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Abstract

Although the Roman deity Faunus is considered an ancient, indigenous and Italic god of the Latins, by both ancient and modern scholars, on closer examination this judgement turns out to be far less certain than it would appear. This thesis undertakes a reassessment of the evidence for the god Faunus in the Republic and early Empire and presents an alternative interpretation of the evidence: that Faunus as an individual deity was largely a creation of the Augustan poets. I will argue that Faunus evolved from the disembodied voices of the Republican fauns and that a separation between the fauni and Faunus is justified. I will reveal the role Faunus plays as mediator in the relationship between the Romans and their landscape, assisting in the negotiation of those aspects upon which they relied for their security and prosperity.

In the first chapter I will demonstrate that there are clearly grounds for revision of the argument that Faunus should be assigned the epithet ‘ancient’ by scholars such as Fantham and Wiseman. I will argue that the Republican fragments of Cincius, Acilius and Varro are either dubious in their dating or can be interpreted as alluding to fauns. I will examine the relationship between Faunus and deities such as Pan and Silvanus in order to reveal any evidence of either confusion or syncretism. I will make suggestions in Chapter 2 as to why Horace offers a particular portrayal of Faunus in the Odes as rustic and clearly associated with the rural and woodland landscape, the patron deity of Horace’s Sabine farm. In the third and final chapter I will suggest why it is that Virgil, who ignores Faunus in favour of the fauns and Pan in the Eclogues and Georgics, suddenly gives Faunus such prominence in the Aeneid. Faunus is constructed in the second half of the poem as part of the Italian landscape encroached upon by the Trojans. The Virgilian Faunus is an ancient and oracular deity in the Latin landscape. I will draw on the findings of Fordyce and Schiebe and argue that Faunus has no place in the early kings list. Finally, I will argue that the treatment of Faunus by Virgil is representative of the relationship between the Trojans and the Latins and that we can map its breakdown by closely examining episodes which feature this deity as we move through books 7 to 12 of the Aeneid.
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Introduction

Context and introductory background
While many scholars refer to Faunus as one of the most ancient of the Italian deities, Republican sources have the fauns as their focus. The sudden explosion of references to Faunus in Augustan age Latin literature is striking and suggests this later period as the time of his creation or reinvigoration. There are implications regarding the reappraisal of Roman identity and the renegotiation of Roman relationship to landscape in the evolution of Faunus and the fauns over the Republican to the early Augustan periods. The characterisations of Faunus by Horace and Virgil also play a role. This thesis will offer a detailed case study of Faunus, his appearance, nature, influence and surroundings. We will see that fragments of Cincius, Acilius and Varro that may imply that Faunus is a Republican god are worthy of question since they lack real context and it is often difficult to extract the actual fragments from the works in which they are preserved. I will argue that some of the fragments can actually be assigned to the fauns whom I will suggest predate Faunus. Other deities such as Pan and Silvanus, closely related to Faunus, have a real presence in Latin literature of the Republican period. In the references to Arcadian Pan it is evident that the distinction between Faunus and Pan is not always clear-cut by the early Empire for Ovid in the Fasti seems to view them as one and the same deity. That Virgil includes the fauns and Pan in the Eclogues and Georgics and then gives Faunus prominence in the Aeneid is further evidence in support of the argument that Pan rather than Faunus was the focus of the Republican period. Was the introduction, reintroduction or emphasis of this ‘ancient’ god part of the Augustan renegotiation of Roman identity and revival of early ideals of which religious restoration and reformation was a focus?

Horace’s Odes and Virgil’s Aeneid are the most numerous in references to Faunus as a rustic god, a protector of flocks and poets, in woodland settings and ancient groves, set amongst the high hills and the low fields, and as a god with oracular capabilities and as an ancient king. Well aware of the value of nature, the Augustan system of visual communication placed great importance on sacred groves and trees in order to draw connections between the past glory of the gods
and the revival of the Golden Age at hand (Kellum, 1994, 211-224). All Italy turns to Faunus the seer for advice and Virgil clearly posits the deity in the landscape of the Albunean grove in *Aeneid* 7. Boas (1938, 62) argues that Virgil was among the poets of the Augustan age who appreciated nature and that for Virgil this appeal was mixed with a sense of national pride. How humans relate to landscape is of universal concern and cultural interactions with landscape contribute to formulation and definition of identity. Faunus, a sometimes rustic deity of the countryside himself, possesses an intimate relationship to the landscape. This deity is an excellent choice for an investigation into the Roman relationship to landscape against a backdrop of Roman social perspective, legendary mythical foundations, golden-age imagery and sacred rites. Faunus is placed on the threshold between the rural and urban spheres as a mediator between nature and culture.

Although Horace’s *Odes* contain a relatively small number of references in comparison to Virgil, we will see that their importance cannot be discounted as Faunus is clearly an important mediator between humans and the landscape in these odes. Horace is the first extant poet to describe in detail the characteristics of Faunus and to place him within the landscape in which he dwells. In Horace the relationship between Faunus and the landscape is much clearer due to the poet’s characterisation of the deity as so closely associated with the rustic countryside of the Sabine farm, assisting in the negotiation of those aspects upon which the Romans relied for their security and prosperity. As Faunus is the protector of flocks, so he is guardian of the livelihoods of Romans; he shields them from the fierce summer and wind and rain (*Odes* I 17).

**Significance**

My analysis of references to Faunus in Latin literature will reveal that scholars have made unsupported assumptions regarding the antiquity of this deity. No previous investigation has considered the reasons why a poet such as Virgil, whose work bridges the Republican to Empire periods, ignores Faunus in his pastoral poems of the Republic and then makes him a focus of his Roman Empire epic. There has not yet been a dedicated literary study of Faunus and the Roman landscape. As a novel aspect of my topic I will bring into focus the sudden explosion of references to Faunus of the Augustan age. This thesis will also break
new ground by comparing how Horace and Virgil use Faunus to interpret landscape. The way in which Romans view their landscapes and their connection to them are explored in the interplay between poetry, religion and landscape. Scholarship has not yet paid particular attention to Faunus as a mediator between the Romans and their landscape, nor has his place in the landscape over the sources been investigated. My scholarship will bring into focus the Roman relationship with landscape, which will inform us about their identity and provide us with an understanding inclusive of cultural beliefs associated with the landscape.

**Theoretical framework and methods**

Renewed Roman interest in Faunus may have stemmed from Augustus’ revival of traditional Roman religion as a basis for his moral and political reforms. It is not surprising that this would involve a renegotiation with the landscape involving concentrated focus on particular deities such as Faunus. It is well documented in Varro (*Rust*. 3.1.1, 3, 4) and Cicero (*Att*. 14.13.1) that Romans consider the landscape and their interaction with it as important. Poets such as Propertius (1.9-12) and Tibullus sometimes set their works in visually engaging rural landscapes. For Horace (*Carm*. 1.17), the *locus amoenus* is his Sabine farm, an environment most suitable for the production of poetry. By Vitruvius’ time in the early first century BCE landscape and its depiction was cause for Roman literary debate (Vitruvius *De arch*. 7.5.1-4): ‘Identity is critical to a sense of place, *genius loci*, for people’ (Taylor, 2008, 5; Roe and Taylor, 2014, 15-16).¹

I will frame my thesis around the primary source material for Faunus and the fauns from Republican times to the early Empire, in order to reassess the dating of these deities. I will translate, analyse and categorise all references to Faunus and the fauns in Latin literature from the earliest suggested references such as Cincius up to Gellius.² Ultimately my focus will not extend in detail beyond Servius’ fourth century commentary on the works of Virgil. I will review ancient literary and archaeological evidence for Faunus and the fauns in order to determine how

¹ See Kozljanic in Bishop, (Ed.). (2011, 69-92) for the relationship of Roman *genius* to the modern concept of *genius loci* who cites Horace extensively for the importance of genius to Roman identity, for example, Horace, *Epistles* 2.2.87, 2.1.14; *Carmina* 3.17.14-15, 4.11.8 and Petronius 57.2 and Calpurnius Siculus 5.26 among others for *genius loci*.

² See appendices for various tables which demonstrate this work.
the Romans viewed and depicted their landscapes in association with these deities. So the ultimate scope of my actual thesis ranges from fragments purported to be Republican through to Virgil’s *Aeneid*. Initially I considered including Ovid but decided against it due to restrictions on word length and clear signs that Ovid has syncretised Faunus with Pan. The necessity of looking at early references to the fauns in order to explore issues such as chronology between them and Faunus and possible pluralism had an impact on what else could be included. Indeed had this been a PhD, rather than a Masters thesis, I would also have extended the study to include Calpurnius, the last poet with a concentrated focus on Faunus who has eight references to the deity.

I will conduct an analysis of the appearance of Faunus and the fauns across the primary sources with the occasional use of sociological perspectives. I will analyse not just the language used to describe these deities, but also the context in which they are found. In order to extrapolate what this is saying about Romans and their relationship to landscape, I will examine the social and religious mores as they apply to these works. I will apply Spencer’s (2010, 4-15) concept of the function of landscape as a link between nature and culture to the deity Faunus, and will build on Spencer’s argument that Roman landscapes specifically in the last century BCE and the first century CE are places of identity formation. Cultural landscapes are at the interface between nature and culture. I will also include in the discussion any later authors who provide evidence for an early Republican Faunus.

My reassessment of the primary evidence for Faunus and the fauns is informed by Wiseman’s works on Republican Rome and its myths. I diverge from Wiseman’s view when I dispute Faunus’ great antiquity and suggest that Faunus and the fauns were distinct and separate deities. I will review Fantham’s assessment of Faunus as the god of the Lupercal, drawing again on the findings of Wiseman. Cornell’s recent work on the fragments of Roman historians has greatly informed and to some degree provided a foundation for my analysis of the Republican evidence, particularly regarding the pluralisation of Faunus and the fauns.

The commentaries of Nisbet and Hubbard, Nisbet and Rudd and Quinn have proven important tools in some of my analysis of Horace’s *Odes*. I build upon
Holleman’s view that Horace almost takes on the role of Faunus across the odes in which the deity appears; I also use the work of this scholar as a basis from which to argue that there was no *Faunualia rustica*.

Guided by Zetzel, I will argue for the truly Italic and Roman nature of the second half of the *Aeneid*, where Faunus is introduced into the epic. In my analysis of Faunus as ancient king in the *Aeneid* I build upon the findings of Horsfall, Fordyce, Schiebe and others when I argue against Faunus’ great antiquity. I use Thomas’ idea of tree violation as a starting point around which to map the breakdown of the Trojan-Latin relationship in episodes which feature Faunus.

**Research questions**

1. Where is the evidence for an ancient Republican Faunus?
2. To what extent does later evidence make for a reliable foundation from which to draw conclusions about a Republican Faunus?
3. Why are the fauns the focus in Latin literature of the Republic while Faunus is not prominent until the Augustan age?
4. How can we account for the variety of characterisations of Faunus in Horace and Virgil?
5. To what extent does Faunus function as a mediator between the Romans and their landscape?

**Aims**
This thesis has three main aims. The principal aim is to dispute claims about Faunus’ great antiquity. Next I will establish that the Republican fauns came first and I will argue that Faunus appeared later in Augustan age literature. Lastly, I aim to develop an understanding of Roman relationship to landscape through an exploration of the god Faunus and the fauns. I will demonstrate the necessity of these deities as mediators to assist Romans in the negotiation of their landscapes. I will achieve these aims through a re-evaluation of the evidence surrounding Faunus and the fauns and their development.

**Literature review**
In the ‘Theoretical framework and methods’ section I reviewed the major approaches regarding Faunus and the fauns and Roman relationship to landscape in scholarship which greatly inform my argument. I will now briefly review
The review which follows does not include all of the scholarship from my extensive bibliography as its length precludes inclusion of all the sources in this review.

I undertook several literary reviews in preparation for the material for my thesis. These included works on Roman religion, Romans and landscape and Faunus in Horace, Virgil and Ovid. I began with a general review of literature on Roman religion from the nineteenth century, since later scholars still refer to such works in their discussions about Faunus. Early scholars included Mommsen (1853, 1854-6), Mannhardt (1858-77), Frazer (1890), Wissowa (1902, 1912), Durkheim (1912), Altheim (1931-3) and Rose (1935, 1948, 1950). The works of both Mannhardt and Frazer are now considered outdated and flawed (Graf, 1996, 28-9). Lipka (2009, 1-2) cites Mommsen as Wissowa’s mentor, considers Wissowa still unrivalled and acknowledges Mommsen’s identification of the ‘uniqueness and individuality of Roman religion’. North (2000) still views Wissowa as an essential reference work. Scheid (2003, 3) even refers to Wissowa’s *Religion und Kultus* as the ‘greatest ever handbook on Roman religion’. Although Durkheim’s ‘totemistic approach’ is flawed, his sociological approach is still considered relevant by Rüpke and Beard, North and Price (Lipka, 2009, 5-6).

I then reviewed Dumezil (1958, 1966), Latte (1960), Scullard (1981), North (1989) and Rüpke (1990, 1995, 2007). Although Dumezil views Wissowa as outdated and in need of correction, he still considers his manual the best available. Dumezil has received no lasting support, but for my purposes it is interesting to note that he argued for a distinction between *deus* and *numen* and so was not in favour of ‘Rose’s predeism in Rome’ (Lipka, 2009, 3-4). Lipka (2009, 7-8) looks at the relationship between *numen* and *divus*, which will become relevant to my argument that the terms are not simply interchangeable but do denote a difference in representation of the deity concerned. Lipka (2009, 3) views Latte as wanting, but I agree with North (2000, 2), who still views Wissowa and Latte as valuable reference works and considers the festivals in Scullard still useful, but his theories out of date. North’s (1989, 573-624) questioning of the reliability of later sources such as Varro for information on their own distant past has a bearing on my thesis since it is such sources which are claimed as evidence for a Republican Faunus.
The two volumes from Beard, North and Price (1998) revolutionised scholarship on Roman religion by providing a new historical perspective on previous views and reinterpreting the work of those before them, taking into consideration relevant sociological criticism. Scheid (2005, 182) discusses Augustan transformation of Roman religion, including oldItalic cult sites. For Rüpke (2001, 123) Italian patriotic fervour is part of that which fuels Augustan interest in the ethnic roots of their culture which has implications for how Romans thought about religion. I completed my review of Roman religion by looking at early twenty-first century work from the following scholars: North (2000), Bispham and Smith (2000), Davies (2004), Schultz and Harvey (2006) and North and Price (2011). The scope of North (2000) is from Republican times to the second century CE and can be viewed as a review of recent scholarship on early myths and kings, the character of Roman religion, its deities and their temples and Greek gods and their impact. Bispham and Smith (2000) have edited work often in translation from the early to mid 1990s which includes religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy, contextualising early Roman religion in central Italy. They also consider the necessity of relying on later literary sources and the development of thinking influenced by greater consideration of the social and political context regarding rituals and the transmission or spread of Roman religious practice. Davies’ (2004) focus is Rome’s religious history through the views of Livy, Tacitus and Ammianus on their gods. Particularly relevant to my thesis has been the work on Livy’s perception of the gods and on the historian’s reliability. Schultz and Harvey (2006) integrate literary, archaeological and epigraphic evidence for religion and politics and discussion of the terms ‘Roman’, ‘Latin’ and ‘Italic’ in relation to Republican Italy. This highlighted the need to include varied types of evidence in my own examination of Faunus and the fauns. Lastly, I read North and Price (2011) who included first time English translations of many recent articles on key moments in religious history and the influential arguments in the debates amongst scholars in relation to the Roman Empire.

