 1, 12: 'Romae signum Martis Appia via ac simulacra luporum sudasse'.
79. Alföldi (above, n.68) 302–3.
80. *Aeneid* 8, 630–1.
81. *ad Aen.* 8, 631.
82. It is interesting to note that according to Plutarch (*Rom.* 21) the Luperci began their course at the point where Romulus was exposed.
83. Gjerstad (above, n.18) 40.

ACTA CLASSICA



Acta Classica is published annually by the Classical Association of South Africa. The journal has been in production since 1958. It is listed on both the ISI and the SAPSE list of approved publications.

Published by
The Classical Association of
South Africa

For further information go to:
http://www.casa-kvsa.org.za/acta_classica.htm