Next, I looked at the interplay between landscape and the ancient Romans. Shipley (1996, 4-8) recognises the shifting nature of the scholarship on the relationship between ancient history and landscape. Scholars from the late 19th century to the mid-20th century paid more consideration to landscapes than did
those for the next thirty years, who were more influenced by political history. The Roman relationship to their landscape can be ascertained in part from their wall paintings which included springs, shrines, woods, mountains, herds, shepherds and mythological subjects.\(^3\) Schefold (1960, 88) views the combination of various symbols in wall painting as a Roman invention and one not based on creed, but as an example of the use of the wide-spread ideals of the culture of the time in the same fashion as that of contemporary poets. Leah (1991, 353) examines Campanian wall painters using a literary model as a guide to reading continuous narrative and then considers how this process can serve our understanding of literary images.\(^4\) I will explore the way in which Romans viewed their landscapes and their connection to them (some of them sacred places) in the interplay between poetry, religion and landscape. Recent studies in Latin literature illustrate the rise of the novel and sophisticated approaches to landscape in Roman poetry. Schama (1995, 6) explores the deep veneration for the sacredness of nature and cultural traditions associated with landscape, clarifying the importance of these concepts among the Romans. Beagon (1996, 284) demonstrates, through a study of Pliny, that the landscape was important to Romans. According to Keith (2000, 36-64), descriptions of landscape in Latin epic are heavily imbued with the political and social complexities of Roman life.\(^5\) Newlands (2004, 133-155) demonstrates the influence that Roman authors had upon each other’s landscapes. I will suggest how the Romans interacted with their landscape was intrinsically linked with religious beliefs and practices. Spencer’s (2010, 1) definition of landscape as formed, viewed and represented by human agency is also relevant. This scholar’s views on Roman identity and culture will inform my argument.

---

\(^3\) See Vitruvius, *De architectura* 7.5.1-4 for a full list of subjects and his review of the genre of Roman landscape wall painting.

\(^4\) By Vitruvius’ time tastes had changed to less realistic depictions of landscape and the ancient architect is scathing in his review of this development. The reality of nature has taken a back seat and serves almost as a painted stage set where statues of divinities, sacrifices and shrines become all important. This later development is easily linked to Augustus’ emphasis on the importance of religion and its appropriate depiction. See Zanker, 1990, 192-215 for Augustus’ careful orchestration of the design and depiction of religious and other images in the Forum of Augustum.

\(^5\) Keith discusses feminist criticism and argues that the ancient Roman landscape has been inscribed with a topography of the female sexual organs, that the pre-political landscape is feminised, but then that women are also forced to become part of the landscape, which is under the control of men and are so then themselves under male control.
The varied treatments of Faunus by Virgil, Ovid\(^6\) and Horace are also outlined in terms of the Augustan Golden Age propaganda. Holleman (1973, 260-268) discusses the ‘ludicrousness’ of the Faunus-Omphale episode in the *Fasti* and the reformation of the Lupercalia by Augustus, in particular the element of flagellation. Wiseman (1995, 1-22) disputes Faunus as the god of the Lupercal, discusses the rituals and decline of the festival itself and highlights parallels with Pan. Parker (1993, 199-217) posits that Ovid’s treatment of Faunus varies according to whether the setting is Greek or Roman and views Faunus as having undergone an evolution from a lecherous minor deity to a respected divine adviser to the king. Fantham (1983, 185-216) suggests the need for sheer comic relief as the most likely motive for the change of tone and that Faunus is the god of the Lupercalia in a study of the sources and motivation of sexual comedy in the *Fasti*.

Babcock (1961, 13-19) assesses the role of Faunus in Horace’s *Odes* 1.4 and comes to the conclusion that Faunus as guardian of herds and the oracular Faunus need not be distinguished in the poet’s mind, a conclusion I will dispute.

Incubation oracles and Faunus’ role in them is the focus of Johnston (1948, 349-355) who highlights the one described by Virgil in *Aeneid* 7.81-101 in comparison to the oracle of Faunus in Ovid’s *Fasti* 4.649-64. Boas (1938, 183-4) views Ovid’s representation of Faunus as an imitation of one that first appears in Virgil, arguing that the *Fasti* was written or published much later than the *Aeneid*.

Noonan (1993, 111-125) discusses the juxtaposition of Daunus and Faunus and the associations with the wolf in *Aeneid* 12 and suggests there was overlapping of their identities in the Augustan age, a suggestion that was also made earlier by Boas (1938, 192-3) and Altheim (1938, 422-23).

None of these scholars has accounted for the sudden explosion of references to the individual deity Faunus in the Augustan period or questioned the assumed great antiquity of this deity which the secondary scholars continue to perpetuate. Nor has scholarship paid particular focus to Faunus as a mediator between the Romans and the landscape, or finally his place in the landscape over the primary sources. How Romans interact with their landscape reveals something about their cultural

identity, often formed through religious beliefs or rites. I thus hope that my research will contribute to a greater understanding of the Romans and their world.

Outline of chapters
In this thesis I present the evidence surrounding Faunus and the fauns in largely chronological order. This allows me to argue that Faunus as a deity evolved from the disembodied voice of the fauns. Often this evidence is in much later sources which has influenced the scope of the investigation and has necessitated looking at evidence from the early Republic right up until at least the fourth century BCE. I focus the bulk of this widened sweep in Chapter 1 since it is here that we begin to investigate the antiquity of Faunus represented in later sources in order to determine its credibility. Therefore Chapter 1 is larger in size than those that follow. Chapter 2 is the smallest since Horace’s Odes contain only four references to Faunus and in them the deity maintains a reasonably consistent characterisation as a mediator between humans and a landscape to which he is firmly rooted. In Chapter 3, I look at Faunus and the fauns in the Aeneid. This final chapter fits in between the Horace and the Republican chapter in size.

I examine Republican evidence for Faunus and the fauns in Chapter 1. I begin with an analysis of an important fragment from Ennius which is then quoted by later authors such as Cicero and Varro. Next I use passages from Lucilius and Gellius to show that the fauns were ancient. The enduring image of the Lucretian fauns is then my focus, followed by my analysis of the similarly characterised fauns in Virgil’s bucolic works. I investigate fragments from Cincius and Acilius before presenting the evidence we have for a temple to Faunus mentioned by Livy and Vitruvius and the allusion to the festival day of Faunus on the Fasti Antiiates Maiores. Finally I conclude Chapter 1 by discussing the relationship between Faunus and other deities such as Silvanus, Inuus and Pan.

I will suggest in Chapter 2 that it is in Horace in the first century BCE where we find our first representation of Faunus in Latin literature. I will argue that Horace’s characterisation of Faunus contains strong indications of the deity’s role as a mediator between Romans and the landscape. We will see that Faunus’ protection of the Sabine farm extends to the poet’s own creative abilities. I highlight Horace’s use of adynaton in connection with the Faunus episodes since I
view this as a factor in the interplay between the god, the poet and the landscape. Horace and Faunus share a close relationship and the poet at times can be seen to take on certain characteristics of the god himself. In this chapter I also cast doubt upon the use of the poet’s work as support for the Faunalia rustica.

In the final chapter I compare and contrast the Virgilian Faunus with Horace’s earlier characterisation. Faunus has assumed the oracular capabilities of the Republican fauns in his new role as ancient Latin king in the Aeneid. His role as mediator between the Trojans and Latins is instrumental in establishing a relationship between these two peoples in the second half of the poem. We shall see that the desecration of the landscape and the waning power of it are essential elements in the Trojan victory over the Latins.

Notes
1. Primary source abbreviations are taken from the Oxford Latin Dictionary.
2. For quotes in Latin, this study uses u over v.
3. All translations are my own, unless otherwise indicated.
Chapter 1: Republican Faunus and the fauns

1.1 Introduction

The representation of Faunus and the fauns in the ancient sources speaks to how Romans saw themselves in relation to their environment. These deities possess an intimate relationship to the landscape and as such are vital to the way in which the Romans negotiate their own relationship to landscape. The late Roman Republic was a time of conflict and change and the fauns figure prominently at moments when Romans are trying to define their identity. In this chapter I will re-evaluate the evidence for the fauns and Faunus and their development and analyse their connection to the landscape and its importance to the Romans.

Although both ancient and modern scholars consider the Roman deity Faunus an ancient indigenous Italic god of the Latins, on closer examination this judgement turns out to be far less certain than it would appear. The primary purpose of this chapter is to question the widely-held assumption that the Roman deity Faunus is one of the oldest Latin deities. The most important reason for reviewing this opinion is the fact that the evidence is limited and in my view, insecure. It is striking that there are no extant passages from Latin literature containing references to Faunus that can be convincingly dated to the Republic, yet scholars such as Fantham (2009, 30) and Wiseman (2008, 62) argue for a great antiquity for this deity. I will demonstrate that there are clear grounds for revision of the argument that Faunus should be assigned the epithet ‘ancient’.

Prior to the Augustan age, the only evidence we have for Faunus in Latin literature is a dubious fragment from Cincius (ca. 210 BCE), a fragment from Acilius (142 BCE) and a short passage from Varro’s *De lingua Latina* (ca. 46/44 BCE). The time disparity between these Republican fragments and their identification in often much later sources are an impediment to making firm claims about Faunus’ past. I will analyse these fragments and demonstrate that their dating is either dubious or that they can be interpreted as alluding to fauns. But before I discuss the Republican fragments I want to look at the general representation of the fauns in the Republican sources. I will further argue that many references to fauns in sources such as Cicero and early Virgil should not be amalgamated with those to Faunus. In analysing all references to fauns in these
texts I will firstly establish why this separation is justified. Next I will attempt to
demonstrate that these oracular ‘deities’ have a longer history than Faunus.
Clarifying the relationship between the fauns and Faunus in the Republic will
assist in assessing the Latin passages which make reference to fauni and Faunus
from the Augustan period as we will have a clearer understanding of the
chronology of Faunus and the fauns.⁷

We will see that the meagre epigraphic evidence available for Faunus does not
support his ancient existence, nor that he was worshipped in these earliest of
times. There is no extant iconographical evidence that can be decisively
identified as Faunus at all, Republican or otherwise. The most compelling
evidence for dating Faunus to Republic times is the inscription on the Fasti
Antiates Maiores, dated between 84 and 46 BCE. Livy records the vowing in 196
and dedication in 194 BCE of a temple to Faunus (Ab urbe condita 33.42.10,
34.53.3). There are, however, no archaeological remains of this temple. I will
suggest that although Livy is considered reliable for the dating of temples,⁸ we
must at least consider the time period elapsed between the events and when Livy
is writing. I will argue that Livy’s comments cannot stand alone as evidence that
Faunus was a deity of the mid-Republican period. It is also worth noting that
Livy speaks about Pan rather than Faunus in his early history of Rome.

Possible confusion between Faunus and other deities will also be clarified in this
study. Two other mythical figures closest to Faunus in form, attributes and areas
of responsibility are Silvanus and Pan; both are closely associated with the forest
and Pan has a greater presence in the Republican evidence than Faunus.⁹ I will
examine the relationship between Faunus and such deities in order to reveal any
evidence of either confusion or syncretism. Could the appearance of these have
prompted the need for a similar deity to be inserted into the foundation and
religion of the Latins and subsequent Romans?

⁷ See Appendix 2 for a comparative table of Faunus and fauns references. During the Augustan
age there was an explosion of references to the god, some of which emphasise his ancient nature
through reference to the Republican period. In the Augustan age, the number of literary references
to Faunus is four times as high as it is for the fauns. After this time the references to Faunus and
the fauni are almost even.
⁸ See Orlin (1997, 6) and Ziolkowski (1993, 218-219) who argue for this reliability.
⁹ There are 3 references to Silvanus and 21 to Pan in Latin literature of the Republic.
Through a systematic examination of the primary texts I will argue that on Republican evidence alone we can date Faunus to mid to late first century BCE. A major outcome of this chapter will be a better placement of Faunus and the fauns in the chronology of Roman history. I will argue that these deities play an important role in Roman negotiation of landscape and formation of identity and will begin by examining the references to the fauns where landscape features heavily in its formation. And as one of the main threads of my argument is that the fauns precede Faunus I will discuss them first in order to demonstrate my view of the chronology so crucial to the debate.

1.2 The fauns

Republican ideology was inextricably linked with the ideal of the farmer and the rustic landscape in the early bucolic works of Virgil. It is in these rural landscapes that we often find the fauns. It is significant that during Republican times from around 210 BCE until 29 BCE seven Romans including Cicero and Virgil, mention fauns in their works. An important issue regarding the use of these mostly first century Republican sources as evidence for any early period is that these authors have no first-hand, nor second-hand insight into the world of their distant ancestors. Although they did have access to earlier texts now lost to us, even the earliest authors of Latin literature can at the earliest be dated to the second half of the third century BCE (Wiseman, 2004, 84).

We will see that in poetry and prose just on the cusp of the empire there are already signs of a nostalgic point of view which celebrates the values of the pastoral and the role the rustic deities play to underpin early Roman identity. My analysis will focus on establishing the nature of these fauns. A chief characteristic of the fauns during the Republican period is that they appear to be disembodied voices in the landscape. Does the vocal or oracular characteristic of the fauns afford them an important status or place them in a higher class of divinity? Their physical characteristics are not described and remain elusive, so is it possible that the fauns at this time were invisible spirits?

10 References from Cincius, Ennius, Lucilius, Lucretius, Cicero, Varro and Virgil will be included. See chronology in Appendix 1 for details of works from the discussion.
11 As indicated later in this chapter (1.3), Wiseman argues for using Republican and later sources in his Unwritten Rome.
Nettleship (1885, 52) claimed that the *fauni* evolve from seers of early rustic communities into unreal beings speaking with unearthly voices in the recesses of mountain and forest until they finally were identified with the *panes* and *satyroi* due to the Hellenisation of Italian mythology.\(^\text{12}\) Similarly, Warde Fowler (1899, 263) suggested that the *fauni* were deities who came into being with the first Italian farmers who encountered a ‘wild aboriginal race of the hills and woods’.\(^\text{13}\) In my view the fauns need not be rationalised in this way, since they might seem to be little more than disembodied voices in the late Republic.

In Ovid’s *Heroides* (4.49) published around 15 BCE that the fauns are given clear physical characteristics. I suspect that the fauns have been given the physical attribute *bicornes* two-horned due to the syncretism of Pan with Faunus and to the obvious associations with Greek myth in this passage, such as Mount Ida and the dryads.

> quaerque sub Idaeo tympana colle mouent,
> aut quas semideae Dryades Faunique bicornes
> numine contactas attonuere suo.

*Ov. Her. 4.48-50*

and those who shake tambourines at the foot of Ida’s hill, or whom the semi-divine Dryads and two-horned Fauns have affected with their own divinity and stunned.

The fauns have taken on the characteristics of the satyrs who were male companions of Pan. Likewise, Ovid’s *Heroides* and *Fasti* are alone amongst works in Latin literature in their use of *bicornis* and *corniger* horned in application to Faunus.\(^\text{14}\)

Warde Fowler (1899, 265) also argues that for the Italians, Faunus was never a real god but one of an early race of super-humans somewhere between human and

---

\(^{12}\) Harrison’s article (2007, 112-117) on the progressive, modern and outward-looking nature of Nettleship’s scholarship may help to alleviate any concerns about its use here regarding colonial authority from a post-colonial, anthropological and sociological perspective.

\(^{13}\) Despite the age of this source and criticism of Warde Fowler’s evolutionary theory of Roman religion from animism to anthropomorphism, the use of this scholar’s work is still acknowledged in more recent scholarship and so necessary to the discussion here (Beard, North and Price Vol I, 1998, 13-14), (Scullard, 1981, 12).

divine. This evolutionary notion is supported by Rosivach (1980, 140) and Papaioannou (2003, 698) who suggest that Faunus, Picus and Marica could all have been human once.\textsuperscript{15} While I find the evolutionary argument highly speculative I do agree that the fauns precede Faunus as spirits of the countryside. Nisbet and Rudd (2004, 219) are of the opinion that this makes sense in the context of Roman religion because the \textit{fauni} are more nebulous beings.\textsuperscript{16}

1.2.1 Ennius \textit{Annales}

A fragment dated between 200 and 169 BCE\textsuperscript{17}, from Ennius’ \textit{Annales} is the first reference to fauns in extant Latin literature. Later authors Cicero, Varro, Quintilian and the writer of \textit{Origo Gentis Romanae} quote the first two lines from this passage in their various works. The line \textit{uorsibus quos olim faunei uatesque caneabant} is one of the most frequently cited surviving fragments of Ennius’ \textit{Annales} (7.206-207).\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{center}
\begin{verbatim}
scripsere alii rem
Uorsibus quos olim Faunei uatesque caneabant

[cum] neque Musarum scopulos …
Nec dicti studiosus [quisquam erat] ante hunc
\end{verbatim}
\end{center}

\textit{Enn. Ann. 7.206-209}

Others have written of the matter [the first Punic War]\textsuperscript{19} in verses which once fauns and prophets used to sing [when] neither the rough rocks of the Muses … nor [was anyone] learned in speaking before him.\textsuperscript{20}

The \textit{fauni} are ancient and their oracular associations are also evident at a time when there was still no development of physical characteristics in literature. The use of \textit{olim} here emphasises that the \textit{fauni} belong to the past. In seeking to

\textsuperscript{15} For further elaboration see Chapter 3.2 of this thesis.
\textsuperscript{16} The ‘context of Roman religion’ will be illuminated near the close of this chapter (1.3.5) in the discussion of Virgil’s \textit{Georgics}.
\textsuperscript{17} It is most likely that Ennius composed the \textit{Annales} in the 170s BCE and probably started them earlier than the late 180s, sometime after 200 (Kenney, 1981, 65-66).
\textsuperscript{18} See Goldschmidt (2013, 4, 17-28) for the reception of Ennius in the first century BCE.
\textsuperscript{19} Cicero, \textit{Brutus} 75.
\textsuperscript{20} See Wiseman (2006, 514-522) for the importance of this passage in Varro, Cicero and others, and for the relationship between prophecy and \textit{carmen}. 
distance himself from other early tragedians such as Naevius\(^{21}\), more predecessors than contemporaries, Ennius assists us in establishing the ancient nature of the fauns (Erasmo, 2004, 20).\(^{22}\) I agree with Wiseman in his reading of these lines: Gnaeus Naevius is relegated to a lesser class because he employed a meter appropriate to the pre-literary world (Wiseman, 2006, 514).\(^{23}\) The phrase *vorsibus quos olim* refers to the Saturnian verse, an archaic Italic meter. The Saturnian as ‘old fashioned Italic relic’ also asserts the antiquity of the fauns (Parsons, 1999, 134).\(^{24}\) While Skutsch (1985, 371-7) argues that *Faunei* is contemptuous for ‘Faunus representing the primitive and uncivilised past’, I agree with Cornell that the plural here indicates the fauns rather than the generalising plural.\(^{25}\)

The juxtaposition of the fauns here with the first Punic War is relevant to Roman identity as this victory after such a long drawn-out engagement (23 years) made them empire builders; Rome won the new province of Sardinia and Sicily and began to look further afield (Lazenby, 1996, 171-5).\(^{26}\) The fauns are associated with early forms of poetry in the context of moments of crisis, Roman victory and progress. They are linked to the recording of Roman achievements. When later authors such as Cicero, Varro, Quintilian and the writer of *Origo Gentis Romanae* quote this fragment, they reinforce the antiquity of the fauns.

**Cicero Brutus**

To take *Brutus* first, Cicero seems to suggest that the landscape is difficult to navigate.

```
quid, nostri ueteres uersus ubi sunt?

‘quos olim fauni uatesque caneant
```

\(^{21}\) See Cicero, *Brutus* 75-6). *As scripsere alii* is likely an anonymous plural, of contempt, then only Naevius is meant (Skutsch, 1985, 37).

\(^{22}\) Ennius arrived in Rome 204 BCE; Livius was dead by 200 BCE and Naevius in exile about the time of Ennius’ arrival. Ennius distanced himself from the Saturnian metre of ‘the fauns and the vates’ (Wiseman, 2008, 268).

\(^{23}\) This point is emphasised in Cicero *Brutus* 71, discussed later in this chapter.

\(^{24}\) Literary disdain for the Saturnian verse from Ennius on is well known and Parsons provides examples from Ennius *Annales*, Vergil *Georgics* and Horace *Epistulae* (Parsons, 199, 134 note 44).

\(^{25}\) Cornell (2014, pers. Comm., 6 May) agrees that the *fauni* are intended here rather than a generalising plural which would intend Faunus. Cornell (1986, 244-250) reviewed Skutsch’s 1985 edition.

\(^{26}\) See Polybios 3.28.2, 70.6-9, 79.1-4, 88.8-12. Also see Lazenby for a detailed discussion of the war and its implications for empire building.
cum neque Musarum scopulos …
nece dicti studiosus quisquam erat ante hunc’

Cic. Brut. 71.6-9
Why, where are our ancient verses? ‘Which once fauns and prophets used to sing, when neither the rough rocks of the Muses … nor was anyone learned in speaking before him’

tamen illius, quem in uatibus et faunis adnumerat Ennius,
bellum Punicum quasi Myronis opus delectat.

Cic. Brut. 75.5-6
Nevertheless, the Punic War of that man [of Naevius] whom Ennius counts among the prophets and Fauns, gives delight as if a work of Myron.

The landscape in the first passage from Brutus above is one difficult to negotiate, because of its scopulos ‘rocks’, the bane of farmers. The scopuli belong to the Muses, but the presence of the fauns in this passage may hint at an Italian landscape. Purcell (1996, 184-189) explores the link between Roman imperialism and the power over landscape, stressing the close relationship of the physical landscape with religion and ideology. In this passage from Brutus the heights are lofty, close to the gods. The Romans yearn to either conquer or to become a part of that ethereal landscape. The association of the fauni with poetry before the introduction of the hexamter to Italy emphasises the antiquity of the fauns.

Cicero Orator
The use of antiquis in close proximity to the line quoted from Ennius to describe the writers also reinforces the ancient nature of the fauns themselves. It is even more telling that uetera is used in reference to poetry associated with the fauns.

Ergo Ennio licuit uetera contemmenti
dicere ‘uersibus quos olim fauni uatesque caneant,’

27 The rough rocks echo Lucretius’ reference to the isolated locale of mountainous regions (4.575); see this chapter 1.2.4.
28 I believe this to be describing a Roman landscape to some extent, despite the fact that the rocks of the Muses could be an allusion to Mount Helicon, the legendary home of the Muses.
mihi de antiquis eodem modo non licebit?

Cic. Orat. 171.4-6

Therefore since it was allowed to Ennius, in contempt to say ‘in verses which once the fauns and prophets used to sing’, am I not permitted in the same manner [to speak] about the ancients?

We see a tension between the critiquing by Ennius of verses of old and that allowed to Cicero. This is telling of the environment in which Cicero and others were working and by extension to some extent reflective of the Romans themselves. But what understanding do we gain about the fauns from Cicero’s comment? Here he seems to associate them with a primitive and rustic past.

Cicero De divinatione
In this passage from Cicero’s De divinatione the ancient nature of the fauns’ relationship with their oracular powers is strengthened, emphasised by their association with Marcius and Publicius.

‘Uersibus, quos olim fauni uatesque caneabant.’

Similiter Marcius et Publicius uates cecinisse dicuntur;

Cic. Div. 1.114-115

‘In verses which once fauns and prophets used to sing.’ The prophets Marcius and Publicius are said to have prophesised in a similar way;

Marcius and Publicius are brothers for whom we have no date; they belong to the legendary period (Pease, 1963, 253). The Marci, described as nobili loco nati, belonged to the great plebeian gens (consular from 357 BCE).29 Wiseman (1991, 118f.) suggests that Marcius and Publicius probably date back to the first college of plebeian augurs in 300 BCE.

Varro De lingua Latina
Varro’s On the Latin Language, a grammatical treatise written between 46 and 44 BCE, has also been cited by scholars as Republican evidence for Faunus. While this passage may contain the only reference to ‘Faunus’ (nominative singular case) from Republican times it is equally likely that the fauni are really the intended focus here and once again they are indigenous, ancient and oracular.

---

29 Wiseman (1994, 59). Livy (6.1.6) says a Cn Marcius was tribunus plebis in 389 BCE.
Goldschmidt (2013, 56-7) argues that according to Varro’s etymology, the *fauni* were criticised for primitivism and superstition as the poets of old were criticised in the *Annales* and that as gods they are associated with the earliest Latin poetry. This association is important to the current discussion as it provides support to the idea that they were ancient and preceded Faunus. There is, however, another way to read the passage and the role of the word ‘Faunus’:

_uersibus quos olim fauni uatesque canebant. Fauni dei Latinorum, ita ut et Faunus et Fauna sit; hos uersibus quos uocant Saturnios in siliestribus locis traditum est solitos fari <futura, a> quo fando Faunos dictos. antiqui poetas uates appellabant a uersibus uiendis, ut <de> poematis cum scribam ostendam._

Varro Ling. 7.36

In verses which once the fauns and the poets used to sing. Fauns, gods of the Latins, so that there are Faunus and Fauna both; it is passed down that these entities in the verses they call Saturnian were accustomed in wooded spots to speak <things that are about to come> from which utterances they were called *fauni*. The ancients used to call poets ‘*uates*’ from weaving verses ‘*viere*’, as I will show when I write <about> poetry.

In this passage Varro may simply be stating that the fauns can be either of male or female gender (a linguistic point), which suggests that line 2 may in fact not be a reference to the individual deity Faunus. Warde Fowler (1899, 260), quotes line 2 of this fragment and suggests that Faunus evolved from the *fauni*. Wissowa (1884-1937, 1.1454-60) argues that Faunus is a single deity, rejecting the multiple deity notion suggested by his contemporaries. To suggest, as Wiseman (2004, 76), does that ‘Faunus could be thought of as an individual or as one of a race of creatures called fauns’ is an over-simplification of the issue of chronology surrounding Faunus and the fauns. According to Wiseman (2006, 518) Varro uses the plural to indicate that ‘Faunus’ and ‘Fauna’ are two individual deities and not

---

30 In post-Varronian Latin *uates* can also mean ‘poet’ because part of the prophet’s role was assumed by the poets of early Roman literature. Virgil and other Augustan poets since influenced by Varro’s interpretation of *uates* took the word to mean poets (Newman, 1967, 99-206).

31 See Warde Fowler (1888, 310) for a review of Wissowa’s article on Faunus in Roscher’s *Mythological Lexicon* which also cites disagreement with Wissowa’s identification as Faunus as the god of the Lupercal and the etymology of Faunus from *fauero*.
that the *fauni* can simply be of either male or female gender. Varro is primarily concerned with word forms, not the nature of the gods, so the possibility of many fauns rather than individual deities cannot altogether be denied. Even Servius’ fourth century commentary on Virgil’s *Georgics* 1.11 cites this same passage in support of the pluralisation of the fauns. This provides no further evidence that Faunus the individual deity is intended here. Fantham (2009, 19) points out that Varro fails to include Faunus or Fauna among the gods in his *Res Rusticae* or in his discussion of the Lupercalia, which provides further evidence for a reading of fauns in the plural here. In short this fragment provides no satisfactory evidence that Faunus was an independent deity at this stage.

This passage highlights the divine and indigenous nature of these beings. *Deus* is used to suggest a more important divinity: the fauns appear more god-like and less like the other inhabitants of the woods such as nymphs or satyrs. *Silvestribus locis* here clearly places the fauns in the landscape and it is a woodland or forested setting which can also indicate a rural environ or wilderness customarily inhabited by the fauns. That the fauns are gods of the Latins suggests that in Varro’s time these deities were already considered ancient. Varro’s reference to the Latins, the earliest inhabitants of Rome from about 1000 BCE suggests that a link to antiquity was an important notion for a sense of Roman identity. The desire to prove their antiquity appears strong for the Romans, which may explain their desire to establish the antiquity of their deities as well.

Varro’s use of *uates*, ‘poets’, other archaic words and the reference to the Saturnian metre further indicates the indigenous nature of the fauns. This line serves as an early reminder of the ancient oracular powers of the fauns, powers which Faunus inherits. The link between poetry and prophecy was probably understood from the mid-third century BCE (Santangelo, 2013, 153). It is through their oracular capabilities that the fauns assist the Romans in relating to

---

32 It is generally agreed that the Latins were among the earliest tribes who inhabited Latium on the west coast of central Italy just south of the Tiber, now Campagna di Roma. From 600 BCE Rome was the most powerful Latin state. In *The Beginnings of Rome*, Cornell (1995, 48-57) describes early Latium from the end of the sixth century BCE and shows the extent of the Roman city state in this period (204-208).

33 See Erasmo’s *Archaic Latin Verse* for an understanding of the *carmen*, its influence on the development of the Saturnian verse such as Livius Andronicus, Naevius and Ennius and particularly page 8 for use of archaic vocabulary by Augustan poets such as Horace in his *Odes*. 
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their landscapes. They speak from places that may appear ominous or unnegotiable (terrain that is rough or thick with trees).

For Ennius, Cicero and Varro, the fauns are ancient and oracular. Their reference to the Ennius line asserts the importance of ‘divination and prophecy in Roman intellectual debate’ (Santangelo, 2013, 153). Cicero lays emphasis on an isolated and rocky environment, while Varro highlights a woodland setting and their status as gods of the Latins who are of either gender.

1.2.2 Lucilius Satires

For Lucilius who writes after Ennius but before Lucretius, Cicero and Varro, the fauns retain their characteristic antiquity and along with Numa, are institutors of the nightmare-inducing female monsters, the lamiae. They no longer possess oracular capabilities, but their association with Numa may recoup any perceived loss of status. Lactantius Div. Instit., 1.22.13 introduces this text and as a Christian writer is likely to be hostile regarding pagan beliefs. Lactantius attacks Pompilius, Roman religion and the rites of Faunus (McDonald, 1964, 89-90). Lucilius appears to ridicule belief in gods here, but since it is a fragment we do not know whose spoke the words in the original poem (Keane, 2010, 27). This ca. 130 BCE passage from Lucilius’ Satires is about the terror-inciting lamiae; these female monsters (witches or bogies) were supposed to devour children.

Like the fauni, the lamiae have not been seen, so their physical appearance remains a mystery. Here is the passage in Lactantius:

Lucilius eorum stultitiam, qui simulacra deos putant esse, deridet his uersibus.
Terriculas, Lamias, Fauni quas Pompiliique instituere Numae, tremit has, hic omnia ponit.

34 See Cicero, Brutas, 107, Velleius 2.9.3-4, Valerius Maximus 3.7.11, Gellius, 17.21.49 and Jerome 160.2. Conte, 1994, 744, dates the publication of the first books to this date. The latest internal references allude to events of 107 BCE. Also see Freudenburg, 2001, xii; Raschke, 1979, 78-89; Drury, 1982, 828-9.

35 See OLD, 1968, 998, 1 for this definition. Keane, (2010, 27) identifies Lamia as a mythical witch who abducted and devoured children. The commentator is presumably referring to the Lamia in the fourth to third century BCE Greek historian Duris, FGTh 76 F 17. The lamiae may have been monsters represented as blood-sucking witches, hags, and vampires or similar, much like a bogeyman, but with female head and breasts and lower body of an ass or a serpent (Evans, 1857, 336 note 1). Also see Leopardi (1855, 103) for Meursius (1599) Exercit. crit. Par. 1 to Plaut. Truculent Act. II, Seen. 2, v. 20, who reads Lamiae haec sunt from an old codex in support of their characteristics of blood sucking and eating children alive.

36 Leopardi (1855, 103) emphasises the unknown nature of the physical appearance of the lamiae.
Ut pueri infantes credunt signa omnia aena
uiuere et esse homines, sic isti somnia ficta
uera putant, credunt signis cor inesse in aenis.
Pergula pictorum, ueri nihil, omnia ficta.

Lucil. 15.19

Lucilius, in these verses, laughs at the silliness of those who regard images as gods. The terrors, lamiae, which the fauns and descendants of Numa instituted, he trembles at these, he places everything on this. Just as little children believe all statues of bronze are alive and are human, so those men believe false dreams are true, believe there is a heart inside these bronze statues. Like the framework of painters, nothing is real, all is fake.

In this attack on those who believe in the ancient superstitions, the fauni are clearly identified as ancient as they supposedly invented these tales with the descendants of Numa Pompilius, the second legendary king of Rome. This association dates the fauns to the seventh, possibly eighth century BCE. Numa is credited with organising state religion and this attack is questioning some of that institution (Ab urbe condita 1.19-22). The attack on believers of the ancient superstitions is also an attack on the fauns and those who set them up and an understandable one if they were instituted as Livy suggests; as a means to control the mob through the fear of gods (Ab urbe condita 1.19.4).

The act of instituting the lamiae can be regarded as a religious act with social and political consequences, especially when we consider Numa’s role as king. When associated with seers and other humans such as Numa, we are invited to envisage that the fauns possess more human-like characteristics. Perhaps these traits enable them to interact in a meaningful way in the more socially and politically imbued landscape of ‘civilisation’, allowing Romans to more easily relate to these ancient, at times prophetic, possibly disembodied, spirits.

How does the presence of the fauns in early Latin literature impact Roman civilisation at a time when the role of Hellenisation was part of the socio-political discourse? According to Freudenburg (2001, 1-3) Lucilius expresses disgust at Rome’s Hellenisation from the very first book of the Satires, an attitude important to establishing how some Romans viewed the influences on their identity. In
opposition to this approach, Gruen (1992, 274, 283, 291) suggests that Lucilius’ attitude is not an expression of anti-Hellenic, but an objection against the excesses resulting from the elite’s confrontation with it, their falling short of the ideals and wished to assault the pretentious who ‘cultivated Greek philosophy and then descended into puerile polemic’. There may be irony in the presence of the fauns in this ancient and indigenous context as part of Lucilius’ assault on Hellenism; or it may be Lucilius is asserting their presence.

1.2.3 Gellius Noctes Atticae
We find further evidence for the fauns as ancient in Gellius’ Noctes Atticae. The singular god Faunus does not rate a mention. The indigenous nature of the fauns is emphasised in two passages which mention these deities alongside the aborigines. Conte (1994, 761) dates the Attic Nights to 169 CE or just before, so we can see that the idea of the fauns as ancient deities was one which persists.

Ibi ille amicus ridens: ‘amabo te,’ inquit
‘uir bone, quia nunc mihi a magis seriis rebus otium est,
uelim doceas nos, cur “pluria” siue “compluria”-nilih
enim differt-non Latine, sed barbare dixerint M. Cato, Q.
Claudius, Valerius Antias, L. Aelius, P. Nigidius, M. Uarro,
quos subscriptores approbatoresque huius uerbi habemus
praeter poetarum oratorumque uerborum multam copiam.’
Atque ille nimis arroganter: ‘tibi’ inquit, ‘habeas auctori-
tates istas ex Faunorum et Aboriginum saeculo repetitas
atque huic rationi respondeas.

Gell. NA 5.21.6

Thereupon that friend of mine laughing said: “Please, good man, because I am at peace from more serious affairs I wish you would tell me why there is ‘pluria’ and ‘compluria’ for there is no difference, not in Latin, but they have been used incorrectly by Marcus Cato, Quintus Claudius, Valerius Antias, Lucius Aelius, Publius Nigidius, and Marcus Varro, whom we have as endorsers and sanctioners of this word, besides a great number of the ancient poets and orators.” And he said too arrogantly: “You can have these authorities dug up from the age of the Fauns and Aborigines, but what is your answer to this rule?”
The context of the first reference to the fauns in this passage is a grammatical debate on the use of the word *pluria* and *compluria*. That Gellius names his sources adds an air of authenticity to the representation of the fauns in this passage. In spite of the fact that Gellius lists mainly late Republican writers, it is the respondent’s answer which proclaims that in Roman minds the fauns are sprung from the earliest times. The fauns are disparagingly relegated to the earliest of ages, that of the *Aborigines* through the tone of the speaker.


Gell. *NA* 16.10.6

We ask therefore you to consider that one of the annals of Quintus Ennius is not being read now, but the *Twelve Tables* and how you would interpret what is “*proletariate* citizen” in that law.’ ‘It is true,’ that man said, ‘that if I had learned the law of the fauns and the *aborigines*, I ought to explain and interpret this. But since *proletarii, adsidui, sanates, uades, sub-uades*, “twenty-five asses,” “retaliation,” and trials for theft “by plate and girdle” have vanished, and because all the ancient laws of the *Twelve Tables* except in the legal questions reported in claims of the centumviri were put to sleep by Aebutian law, I ought to provide study and knowledge of laws and bills and our decrees, which we use.’

Ennius’ *Annales*, the Twelve Tables and a definition of *proletarius* serve as the context for the second reference to the fauns in the *Attic Nights*. Livy (3.33-34) describes the creation of the Twelve Tables and dates them to the mid-fifth
century BCE. Gellius’ references back to the Twelve Tables and the past prepares for us to do the same regarding the fauns and the *aborigines*. *Faunuorum et Aboriginum* is well-posed approximately two lines in between *Annalem nunc Q. Ennius, sed Duodecim Tabulas* and *Duodecim Tabularum antiquitas*. The Twelve Tables are described with the noun *antiquitas*, which reinforces the antiquity or longevity of the law of the fauns and *aborigines*. Even more significant is that the fauns are associated with the creation of the most ancient type of law.

1.2.4 Lucretius *De rerum natura*

For Lucretius who writes after Ennius and Lucilius but before Cicero, the fauns seem to have lost their potency while their relationship to the physical landscape has strengthened. The fauns who are depicted by Ennius and Lucilius as ancient beings no longer retain this aspect as part of their characterisation in Lucretius. They have lost the status and seriousness of prophecy and association with religious institution and are now seen as sporting and playful in the woodland setting. This is apt for a work which takes a negative view of *religio* and the burden of *pietas* (1.81).

In *De rerum natura* (4.575-589) the noisy fauns inhabit the hills, where their voices echo in valleys for all to hear. Lucretius suggests that the sounds echoing from mountainous regions gave rise to the legend of the fauns. Although not oracular in this passage, their vocal characterisation is still apparent in their association with voices and other sounds echoing from the mountainous region. These echoes result from particles sent out from voices which hit the rocks and mountains before they reach the ears (568-79). Gale’s (2005, 444) argument that Lucretius seeks to neutralise mythological content through scientific explanation, in order to demonstrate that ‘elements of the natural world are neither animate nor controlled by the gods’ can help us to understand this passage.

```plaintext
quae bene cum uideas, rationem reddere possis
tute tibi atque aliis, quo pacto per loca sola
saxa paris formas uerborum ex ordine reddant,
palantis comites cum montis inter opacos
quaerimus et magna dispersos uoce ciemus.
sex etiam aut septem loca uidi reddere uoces,
```

575
When you see this well, you may be able to provide an explanation to yourself and others, how rocks in uninhabited places report back the same forms of words in proper order when we are searching for companions wandering in shaded mountains and we call out to those scattered with a great voice. I have seen places returning six or even seven voices, when you sent one: thus do the hills themselves to hills beat back and repeat the words that are taught to return. Neighbours imagine that goat-footed satyrs and nymphs live in these places and they generally say there are fauns, whose night-wandering noises and sportive play break the voiceless silence (and they say that) there are sounds of strings and sweet laments which the flute pours forth, touched by the fingers of the players, and far and wide the country folk listen, while Pan shaking the pine garland on his half-beast head, often runs over open reeds with his curving lips so that the pipe may never cease to pour out the woodland song.

The fauns are neither labelled *deus nor numina*, but their presence in the landscape is clear. The environment is sparsely populated by people, shaded and hilly. The shade implies trees where we often find the fauns and the hills recall the earliest settlement of the first Italic peoples. As Nichols (1976, 92) suggests, in this passage gods are consolation in lonely places and need not be frightening. Although the fauns are not frightening here, they are associated with night time
and with the disruption of the tranquil silence of the landscape; perhaps there is an element of fear which looks back to the expression of fear of Nature at 3.950. In the passage above the fauns are deeply embedded in a natural and rustic landscape; the connection between them and their environment is undeniable. Evidently the fauns are represented as lesser deities, when they inhabit the natural, untouched or remote landscape.

This representation of the wild locales of the countryside as haunts of gods and demi-gods is a familiar one in Latin literature. The inhabitants of these places are presented as believing that the gods and other creatures live in such places. So these types of landscapes evoke the presence of divinity, asserted through the inclusion of natural features such as mountains and wooded groves (Newby, 2012, 355-357). In such references the sanctity with which Romans viewed nature is clear. This is true despite Lucretius’ rationalisation of the popular belief in nymphs, satyrs, fauns and the god Pan (Bailey, 1947, 1247-8). In this passage we see the characteristic use of Pan rather than Faunus as the preferred deity by most of the authors of the Republican period.

So far we have seen three different portrayals of the fauns in Latin literature of the Republican period. In Ennius the fauns are associated with an archaic Saturnian metre they shared with prophets, in Lucilius they are the institutors of superstitious beliefs in the lamiae and in Lucretius the fauns are an invention of near mountain-dwellers as a type of anthropomorphism of echoes and other noises. They may be dancing as in the Georgics (to be discussed later in this chapter 1.2.8), or ‘playfully sporting’ in Lucretius, but the stronger the connection to the uncivilised landscape, the less potent the fauns appear. They are still making noise, but it is joyful or mischievous (or, at the most, disruptive) and there is no mention of oracular powers or explicit composing or reciting of poetry.

1.2.5 Cicero De natura deorum

In his dialogue on philosophy and religion, De natura deorum, Cicero’s Lucilius also mentions the uoces ‘voices’ or ‘speaking’ as well as the divine nature of the fauns’ prophetic powers. The context is a discussion about the nature of the gods

37 Ovid, Amores, 3.1.1-4; Seneca, Epistles, 41.3; Statius, Silvae, 2.3.
38 Their noise may be an allusion to the fauns’ oracular capabilities as a distant memory from previous passages in which they appear.
between the Epicurean Gaius Velleius, the Stoic Lucilius Balbus and the Academic Gaius Cotta. The ineffable nature of the fauns here is representative of how the gods were understood in this work.\textsuperscript{39}

Saepe Faunorum uoces exauditae, saepe uisae formae
deorum quemuis aut non hebetem aut impium deos
praesentes esse confiteri coegerunt.

Cic. \textit{Nat. D. 2.6.17}

Often voices of the Fauns have been heard plainly, often forms of the gods have been seen, compelling anyone neither feeble-witted nor impious to admit that the gods are present.

This passage juxtaposes the ideas of belief in and actual evidence of the existence of the gods. We see confirmation of the divine nature of the fauns already mentioned by Varro, writing at around the same time, but in this passage from Cicero their divine nature seems quite ethereal.\textsuperscript{40}

In the next passage from \textit{De natura deorum} we see a confirmation of the disembodiment suggested in the previous passage. In response to Balbus (in the passage below) Cotta alludes to the oral capabilities of the fauns in his ignorance of their existence and of their form. The fact that he takes Balbus at his word suggests that the voices of the fauns have indeed been heard. I think that although Cotta does not have personal experience of the fauns, he does not outright deny their existence. The fauns are difficult to identify and in Cicero’s day the attributes of a faun were unknown. Are the fauns disembodied spirits, with their oracular powers as the focus?\textsuperscript{41}

Nam Fauni uocem equidem numquam audiui; tibi,
si audiuisses te dicis, credam, etsi Faunus omnino quid
sit nescio.

Cic \textit{Nat. D. 3.15.12}

\textsuperscript{39} See this work 2.28.70 where Cicero discusses the perversion of the imagery of the gods and describes this behaviour as foolish.

\textsuperscript{40} Pease’s (1958, 560) identification of Faunus rather than the fauns here is implausible particularly when the Lucretian passage (already discussed) where the fauns are pluralised is included in the sources he cites.

\textsuperscript{41} It is not until Ovid’s \textit{Heroides} (4.49) composed 25-16 BCE that the fauns are given physical characteristics, as observed earlier in this chapter 1.2.
Moreover for my part I have never heard the voice of a faun; but if you say you have heard one, I will believe you, although I certainly do not know what a Faun is.

The use of these verbs, *uocem, audiui* and *audiuisse*, alludes to the oracular capabilities of the fauns. This relates back to the use of *uoces* in the previous passage. Together the two passages suggest that the fauns had no physical embodiment and were simply ‘voices’. The first passage from *De natura deorum* seems to confirm the status of the fauns as divinities, but then the second almost questions their existence altogether.

**1.2.6 Cicero De divinatione**

A further passage from Cicero’s *De divinatione* clearly mentions the oracular powers of the fauns, but now with primary emphasis on the reliability of their prophecies. Ennius made clear the oracular association of the fauns, to which Cicero alludes in this passage through the use of *ex occulto* ‘from hidden places’. That the voices are heard and the speakers are unseen in this passage is suggestive of the disembodied spirits already identified in Ennius’ *Annales*.

> Saepe etiam et in proeliis Fauni auditi et in rebus turbidis
> ueridicae uoces ex occulto missae esse dicuntur ;
> 
> Cic. *Div.* 1.101

Often also fauns are said both to have been heard in battle and in troubled times truthful voices have been sent from hidden places;

There is a clear indication in this passage of the fauns’ prophetic function during war in Roman history, affirming a connection between the fauns and war which is evident in another example discussed in this chapter\(^{42}\) (Hraste & Vukovic, 2011, 113). The helpful advice given in times of great need comes from hidden, mysterious or secret places, likely from the untamed countryside or the depths of a thickly-forested wood. Pease (1963, 279) acknowledges Cicero’s allusion to the Lucretius passage we have already examined (4.575-589) and relegates the ‘physical origin’ of the sounds here to a lesser category than those ascribed to Faunus. This relegation is due to an emphasis on the echoing of the landscape through natural features such as wind either in the open or in the branches of trees.

\(^{42}\) *Brut.* 75.5-6.
So in Cicero when we take *ex occulto* to mean ‘hidden’ or ‘mysterious places in the landscape’ we see an echo of the isolated location inhabited by the fauns in Lucretius, and in Cicero’s own *Brutus*. I view the fauns as powerful still since such landscapes are precisely those with which the Romans needed assistance to negotiate successfully.

Wiseman (2006, 518) suggests that here Cicero sees the plural *fauni* as a collective lot of ‘half-gods’ because he fails to use *deus* as Varro did earlier. As stated previously, I agree that *deus* does indeed emphasise that a god rather than a half-god is intended. I am not as confident that the failure to use the descriptor negates the divine nature of the fauns completely, particularly when their prophetic powers are presented as unquestionable and also because no ‘lesser’ term such as *numina* is used in this context.43

As part of the pro-religious message in the *De divinatione* the fauns are depicted as credible prophetic entities. *De divinatione* presents arguments for and against divination in equal fashion. Momigliano (1984, 209) points out that *De divinatione* is overtly pro-religion and anti-divination, while *De natura deorum* is pro-religion and *auspicia* (divination) but denies the existence of the gods. We have seen in the first passage of *De natura deorum* an acknowledgement of the gods, but by the second passage scepticism is revealed as far as the fauns are concerned. Scholars like Momigliano (1984, 209) posit that the Roman upper class faced ‘revolutionary’ events between 60 and 40 BCE44 and that it was in this atmosphere that some of the Roman intellectuals began to think far more seriously about religion. It is interesting that the fauns form part of the discourse.

While Cicero was becoming more sceptical, Caesar and his close followers were becoming more interested in exploring religious questions. Although Cicero was an Academic and deplored Stoicism’s superstition, he liked other facets and he was no sceptic, not always accepting their conclusions on theology or religion (McGregor & Ross, 1972, 33-34). As we will see in the following chapter there is a significant difference between the Caesarean and Augustan ages; poets

---

43 See this chapter 1.2.8 for a discussion of the term *numina* where I suggest that this term indicates a less important deity.
44 These ‘revolutionary’ events included a series of conquests in Spain, Asia, Gaul, Britain and Egypt.
represented the new age. Poets lead the way in defining Faunus in the same way as historians, orators and philosophers did for the fauns during Republican times.

1.2.7 Virgil *Eclogues*

Virgil’s *Eclogues* are a Roman version of Greek *Bucolica* and in this case are a dramatic and mythic interpretation of revolutionary change in Rome during the turbulent period between roughly 44 and 38 BCE. Virgil deploys an Arcadian perspective which features shepherds with Greek names and a Hellenic landscape as a backdrop for discussion of Roman issues after decades of civil war (Spencer, 2010, 14). The *Eclogues* also owe a debt to Theocritus as some of them are modelled on his *Idylls*. The landscapes in the *Eclogues* contain elements both natural and of poetic artificiality; real and symbolic (Boyle, 1986, 19). We see in the *Eclogues* a veneration of the pastoral; Romans seeking ‘regeneration through communication with an ancient source of virtue’ expressed in the agricultural life and desire to return to nature (Leach, 1974, 66). For Leach (1974, 217) the essential myth of pastoral is man’s troubled quest for a renewal of identity. In *Eclogues* 3, 4, 6 and 8, Virgil uses the soldier and poet Gallus in the hope that pastoral values will permeate into the troubled urban landscape (Boyle, 1986, 30). Rutherford sees *Eclogue* 6 as part of Virgil’s transitioning from being under the influence of Hellenistic poetry and Epicureanism (anti-political, anti-didactic poetry for poetry’s sake) to a need to confront issues of contemporary warfare and politics in his poetry, as a result of the damaging effects of land confiscation and civil war (1989, 44, 46). The ‘nostalgic-soaked rural aesthetics’ of the *Eclogues* ‘gain political bite and a public edge, setting city and country on a collision course’ (Spencer, 2010, 14). This is all relevant to the Roman state of mind, Roman concerns and Roman psyche of this period during which the fauns feature in Latin literature.

*Eclogue* 6, a poem about Virgil’s own poetry and that of his friend Cornelius Gallus, was composed ca. 39/38 BCE (Rutherford, 1989, 42). There is still no sign of Faunus the individual deity, but the fauns are present and they are most like those which Lucretius describes in *De rerum natura* 4.575-589. In this *Eclogue* Virgil’s Silenus has been trapped by two boys, Chromis and Mnasyllus, who demand a song, so he is forced to respond by singing one. Silenus himself
has something in common with the fauns, as he is also part-animal with supernatural powers and knowledge about life and death:

simul incipit ipse.
tum uero in numerum Faunosque ferasque uideres
ludere, tum rigidas motare cacumina quercus;

Verg. Ecl. 6.26-28

At once he himself begins. Not only indeed you might see fauns and wild animals sporting in time, but also rigid oaks shake their tops;

Silenus stands apart from nature and exerts a creative power over it, as Virgil does with his verse, and is playful like the fauns (Segal, 1969, 417). Rutherford (1989, 45) identifies Silenus as a semi-divine figure who can spellbind his audience and enchant Nature itself: a parallel can be drawn with the fauns and their association with uates, canebant, deus and numina in the remote landscape. Silenus’ ability to enact some sort of power over the physical landscape is instant. As soon as he begins his song the fauns, animals and trees respond with dance and movement. The really interesting point here is that fauns are truly embedded in the landscape, being one with the trees and wild beasts and moving in kind to Silenus’ cue.

Segal (1971, 56, 60) argues that Chromis and Mnasyllus were fauns themselves and that this highlights the mythical nature of the setting where singing moves fauns, animals and trees.45 Putnam (1970, 201) sees landscape and spirit as one due to the interrelationship between the physical and metaphysical in Virgilian pastoral. Putnam (1970, 201-3) questions why Silenus is an appropriate prophet in place of Apollo and lists what he calls ‘credentials’ for the task such as uates ‘prophet’, skilled singer, knowledgeable on varied topics. To these credentials I would add the fact that Silenus seems most suited to the environment presented which is itself reminiscent of the landscape the oracular fauns inhabit.

Silenus’ song depicts confrontation between humans and nature and a deepening of bucolic’s involvement in human affairs (Leach, 1974, 235-6). By their inclusion in the song, the fauns play a role in the restoration of harmony between humans, god and nature. So there is a heightening of the relationship between humans and the landscape, a landscape inhabited by the fauns. Poetry, love and

---

45 According to Servius they are young shepherds or satyrs (Serv. Ecl. 6.13, 14, 24).
nature reconcile order and passion in Virgil’s description of the delicate and gentle beauty of the pastoral landscape (Segal, 1969, 424, 426). Just as in Lucretius, when they inhabit physical landscapes and are stripped of their god-like oracular potency, the fauns are sporting, dancing and in a woodland setting. Once more they are not labelled as either numen or deus, yet their interaction with the natural landscape is clear. The reference to quercus ‘oak’ shows that the fauns are associated with a woodland setting and the landscape also has a wildness or untamed and unyielding quality, as do some of the creatures who inhabit it (the feras). It would seem therefore that Virgil has favoured a representation that is much closer to that offered by Lucretius than that of Ennius, Lucilius, Cicero and Varro.

1.2.8 Virgil Georgics
Rustic treatises on the agrarian life to which all good Romans should aspire were valuable instruments in establishing identity in the complex politics of the late Republic (Becker & Terrenato, 2012, 5).46 Farming was the basis of civil life in Roman ideology and agricultural treatises could be a means by which one could discuss the state of the city itself (Green in Becker & Terrenato, 2012, 33, 43). Farming had traditionally produced the sort of men Rome needed most: good citizens and brave soldiers (Bodel in Becker & Terrenato, 2012, 52). In its description of the countryside, the Georgics promote the benefits of an ideal way of life in the country, for many in need of an escape from the pressures of urban living. The political and moral concerns of the Georgics focus upon the dignity of honest rural life over the wastefulness and destruction of war.

The underlying thesis of the Georgics is that agriculture is the underpinning of civilisation and the existence of civil communities (Lembke, 2005, xvi). Could this work foreshadow Augustus’ intention to renew the link between the Romans and their agricultural past just before he rose to power? Wilkinson (1950, 21) points out that when Virgil began the work there was no emperor nor any clear Augustan policy and that the passages praising Augustus in the Georgics must therefore have been written last. In the guise of a manual on farming, the Georgics seeks a renewal for Rome, after the pressures of Republican conquests and expansionism, civil wars and land confiscation. Virgil pays homage to

46 See Cato De agri cultura 160 BCE, Varro De re rustica 37 BCE and Virgil Georgics 29 BCE.
Hesiod, Greek Alexandrians and Lucretius in his poetry at a time when the rustic farmer was under threat from the new wealthy class who were buying up large estates to be farmed using slave labour.

et uos, agrestum praesentia numina, Fauni
(ferte simul Faunique pedem Dryadesque puellae:
Verg. G. 1.10-11
And you, fauns, ever-present deities of the rustics, (bring your feet together Fauns and Dryad girls:

In the *Georgics* the fauns are still in revelry. They are part of the physical landscape in which the rustics worship them as deities. The fauns are considered *numina* of the rustic people. They are ever present which suggests that they have constant influence in the lives of those who worshipped them. Because they are linked with their rustic followers and dancing in joyous celebration and *deus* is not used by Virgil, one can argue that the fauns are half-deities or lesser creatures.

*Numina* is a controversial term; in the early twentieth century, scholars of Roman religion associated the term with the earliest pre-anthropomorphic divinities which suggested an evolutionary process assisted by the importation of Greek gods.\(^{47}\) This anthropological theory was abandoned mid-last century and *numina* is now accepted as a ‘nod’, ‘the will of a divinity’, ‘divine power’ or even as a synonym of divinity.\(^{48}\) Beard, North and Price (1998, 2-3) suggest that Roman poets of the early Empire use the term to indicate divine presence in natural or man-made objects and reject the notion of animistic divinities evolving into anthropomorphic gods. Virgil includes the presence of *numina* in his poetic pictures of the countryside, which are considered the literary counterpart of landscape painting (Wilkinson, 1978, 13-14). The only time the term *numina* is used to describe the fauns in Republican literature is in the current passage under discussion.\(^{49}\)

\(^{47}\) See Warde Fowler (1911, 1-63); Rose (1926) 43-62; Rose (1948, 9-49); Dumezil (1970, 18-46).
\(^{48}\) See John Scheid’s entry in the *OCD* 3rd rev. ed. for the changing nature of the term *numen*.
\(^{49}\) Indeed the earliest first century BCE passages which include *numina* are set in the context of divine associations or intentions. See Cicero, *De divinatione* 2.63.14, Lucretius, *De rerum natura* 2.434; 4.1233; 5.1161; 6.70; 6.1276, Tibullus, *Elegiae* 1.2.81; 1.3.79; 1.9.6.
I propose that the poet prefers *numina* to *deus* as a conscious choice. This may indicate a distinct difference between *numina* and god and I suggest that *deus* signifies a higher level of divinity while the use of *numina* referring to the fauns relegates them to a category of less important divine beings. If not inferior, fauns may at least be viewed as different as they are difficult to define in nature and form. We have already heard of their oracular powers from Varro and Cicero, but as we have established, even in Cicero’s time, not merely their physical attributes but their whole nature was unclear. In fact it seems as though no one had actually seen one but the focus instead was on their vocal presence within the landscape. Such nebulous beings could be easily replaced by the more solid figure of Faunus.

The allusions to the Lucretian fauns are clear in landscapes associated with these fauns.\(^{50}\) We can identify a difference in landscape inhabited by the fauns and by Faunus which suggests that the former preceded the latter. The fauns are of the rustic and wild landscape, a more primitive time, whereas we will see when Virgil comes to present Faunus it is as a legendary, oracular king in a more agricultural and settled landscape.\(^{51}\) Are we to infer that when the fauns are included amongst nymphs and satyrs, rustic deities, sylvan or of the hills as in some of the passages highlighted in this chapter, that they are similar beings, part-animal, part-human and at home in a sparsely populated landscape?

A prevalent characteristic of the fauns in Republican sources is their oracular capability. Cincius, Cicero and Varro all mention this trait. Where the context of passages discussed in this chapter is clearly one of prophecy, this may imply a particular category of divinity apart from satyrs and nymphs. For Ennius, Lucilius, Cicero and Varro the fauns are ancient. From the late Republic the focus changes, Lucretius and Virgil present a different picture: the emphasis now shifts to their relationship with wooded areas. They are rustic, usually dancing or up to mischief and are considered *numina* rather than *dei*. When associated with other creatures or deities, such as nymphs or satyrs, the fauns become more like them and do not exhibit the oracular trait. Their potency as oracular deities seems to diminish in sylvan landscapes. Although in Virgil’s Republican writing the fauns

---

\(^{50}\) For discussion of Lucretius in the *Eclogues* see Clausen’s commentary (1994); Buchheit (1986, 123-41).

\(^{51}\) See Chapter 3.2 Genealogy and the Latin Landscape and *Aeneid* 7.45-9.
are not oracular, we shall see in the next chapter that Virgil is the only Augustan poet to portray Faunus with this ability.\footnote{For oracular Faunus see Virgil \textit{Aeneid} 7.81, 102, 254, 368.}

\subsection*{1.3 Faunus}

Modern scholarship has variously referred to Faunus as ‘ancient’, ‘Italian’ and ‘indigenous’. Holland (1961, 158 note 68) claims that Faunus was an old Latin deity important to the Palatine settlers, and that he was an early deity who fell into comparative obscurity as urban life developed in Rome, but as we will see there is a lack of secure evidence for this claim. Pouthier and Rouillard (1986, 105-109) assume a great antiquity for Faunus when they argue that at the beginning of the third century he was a ‘worn-out god’ who gave way to Silvanus, that he appeared in response to Pan and was also confused with Evander. More recently scholars such as Beard, North and Price (1998, 89) include Faunus among a list of ‘notable Latin deities’. Fantham (2009, vii, 30) simply gives Faunus the epithet ‘ancient’ as though it were an intrinsic part of his nature.

Although Wiseman (2008, 8, 319) questions the accuracy of poets, playwrights and historians of the late third century BCE such as Naevius and Cincius Alimentus when they speak on their own distant Roman past, he argues that they and later writers such as Livy do have insight to offer into Republican times and ‘unwritten Rome’. The extent to which this last statement is true will be debated in this and following chapters. Even Cornell (1995, 11, 217) who views the tradition of the birth of the Republic as romantic saga concedes that such a tradition may well be a version of actual historic events. Still it is difficult to find conclusive evidence that Faunus is ancient beyond the second century BCE. The assumptions of modern scholars regarding Faunus’ antiquity may rest on the fact that Augustan poets such as Horace and Virgil regularly depicted Faunus as an ancient deity, but Augustan poets may have had their own agendas.

It is striking that there are no extant passages from Latin literature containing references to Faunus as an individual deity that can be convincingly dated to the Republic. I will argue that a fragment from the third century BCE Cincius actually belongs to the Cincius of the Augustan age. In the early first century CE in his \textit{Ab urbe condita}, Livy recalls the vowing and dedication of a temple to
Faunus from the late second century BCE, an historian recalling the distant past. Despite the noted reliability of Livy for the dating of temples, can we not at least consider the time period elapsed between the events and when Livy is writing? We have no extant iconographical evidence for Faunus dated prior to the fourth century CE. Wiseman (2008, 62) argues that Faunus is first mentioned in the mid second-century BCE by Acilius in Plutarch’s 75 CE *Romulus* (21.7). I will contest Wiseman’s argument shortly in this chapter. I have already suggested that Varro’s etymological reference in his *De lingua Latina* of 46/44 BCE is rather a reference to the *fauni* (Varro, *De lingua Latina*, 7.36.2).

The meagre epigraphic evidence available for Faunus does not support his ancient existence or that he was worshipped in these earliest of times. Scholars who assert Faunus’ antiquity have had to come up with various reasons to explain the lack of early inscriptional evidence for this god. For instance Warde Fowler (1899, 258) states that ‘the absence of inscriptions [to Faunus] … seems to show that he remained always much as wild as he was before the age of inscriptions began’. Fantham suggested that the reason for the lack of evidence of personal devotion to Faunus is because by the time of literate Rome, the god was overwhelmed by competition from gods such as Pan (Fantham, 2009, 17-18). Bayet (1920, 63-143) argues that identification of Faunus with Pan and the similarity of the Lupercalia and the Arcadian cult of Zeus Lykaios laid the foundation for Arcadian influences such as Evander in Roman legend. Faunus, however, has not been proven to be the god of the Lupercal, and was likely a later suggestion here as well as in the Evander myth.

It has been suggested that Faunus was mostly forgotten or neglected in the *urbs* at the dawn of the Augustan age and so proved an excellent candidate for renewal.

---

53 See Dorcey (1992, 34 note 5) for a discussion on Peter’s (1886-1890) identification of Faunus in the bronze statuettes of a bearded god wearing a goat’s skin and boots, and carrying a cornucopia or club. Dorcey identifies them as Silvanus. See Johns and Peter (1983, 74) for some iconographical clues regarding Faunus on five pieces of jewellery from the fourth century CE Thetford Treasure.
54 See this chapter 1.3.1 Republican fragments; Acilius.
55 See this chapter 1.2.1.
56 The available epigraphy for Faunus during this period is limited to the inscription of the Republican *Fasti Antiates Maiores*, dated to the first century BCE and will be discussed later in this chapter.
57 See Pouthier and Rouillard (1986, 105-109) and Cornell (1995, 69) for the important role still played by the work of Bayet.
Wissowa (1912, 66) cites Schwegler (1856, I.212 ff.) almost verbatim and without critique when he suggests that very old names were given a new narrative background. Faunus may have been an existing deity reinvigorated during the invention of tradition, but the assumptions about his great antiquity are still worth questioning.

1.3.1 Republican fragments
I will now proceed to show that the fragments dated to the Republican era and regarded by some scholars as referring to Faunus as an individual deity are worthy of question as solid evidence for Faunus’ existence as an ancient Latin god.

Cincius Grammatica
A third century BCE fragment from Cincius _Grammatica_ (32.1) is the earliest evidence we have for Faunus in Latin literature, but it is doubtful and so should be treated with caution. I will cast doubt on the date of this fragment and argue that most likely alludes to the fauns.

Faunum
Faunus

_Cinc. Gram. 32.1 NB Serv. G. 1.10_

Ed Funaioli, 1907,

_Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta_

One of the difficulties with this fragment is its authorship: we know of two ‘Cincii’, the one was Lucius Cincius Alimentus who wrote a history of Rome in Greek in the third century BCE, the other the historian Cincius Alimentus, a writer of the Augustan age who wrote on antiquarian subjects (Conte, 1994, 69-70). The fact that this fragment appears in Latin rather than Greek and is attributed to a grammatical work suggests that it belongs to the antiquarian Cincius; thus this fragment probably does not belong to the Republican period.

The name of the deity appears in the accusative singular, but what more can we gauge from a single word? Is it not possible that it refers to ‘one faun’? The context of this fragment is Servius’ fourth century CE commentary on Virgil’s first century BCE _Georgics_ 1.10.

---

58 The work of these early scholars is still relevant as we shall see in this and in following chapters that modern scholars till cite their work.
Cincius et Cassius aiunt ab Euandro Faunum deum appellatum
ideoque aedes sacras 'faunas' primo appellatas, postea fana dicta, et ex eo, qui futura praecinerent fanaticos dici.

Serv. G. 1.10

Cincius and Cassius say that Faunus was called a god by Evander, and for that reason sacred buildings were first called 'fauns', and afterwards called 'fana’ temples, and from this those who may predict the future are called ‘fanatics’.

et uos, agrestum praesentia numina, Fauni

Verg. G. 1.10

and you, Fauns, ever-present deities of the rustics

Servius’ commentary on this passage again draws a connection between Faunus and prophecy. The chanting of spells may well be an allusion to the archaic metre of the Saturnian verses already discussed. The fact that Servius places Faunus in the same context as Evander is worthy of question since Servius could have been influenced by Augustan representations of Faunus as an ancient king. Livy (1.5) does not mention Faunus, but Pan in his description of Arcadian Evander, his settlement on the Palatine hill and the Lupercalia. At least in Livy Faunus was not there from the earliest of times. We do not know how much of the text after Cincius et Cassius aiunt is from Cincius or from Cassius or both. Cornell (2013, 57) highlights this uncertainty as an important consideration because the Latin etymologies of fanum and fanaticus point against a work written in Greek. Cornell (2013, 57) also states that it is quite common for Latin authors to quote Greek texts not directly but in translation, particularly when as in this case Cincius is being quoted not for his use of language but for substantive information.

59 Cornell (2013, 120-121) (F10) (= Peter F2, Jacoby F7, Chassignet F2) = Cassius Hemina 6 F2 Serv. G. 1.10.

60 See Chapter 3.2 and 3.3 where I suggest that the representation of Faunus as an ancient king was a Virgilian innovation which was then taken up by others such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus. See Dionysius’ Antiquitates Romanae 5.16 for the prophetic Faunus, where a voice is heard from a nearby grove after the Tyrrhenians and the Romans had retired to their camps. Livy 2.7 ascribes the voice to Silvanus (see this thesis Chapter 1.3.5 for a discussion of Faunus in relation to Silvanus). This is reminiscent of how the fauns spur the Romans on to victory in Cic. Div. 1.101 (discussed in this thesis Chapter 1.2.6).
Peter included the fragment in the first edition (1883, 32) of *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, but influenced by criticisms of Cichorius he printed it in smaller type in his second edition (1914, 41) and within square brackets, indicating that he now believed it to belong rather to Cincius the antiquarian (Cornell, 2013, 182). However, Cornell who has completed the most recent reading of the fragment made the decision to include it under ‘Possible Fragments’ on the grounds that Cincius is cited alongside another historian, Cassius.\(^6\)

Servius’ commentary from which the fragment is derived is dated to the fourth century CE and the link to Cincius and Cassius cannot be proven conclusively. Even if the fragment can be attributed to the third century Cincius, it is still not evidence for an early Republican god. The context of the Servius quote is Virgil’s *Georgics*, which clearly mentions the fauns and not Faunus. When considered together with the late nature of the commentary, this diminishes the likelihood that this fragment can be used as proof that Faunus is an ancient god of the Latins.

**Acilius**

A second passage comes from the Roman Acilius, who wrote a history of Rome in Greek in the mid-second century BCE. This fragment is preserved in Plutarch’s *Romulus* of 75 CE. Thus we are relying on a first century CE source quoting a second century BCE author on the origin of an ancient festival which possibly dates back to the foundation of the Republic.

\[\text{τὰ δὲ Λουπερκάλια ... ἐλληνιστὶ σημαίνει Λύκαια, καὶ ὅκεῖ διὰ τοῦτο παμπάλαιοι ἀπ᾽ Ἀρκάδων εἶναι τὸν περὶ Εὐανδρον. (5) ἄλλα τοῦτο μὲν κοινὸν ἐστὶ. δύναται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς λυκαιής γεγονέναι τούνομα· καὶ γὰρ ἀρχομένους τῆς περιδρομῆς τοὺς Λουπέρκους ὁρῶμεν ἐντεῦθεν ὅπου τὸν Ὁρμύλουν ἐκτεθήναι λέγουσι. (6) τὰ δὲ δρόμωνα τὴν αἰτίαν ποιεῖ δυστόπαστον ..... (8) Βούτας δὲ τις ... (9) ... Γάιος δ᾽ Ἀκίλιος ἰστορεῖ πρὸ τῆς κτίσεως τὰ htubματα τὸν περὶ τὸν Ὁρμύλουν ἁφανῆ γενέσθαι, τοὺς δὲ τοῦ Φαύνου προσευξαμένους ἐκδηλαμεῖν γυμνούς ἐπὶ τὴν ζήτησιν, ὅπως ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱδρότου μὴ ἐνοχλοῦντο, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο γυμνοὺς περιτρέχειν τοὺς Λουπέρκους.} \]

\[\text{BNJ 813 F 2 = FGrH Plut. Romulus 21.4}\]

---

\(^6\) Lucius Cassius Hemina wrote in Latin around 146 BCE.
Lupercalia ... in Greek means 'Lykaia', and for this reason it seems to be a very old foundation by Evander's Arkadians. (5) But this is common knowledge. The name could have arisen from the she-wolf, for in fact we see that the Luperci begin their course from the place where they say Romulus was exposed. (6) The rites as performed make the original reason for the festival hard to guess at ... (8) A certain Boutas [BNJ 840 F 29] ... (9) … and Gaius Acilius records that Romulus' origins were already obscure before the founding of the city, and that those praying to Faunus ran out naked in search so that they would not be hindered by sweat, and for this reason the Luperci go about naked.62

The context of this fragment is an explanation of the festival of the Lupercalia. The origins of the festival held on 15 February on the Palatine are considered to be archaic and the Lupercalia appears on the Fasti Antiiates Maiores. Faunus has been regarded as the god of the Lupercal, probably in part because of the proximity of the festival to Faunus’ temple day on the fasti and also due to the deity’s similarity to Pan. Livy (1.5.2) mentions Inuus as an epithet of Lycean Pan in connection with the Lupercalia, but Faunus does not appear in this passage. Fantham (2009, 20) raises the possibility that the Lupercalia may have been originally in honour of Faunus and then taken over by Pan. The list of festival days (dies feriati) from this calendar has been dated to the fifth century BCE by Michels (1967, 207-220). However, there is no reliable evidence to connect Faunus with this celebration. Moreover the fact that Plutarch’s text contains the word ‘Faunus’ is not proof that Acilius used the word. Plutarch could be influenced by the Augustan reorganisation. During Augustus’ program of cultural renewal, religious revival played a major role in the reassessment of Roman identity and the recapturing of old Roman values and ideals.63 This passage could be an instance of late Greek interpretation of Faunus, or could even be a reference to Pan.


63 See Zanker (1990, 101-125) and Galinsky (Ed.). (2005, 55-84, 121) for details of some of the reforms of Augustus.
1.3.2 Etymology

The etymology of the names Faunus and the *fauni* has been an issue since the beginning of scholarship on the topic, both ancient and modern. We need to examine the various proposals in order to see if they offer any insight into Faunus’ nature, ancient or otherwise. Nettleship’s (1885, 50-52) proposal that Faunus could mean ‘speaker’ was in agreement with many ancient Latin scholars at a time when etymologists, Nettleship’s contemporaries, such as Curtius (1858-62, 296), thought that the derivation of his name was from *fauere*: ‘light’, ‘grace’ and ‘favour’.64 Faunus does fit well with ‘favour’ when calling to mind Horace’s plea for the deity to be gentle on his land and to bless the young of his flocks.65 Faunus also saves the poet from a falling tree trunk, again ‘favouring’ him.66

Faunus as ‘speaker’ makes more sense when one considers his association with oracular powers in Latin literature from the Augustan era onwards.67 As we have seen, during the Republic oracular power is one of the chief characteristics attributed to the fauns. The representation of the fauns in the passage from Varro *(Ling. 7.36)* discussed earlier in the chapter (1.2.1) supports the etymological relationship between the *fauni* and their oracular talents, in particular: *fari* ‘to speak’ those events that were to come, from which they were called *fauni*.68

Fantham (2009, 4) acknowledges that the *fauni* at least have a strong connection with *fari*, the root of *fabulae*. *Fari* was an archaic word linked to the etymology of the word *faun* in ancient sources already discussed such as Ennius, Cicero and Varro which is further evidence of the ancient nature of these deities or *numina*. So these etymological speculations give us insight into the ancient nature of the fauns and the connection to *fari* supports their oracular capabilities.

---

64 Faunus was connected with φῶς (φαϜ-ος), which Nettleship found too vague and generalised. For *faveere*, to favour, see Cornelius Labeo, cited by Macrobius, *Saturnalía*, 1.12.21; Servius ad *G*, 1.10. For Curtius (1858-62, 296) the base φαϜ- light and φα- speech are identical. Nettleship then suggests fav-, to speak, as the base of Faunus. For Faunus as speaker see Isidore, 8.11.87, Varro *Ling.* 7.32. For Faunus’ identification with Fatuus, ‘the power or god of speech’, see Servius *Aen.* 6.776, 7.47, 8.314.

65 See next chapter for Horace *Odes* 3.18.

66 Horace *Odes* 2.27-31. This ode will also be discussed in the following chapter.

67 Virgil *Aeneid* references cited in note 16; Calpurnius Siculus *Eclogae*, 1.33, Sex Pompeius Festus *De Verborum Significatione*, p 325.11, M Cornelius Fronto *Ad Antonin Imp De Eloquentia and Anonymi de Differentiis* 2.15.14.

68 Kent (1951, 303) disagrees with this etymology for both Faunus and *vates*. 
1.3.3 The fasti
The earliest evidence that we have for Faunus is on a Republican calendar of Antium, the Fasti Antiates Maiiores found at Nero’s villa in Anzio in 1915 and dated between 84 and 46 BCE.\textsuperscript{69} The Fasti Antiates Maiiores is the only surviving calendar from the Republican period before the Julian reform. The inscription is on the Ides, the thirteenth of February, and reads ‘EIDVS. FAVON’: this date was the celebration of the foundation day of Faunus’ temple.\textsuperscript{70} All extant dedication notices on this fasti can be related to temple constructions prior to 173 BCE, which fits in well with the vowing and dedication of Faunus’ temple in 196 and 194 BCE respectively as recorded by Livy (\textit{Ab urbe condita} 33.42.10; 34.53.3) (Rüpke, 2011, 98).\textsuperscript{71} Thus the earliest evidence for the ancient and indigenous Faunus is not so ancient in terms of the Republican era.

In his guide to the festivals and ceremonies of the Republican Roman calendar, Scullard like most scholars acknowledges that we are in murky waters when trying to draw conclusions about religious practices and the various roles and functions of deities of this period (Scullard, 1981, 11). We are relying on much later authors of the Augustan age who themselves are likely to be involved in speculation. For example, rites may have survived whose origins were long lost. However, evidence from the calendar together with aetiological narratives and exegesis on the myths, rituals and festivals linked the past with the present for the Romans, conceptualised their Romanitas and enhances our understanding of what it was to be Roman (Beard, 1988, 7). So, we will see that for some of the Romans of the first century BCE, Faunus begins to have a presence in their mythology and history.

1.3.4 in insula
Temples in the Roman Republic were normally financed by war booty, and were therefore constructed as a consequence of successful campaigns (Cornell, 1995, 266). The period of the Punic Wars was one of conflict and uncertainty so the

\textsuperscript{69} Degrassi 1947, 160; 1963, 2.
\textsuperscript{70} See Degrassi \textit{Inscriptiones Italiae Vol XIII Fasti Et Elogia} 1963 p 4. Publication: InscrIt-13-02, 00001 = ILLRP 00009 = AE 1922, 00087 = AE 1939, 00072 = AE 1953, +00264 = AE 1960, 00209; EDCS-ID: EDCS-16201200; Province: Latium et Campania / Regio I; Place: Anzio / Antium. See Appendix 5 for an image of the Fasti Antiates Maiiores and an extract including February, from Degrassi’s \textit{Inscriptiones Italiae Vol XIII Fasti Et Elogia} 1963 Tab III.
\textsuperscript{71} Rüpke acknowledges that the dating of the temple constructions is subject to the caveat that from the debris a substantial number of entries have not survived.
vowing of temples was an attempt to get the gods on side. During battle a temple may have been vowed in hopeful support of the gods in seeking victory, or later to thank the gods for that achieved success. The temple of Faunus was vowed and dedicated in the Middle Republic during the interval between the second and third Punic Wars; it was not funded by booty but by fines as Livy reveals in his *Histories* (discussed below). Perhaps guidance from the ancient Latin king or protection for the flocks may have been sought in the vowing and dedication of a temple to Faunus. We do not know.

Livy recalls the temple to Faunus in the second century BCE on the Tiber Island; that is, we find an historian recalling a period two-hundred odd years in the past. Livy’s first book was written while Virgil was working on the *Aeneid*, so it is not surprising that Livy would ignore Faunus in the early books of his history in favour of Pan and Inuus?

**Livy Ab urbe condita**


Livy *AUC* 33.42.10

Gnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus and Gaius Scribonius Curio, plebeian aediles, [principally] brought many grazers to trial before the people: three from these were convicted; and out of the money from the fines they raised a temple of Faunus on the island. The Plebeian Games were repeated for a period of two days, and there was a banquet because of the games.

Aedes eo anno aliquot dedicatae sunt: una Iunonis Matutae in foro holitorio, uota locataque quadriennio ante a C. Cornelio consule

---

72 First Punic War 264-241 BCE; second 218-201 BCE; third 149-146 BCE.
74 See Farron, 1981, 100.
Gallico bello: censor idem dedicauit; altera Fauni: aediles eam biennio ante ex multaticio argento faciendam locarant C. Scribonius et Cn. Domitius, qui praetor urbanus eam dedicauit.

Livy *AUC* 34.53.3

Several temples were dedicated that year: one to Juno Matuta in the Forum Oltorium, having been vowed and contracted for a period of four years before in the Gallic war by the consul Gaius Cornelius, the same man as censor dedicated it; the second of Faunus; two years earlier the *aediles* Gaius Scribonius and Gnaeus Domitius leased out the contract for its construction out of the money from the fines, Gnaeus Domitius as city praetor dedicated it.

The *aediles* provided a major source for building projects in Rome and the temple of Faunus was one of those constructed from money collected from fines (Orlin, 1997, 143-144). That the money was provided from the fines of three grazers may provide a clue as to the reason for the dedication to Faunus since he is often referred to as a rustic god of the countryside. The *pecuarii* were probably convicted of fraud in the number of their flocks using public pasture.\(^{75}\) Did the fact that the *aediles* were plebeian mean that a god of the common people (ordinary people working the land) should ‘receive’ the temple, even more so since the fines were from grazers? This could be the case since Faunus was known as protector of both wild and cultivated land. Orlin (1997, 19) proposes that the temple may have been built either to thank Faunus for bringing the men to justice or as a request for help to do so.\(^{76}\) In political terms, some temples in the early second century BCE were dedicated by the individual most responsible for its construction, as a sign of harmony between the individual and the Senate (Orlin, 1997, 181). The temple of Faunus may have been one of these, as in 194 BCE the urban praetor responsible for its dedication, Gnaeus Domitus, was one of the *aediles* who had let the contract in 196 BCE.

\(^{75}\) Letting out the *ager publicus* (land which was property of the Roman state) contributed to the revenue of the Roman Republic. Cattle needed to be registered and failure to do so would mean paying a fine if caught.

\(^{76}\) Orlin (1997, 19ff) provides the following reasons with examples for the vowing of temples: internal civil situations of the Romans and their gods, natural phenomena such as plagues, droughts and other portents and crises such as mutiny; external military situations such as war.
According to Holland (1961, 158 note 68, 192) the island to which Livy refers, the Tiber Island, was sacred to Faunus prior to the vowing and dedication of his temple there, going so far as to suggest that the location of the temple on the island was ‘incomprehensible unless he [Faunus] had been there from time immemorial’. Transportation of cattle by ferry across the Tiber from the earliest of times was an obvious reason for the presence of Faunus on the island, in that the god could ensure safe voyage (Holland, 1961, 157-158). These assumptions made by Holland are inordinate. Holland too readily uses Ovid’s *Fasti* as a source to draw conclusions about Faunus in the Republican period. Ovid is not as direct with his information as Holland suggests. One cannot assume that this was the reason for the location of the temple or that Faunus had been worshipped there forever.

Did Faunus’ association with the landscape influence the location of his temple? The landscapes that Faunus usually inhabits are rural and so more remote. Richardson (1992, 148) who views this location as a ‘relegation’ finds it difficult to understand that the temple would be erected there since Faunus was ‘a very ancient Latin god’. Thus the very fact that this temple was relegated to the Tiber Island suggests the possibility that Faunus was not so ‘ancient’ and revered.

**Vitruvius *De architectura***

In 15 BCE Vitruvius described in his *De Architectura* a type of temple on the Tiber Island, of which he uses Faunus’ temple as an example.

Vitruvius* De architectura* 3.2.3-4

The prostyle has everything as *in antis*, but at the corners opposite the antae two columns and architraves not only in front, as *in antis*, but also one to the right and one to the left in the wings. An example of this is on the Tiber island in the Temple of Jupiter and Faunus.

---

This passage may support the existence of the temple, but does not speak to its antiquity or to any great antiquity for Faunus. This temple may have originally been dedicated to Pan and in the post Punic War confusion may later have been interpreted as a temple to Faunus.

If we consider Livy reliable for his dating of temples and their foundations, we have evidence for a Republican Faunus of the second century BCE. We do not seem to be able to source the deity’s existence any earlier unless we rely on the presumption of many ancient and modern scholars that Faunus is indeed an indigenous deity of the Latins. The most compelling evidence we have for Faunus as a single deity in Republican times is the inscription to the deity on the Fasti Antiates Maiores. The next most ‘reliable’ piece of evidence is Livy’s Ab urbe condita. I have cast reasonable doubt upon the Cincius and Acilius fragments. When we also take into consideration the lack of iconographical and other archaeological evidence for an early Republican Faunus, the argument that this deity is one of the most ancient is by now substantially weakened.

1.3.5 Relationship with other deities

In this section I will focus on how the confusion and syncretism between Faunus, Silvanus, Inuus and Pan may have contributed to the mistaken impression that Faunus had a long-standing association with Rome. These gods all share a strong association to a particular type of physical landscape. The woods and mountainous wilds are their domain, they are sometimes characterised by goat-like features and may be protectors of shepherds and their flocks. I have already argued that Romans needed tutelary gods of the woods, guardians of their livelihood, through whom they could successfully negotiate difficult or potentially dangerous landscapes.

Early on in the scholarship Wissowa (1912, 212-13) considers that Faunus and Silvanus were complementary: Faunus the recipient of public worship with Silvanus as his private counterpart. In this way Wissowa attempts to account for the fact that Faunus has a temple while Silvanus does not and also for the abundance of iconography dedicated to Silvanus and the lack of it in relation to

---

78 The goat-like features of the Italian gods are not evident during the Republic, but evolve later in response to their identification with Pan.
Faunus. Dorcey (1992, 39-40) rejects Wissowa’s theory (which Dorcey states is shared by others) of the relationship between Silvanus and Faunus.

In arguing against the identification of Silvanus with other gods such as Faunus and Pan, Dorcey (1992, 41) actually highlights those features that they have in common, such as forests, their association with nymphs, their protective function over shepherds and flocks, and their goat-form. According to Doniger and Bonnefoy (1992, 127), ‘the Latin interpretation of Pan was not Faunus, but Silvanus’ in the third century BCE. This is unlikely because Silvanus does not exhibit caprine features in the Aulularia.79 It is not until Ovid’s Fasti, that we find strong evidence for the syncretic translation of Pan competing with Faunus in Latin literature. This is partly because it is in the Augustan sources that Faunus truly has a presence, while the same cannot be said for the Republican period. Faunus is also horned and hooved and lacking in oracular powers in the Fasti. Fantham (2009, vii) freely uses the epithet ‘ancient’ to describe Faunus when suggesting that ‘Pan and Silvanus displaced him as early as our earliest literary evidence.’ In the visual arts Faunus was overshadowed by Pan, in poetry less so, and in personal cult he was displaced by Silvanus.

As mentioned earlier, Fantham (2009, 17-18) considers the competition with other gods before literacy was introduced to Rome as responsible for the lack of evidence of personal devotion to Faunus, but this argument is inconclusive. Although there are over eleven hundred inscriptions relating to the cult of Silvanus, only one of them is dated to the Republic.80 There are several hundred statues and reliefs in the iconography of Silvanus, but none of these date to the Republican period (Dorcey, 1992, 13). There are three references to Silvanus in Latin literature of the Republican period and they all date to the first century

---

79 As their evidence, Doniger and Bonnefoy use Silvanus in Plautus Aulularia, 666, 759: Siluani lucus extra mariumst auis crebro salicto oppletus: ibi sumam locum. certaunst, Silvano potius credam quam Fide. The grove of Silvanus, outside of the wall, is unfrequented, and planted with many a willow; there will I choose a spot. I'm determined to trust Silvanus, rather than Faith; illam ex Siluani luco quam abstuleras, cedo. Give me up that pot which you took away from the wood of Silvanus; cf. T Bömer, Ovid, Fasti, Kommentar, p 101.

80 See Dorcey (1992, 1) and the table on inscriptions Appendix IV on page 181 of the same publication.
There is no surviving iconography for Faunus or Silvanus during this period. Still, in the fourth century CE there was confusion between Faunus, Silvanus, Inuus and Pan.

Hunc Faunum plerique eundem Siluanum a siluis, Inuum deum, quidam etiam Pana [uel Pan] esse dixerunt.

Many have said this Faunus is the same as Silvanus from the woods, as the god Inuus, some have also said he is Pana [or Pan].

Servius mentions Inuus in his commentary on Virgil’s *Aeneid* (6.775.3). According to Servius, Inuus is an epithet of Faunus, which suggests syncretism and identification rather than confusion.

Inuus autem latine appellatur, Graece Πάν: item Ἐφιάλτης Graece, latine Incubo: idem Faunus, idem Fatuus, Fatuclus.

Serv. Aen. 6.775.3

But he is called Inuus in Latin, Pan in Greek, likewise in Greek Ephialtes, in Latin Incubus: also Faunus, as well as Fatuus, Fatuclus.

It is with the Greek Pan that Faunus is most often equated. As I have demonstrated, there are no reliable references to Faunus in Latin literature from the Republican period, but we will see that for Pan there are many. The abundance of references to Pan in Latin literature of the Republic (21) in comparison to the fragmentary evidence we have for Faunus from the same period

---


82 The lack of iconography for Faunus continues to remain an issue until the late fourth century CE spoons and other items from the Thetford Treasure, referred to earlier in this chapter.

83 The so-called *Origo Gentis Romanae*, a sometimes etiological and euhemeristic explication of Rome’s distant past to Romulus’ foundation of the city, survives only in two fifteenth century manuscripts, *Codex Bruxellensis* and *Codex Oxoniensis* (Banchich in Haniszewski, 2004, ii). The author is unknown. Other references to Faunus in this work place the god in a variety of contexts: Saturnian prophecy 4.4, king 5.1, father 9.1 and befriended by Evander 5.3. This number of roles in such a work suggests either an uncertainty surrounding the god’s character or a deliberate emphasis upon this indigenous figure.
make it clear that Pan was the focus and that Faunus was not.\textsuperscript{84} The number of references to Pan remains approximately the same during the Augustan era, so there is continuity from the Republican period on, although Faunus is mentioned more than Pan during the Augustan age. This lends credence to the possibility that Faunus was chosen for emphasis from the Augustan age, perhaps to reinvigorate what Romans thought of as an ancient Italic deity. This demonstrates the need felt by the Romans to prove their ancient origins, an important emphasis in defining \textit{Romanitas}. This would also help to explain the Augustan intertwining of Faunus with the foundation and early kingship of the Latins.

It is important to analyse the evidence with regard to the question when Pan was introduced into Rome so that conclusions can be drawn regarding syncretism with Faunus. Does the introduction of Pan have an impact upon how far back we can date Faunus? When we consider the likely introduction of Pan into Italy during the third century BCE\textsuperscript{85} with the beginning of Latin literature in Rome around the same time, we might suggest that there are indications of early syncretisation, if there was evidence of an early Republican Faunus. Perhaps Faunus as an individual deity was created in response to the introduction of Pan and that is why there is no evidence of his ancient origins.

The earliest reference to Pan in Latin literature is fragmentary, dated to the second century BCE and appears in Ennius’ \textit{Euhemerus sive Sacra Historia} 66.\textsuperscript{86} The next reference to Pan is dated to the first century BCE and appears in Cicero’s \textit{De natura deorum} 3.56.6. An earlier appearance of Pan in Rome somewhere in the third century BCE has been attributed to a highly subjective fragment of Eratosthenes appearing in the scholia to Plato’s \textit{Phaedrus} 244b.

Wiseman (1995, 5) suggests (and even he admits it to be only a guess) that Pan was introduced to Rome in the fourth century BCE based on the identification of the god as the bearded, booted figure wearing a goatskin cloak knotted around his neck by the forelegs and carrying a shepherd’s throwing stick in the Praenestine mirror (Appendix 6, Figure 2; Wiseman, 1995, 5). This mirror depicting the she-

\textsuperscript{84} See Appendix 4 for a comparative table of the number of references to Pan and Panisci in Latin literature from the Republic up to and including the Augustan age and Appendix 2 for those to Faunus and the fauns.

\textsuperscript{85} Various dates for the introduction of Pan into Italy will be discussed shortly in the chapter.

\textsuperscript{86} Warmington, 1935, \textit{Remains of Old Latin}, 422.
wolf and the twins from the Remus and Romulus legend has been suggested as proof of an ancient Faunus.\textsuperscript{87} Scholars such as Jordan (1885), Wiseman (1991) and Pairault Massa (1992) have sometimes identified the bearded wild man standing to the left of the suckling scene, who is naked, except for boots and a goatskin cloak knotted around his neck, as Faunus (Wiseman, 1995, 67-69). Wiseman (1992; 1993) has even changed his mind over the years and thinks it is Pan rather than Faunus.

Wiseman (1995, 3) also uses the Eratosthenes fragment to date Pan’s introduction to Rome in the third century BCE.\textsuperscript{88} This fragment has been called into question and it has been suggested that it should not be attributed to the scholiast at all, having been incorrectly copied out (Bernhardy, 1822, 86). The fragment is not included in Jacoby’s \textit{Fragmente der griechischen Historiker} and this could well be because it is deemed spurious.\textsuperscript{89} The fragment in itself is not as reliable as other types of evidence such as direct quotations from the sources; after all this is a scholiion, rather than actually commentary. Although the fragment is not a direct comment of Eratosthenes on the origin of the cult of Pan in Rome or the cult’s first appearance in Rome, it is used by others confirm the presence of Pan’s cult in Rome. The association is not direct and the fragment is not conclusive evidence. Pan’s introduction is most likely third century BCE, based on an engraved mirror from Praeneste which depicts a goat-legged Pan with the label ‘PAINSSCOS’ (sic; \textit{Paniskos}; little Pan) dancing with ‘MARSVAS’ (Marsyas) the satyr (Appendix 6, Figure 1).

As with the \textit{fauni}, there are references to the \textit{Pansici} (little Pans) and the \textit{Panes} (multiple Pans) in both the Republican and Augustan periods, but the number of references to Pan take precedence. It is surely significant that the same Republican authors who refer to the fauns and not to Faunus do include Pan the individual deity in their works, often the same works. Perhaps there was syncretism between Faunus and Pan at the commencement of writing in third

\textsuperscript{87} It was assumed to be a fake until the early 1980s. For the mirror as a fake see Koerte (1897, 172) and Duliere (1979, 72-3) and for its reassessment see Adam and Briquel (1982, 36-48).
\textsuperscript{88} See Ruhnken (1800, 61) for the fragment Wiseman uses in his analysis of the Lupercalia.
\textsuperscript{89} See FGrH BNJ 241 F 26a and 26b where the fragments state that Eratosthenes wrote about the sixth Sibyl, whereas in the scholia to Plato’s \textit{Phaedrus} it is the fourth, the Italian Sibyl. Eratosthenes may well have written about both, but we simply do not know.
century Republican Rome and Faunus was subsequently reemphasised during the Augustan age in an attempt to recapture old Roman values and ideals.

Following Wiseman, Fantham suggests that Pan was established early in Rome very soon after his cult had spread beyond Arcadia in fifth century Greece BCE (though not as early as tradition would have it, brought by the pre-Homeric Arcadian founder-king Evander) (2009, ix, 19). According to Fantham, Pan would have been welcomed to Rome along with other Greek cults introduced in this period, such as those of Demeter/Ceres. John Scheid (1995, 15-31) says the foreign, Greek cult of Ceres was imported to Rome in the middle of the third century BCE, which is a lot later than Fantham and Wiseman seem to suggest.

Was this an attempt to undo interpretatio Romana, Greek mythology’s gradual adoption by the Romans? The process of Romans identifying their own deities with Greek ones with whom they appeared most closely to correspond began as early as the sixth century BCE (Hansen, 2005, 11-12). Pease (1963, 278) debates various treatments of Faunus and the fauns which have been influenced by Pan and the satyrs, resulting in their pluralised form. I can accept that Faunus was identified with Pan and so acquired goat-like characteristics due to their similarities of domain and function, but not that this was due to the Greeks having a more visual imagination as suggested by Nisbet and Rudd (2004, 219). This outdated view of Roman religion as devoid of mythology and overwhelmed by ritual has been disputed at length on many occasions and most successfully by C Robert Phillips III,

… Roman religion needs to be taken seriously in its own right. It should not be demoted because it did not transmit a theological system in its sacred texts, or because it did not offer paradigmatic tales about the gods.

C Robert Phillips III (1992, 63)

91 Interpretatio Romana did not occur overnight and the sources were many and varied. The term is used by Tacitus in Germania 43.4 and Ando identifies this as the only use of the term in Latin literature that survives (Ando, 2008, 41-51).
92 See Wissowa in Roscher, Ausfuhr. Kexihon, s.v. Faunus (1886, 1454-1455) and Relig. u. Kult. d. Romer, 2 ed. (1912, 212).
93 Phillips (1992, 59-61) discusses the historical considerations of the nineteenth century which led to theories of socio-cultural evolution reliant on comparative ethnographic material from colonial empires and prejudices of the socio-economic elite of white European Christian male administrators. He concludes that the study of Roman religion has suffered in comparison with the
It is through a conceptual approach that Lipka (2009, 117) identifies the formation of divine concepts in Rome, via adoption, deification and differentiation. Perhaps Faunus dominates in Latin literature from the Augustan age onwards as a backlash against the Greek Pan during a time when Roman identity was being reassessed.

Perhaps there was syncretism between Faunus and Pan in Latin literature of the Republic which was then ‘corrected’ by Augustan poets, but I very much doubt it. The relationship between Faunus and Pan during the Augustan age will be addressed in the following two chapters. One can understand the desire to connect Faunus with the Lupercalia as it is so close to his festival day, but the association has not yet been proven conclusively in the scholarship. When I come to presenting the evidence for the Augustan era, it will be clear that Faunus is indeed a distinct and individual deity. We will see that Faunus alone of these three deities possesses oracular powers and so stands apart from Pan and Silvanus in this important function. Where there is an explosion of references to Faunus in the Augustan age, Silvanus experiences a great emphasis in his iconography. Both deities maintain their individual characteristics as separate entities and this is reinforced in the clear naming of each in literature for Faunus and in iconography for Silvanus. We may conclude that Faunus successfully resists complete syncretism with Silvanus and Pan.

1.4 Conclusion
The most compelling evidence we have for Faunus as a single deity in Republican times is the inscription to the deity on the Fasti Antiates Maiores, dated from the mid to late first century BCE. The next most reliable piece of evidence is Livy’s Ab urbe condita, from the Augustan age, which dates Faunus to the second century BCE. The temple alone cannot prove that Faunus was an ancient god of the Latins as it can only be dated to the mid-Republican period. Stroh (1990, 559) agrees that apart from the temple dedication in Livy, the single god Faunus is not attested in the Republic.

study of Greek religion and the attendant definition of ‘mythology’ due to the spiritual kinship that German scholars since the late eighteenth century have felt with the Greek tradition of gods and heroes. See also a chapter by Phillips in Rüpke (2011) for a detailed history of the study of Roman religion, the changing trends and factors which have affected views taken since the beginning of scholarship to quite recent developments of this century.
I have questioned the judgement by many ancient and modern scholars that Faunus is an ancient Latin deity. I have cast reasonable doubt upon the fragments from Cincius, Acilius and Varro. When we also take into consideration the lack of iconographical and other archaeological evidence for an early Republican Faunus, there are clearly grounds to reconsider the argument that this Roman deity is one of their most ancient. We have seen that the written evidence is fragmentary, tenuous and late and that modern scholars overstate the deity’s antiquity. Even for the fauns, assumed ancient in Latin literature, our earliest evidence is still only from the second century BCE.

The overwhelming number of references to the fauns in Latin literature of the late Republican period indicates that they were the focus rather than Faunus. Faunus as an individual deity may have evolved from the disembodied voices of the fauns. Boas (1938, 185) supports this theory, discussing the evolution of these ‘mysterious voices of nature’ with which the fauns are associated, to the appearance of this ‘predicting god’ and ‘god with a human voice’, Faunus playing the same role as the formless fauns. Etymologically, Faunus was probably ‘the speaker’ in keeping with the oracular powers of the fauns of the Republican period and I have shown that the fauns of the Republican period have oracular powers. It has been surprising to discover that the oracular capabilities of the fauns sometimes diminish or disappear altogether when these deities are closely linked to the landscape of the woodland setting. These deities provide answers to the Romans during times of crises and they are even heard on the battlefield. The emphasis on Faunus and the insertion of this deity into the foundation legend of Rome makes clear the rightful place of the Romans in the land they inhabit, something that meant so much to their identity and sense of Romanitas.

The lack of evidence for cult worship of Faunus has suggested that Silvanus took centre stage in that realm. Pan’s entry into Latin literature coincides with that of the fauns in fragments from Ennius dated to the second century BCE. The notion that Faunus was usurped by Pan in the written sources simply cannot easily be supported. If Faunus is indeed ancient, then the almost complete lack of references to this deity during the Republican period is surprising to say the least. The fact that Pan dominates in Republican sources and is the focus rather than Faunus furthermore suggests that the latter did not have much of a presence. The
third century BCE Praenestine mirror does seem to indicate the presence of Pan in Rome during the third century BCE, but this is not supported by the presence of Pan in the literary sources.

My thesis is that it is most likely the Augustan poets fleshed-out Faunus as an individual god and gave him a much more dominating presence in response to Pan. This position will be a focus of chapters two and three. The abundance of references to Faunus in the Augustan age can be read as a deliberate attempt to assert an antiquity for Faunus, possibly under the influence of Augustus or as a matter of national pride. Considering the writing of Roman history and re-assessment of Roman identity that was occurring during the Augustan period, it would scarcely be surprising to find that the Augustan poets were employing all the creative licence they could muster in their representation of this elusive deity, even to the point of placing this figure at the heart of Rome’s early genealogical tradition. In the next chapter I will focus on Horace’s *Odes*, which, as I will argue, contains the first appearance of Faunus in Latin literature.
Chapter 2: The Horatian Faunus

2.1 Introduction

In this and the next chapter I will analyse of the representations of Faunus and the fauns in Latin literature of the early Empire. As a first step in the analysis I will discuss the proportion of references of Faunus and the fauns not only in relation to the Republican evidence, but also in relation to Pan’s presence in the sources. I will then evaluate the theories of Nisbet and Rudd, Putnam and others surrounding the identification of Faunus with Pan.

It is in Augustan poetry rather than prose that we find an overwhelming presence of Faunus and the fauns.94 It is worth noting that there are thirty five references to Faunus and nine to the fauns in poetry, whereas there are only three references to Faunus and none to the fauns in prose. This suggests a renewed interest in Faunus which, I shall argue, may well have been the result of Augustus’ revival, restoration and reformation of traditional Roman religion as a basis for his moral and political reforms in Roman society.95 This would fit nicely with Wallace-Hadrill’s point (2008, 450-2) that the Augustan age brought a renegotiation of Romanitas (Roman-ness) and Roman identity, expressed through symbols of culture. Could Faunus be a symbol of a forgotten past as an indigenous deity?

In the early empire, the most frequent references to Faunus occur in Horace’s Odes and Virgil’s Aeneid. My particular focus in this chapter will be Horace’s Odes and in the following chapter it will be Virgil’s Aeneid. The primary purpose in my analysis of the Odes and the Aeneid is to identify the chief characteristics attributed to Faunus and the fauns. Why do Horace and Virgil refer so often to Faunus and the fauns and why do these poets offer such different portrayals of these deities? Horace and Virgil knew each other and would have been aware of each other’s work (Hor. Sat. 1.6.34-55). I will be considering the extent to which the Horatian Faunus is an intermediary between the Lucretian and Virgilian fauns and the Faunus of Virgil’s Aeneid. What do these portrayals tell us about Roman identity and the need Romans felt which may have compelled them to introduce or reintroduce an ‘ancient’ and indigenous god at this point in their history? I will

94 See the table in Appendix 7 for the statistics of Faunus and the fauns in Augustan literature and for a chronology of the works.
95 See Galinsky (2007, 71-82) and Orlin (2007, 73-92) for Augustus’ religious reformation.
continue to question the long-held assumption of Faunus’ antiquity suggested by Horace and Virgil in these two chapters.

Representations of Faunus linked Romans with their past, their legendary origins, the landscape and in particular the rustic countryside they so idealised. Did they insert this deity into the narrative of their origins in order to reaffirm their own antiquity as a race? Holleman (1972, 496) suggests that while Virgil made Faunus part of Rome’s history and great future, Horace goes slightly further by including the deity in ‘a personal dream of a Golden Age’. Following Holleman I will show that there are Golden Age elements in the choice of imagery depicted in the *Odes* and that it is in these episodes that Faunus strongly exerts his power over the landscape.

This examination of Faunus in both lyric poetry and epic will produce a more nuanced understanding of the Roman relationship to landscape; as in these works there is a concentration of landscape imagery surrounding this god. The deity is variously represented as a rustic god, a protector of flocks and humans, garlanded, in woodland settings such as ancient groves and set amongst the high hills and the low fields. I will compare and contrast the variety of landscapes Faunus inhabits in Horace and Virgil in order to suggest the significance of each. As we will see, landscapes described by Augustan poets are not only imaginings influenced by the social, political and religious contexts of their creators but to some degree also representations of actual geography in antiquity.

### 2.2 The Odes

The first appearance of Faunus in Latin literature in the Augustan age is in Horace’s *Odes* I-III. The *Odes* contains four references to Faunus. Although Horace’s *Odes* contain only a small number of references, their importance cannot be discounted as Faunus is clearly characterised in them as a mediator between humans and the landscape. There are clear seasonal markers in three of the *Odes* which mention Faunus and these root the god in the landscape. These odes also

---

96 See Chapter 1.2.6 and 1.2.7 for Roman idealisation of the rustic countryside and agricultural life and its impact on renewal of identity.
97 See Chapter 3.2 for Golden Age imagery in Faunus episodes in the *Aeneid*.
98 Ovid’s works also contain numerous references to Faunus, a great number in the *Fasti*; please see the table in Appendix 7. In Ovid there is evidence of syncretism of Faunus with Pan due to the goat-like physical characteristics the god exhibits.
99 1.4.11, 1.17.2, 2.17.28, 3.18.1.
highlight the importance of honouring the god in order to ensure a positive relationship with the landscape he inhabits. I will argue that, although there are allusions to an Arcadian landscape inhabited by appropriate gods, we find that with the last reference to Faunus in the *Odes* (3.18) the Greek has given way to the Italic landscape of Horace’s Sabine farm.

**Odes 1.4**

Horace’s *Odes* reflect acknowledgement of the inevitable changing balance in the essential relationship between the Romans and their environment. Faunus, a deity associated with the physical landscape, plays a crucial role in balancing this relationship. Their close identification with nature and their land means acceptance of any changes in their lives, livelihood and future brought about by the vagaries of the seasons and the variation in landscapes they sought to inhabit.

As we see from the first lines of the poem (below), there are both Greek (*Cytherea, Gratiae, Cyclopus, Lycidan*) and Roman (*Uenus, Uolcanus, Faunus, Mors, Sestius, Manes, Plutonius*) elements which appear highly suggestive of the interchangeability or syncretism of Faunus and Pan which we also find in Ovid. Moreover Will (1982, 240-5) views this ode dedicated to Sestius as ‘far from being a typical Hellenised “spring” poem’, but representative of miniature landscapes found on the walls of Pompeii and Stabiae and with indication of personal references to Sestius’ own villa. Thus the landscape represented appears to have some authentic Roman elements.

```
soluitur acris hiems grata uice ueris et Fauoni,
trahuntque siccas machinae carinas,
ac neque iam stabulis gaudet pecus aut arator igni,
nec prata canis albicant pruinis.

iam Cytherea choros ducit Uenus imminente Luna,
iunctaeque Nymphis Gratiae decentes
alterno terram quatiunt pede, dum grauis Cyclopum
Uolcanus ardens uisit officinas.
```

100 See Chapter 1.2, 1.3.5 for Faunus and the fauns in Ovid.
101 See Chapter 1.2.7 for a brief discussion on Roman wall paintings.
nunc decet aut uiridi nitidum caput impedire myrto
aut flore terrae quem ferunt solutae; 10
nunc et in umbrosis Fauno decet immolare lucis,
seu poscat agna siue malit haedo.
pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas
regumque turris. o beate Sesti,
uitae summa breuis spem nos uetat incohare longam. 15

iam te premet nox fabulaeque Manes
et domus exilis Plutonia; quo simul mearis,
nec regna uini sortiere talis,
nec tenerum Lycidan mirabere, quo calet iuuentus
nunc omnis et mox uirgines tepebunt. 20

Hor. Odes 1.4

Sharp winter thaws for the dear change to spring and the west wind, and the tackles drag down dry hulls, neither the flock now enjoys neither the fold nor the ploughman the fire, nor are the meadows whitened with hoary frost. Now Cytherean Venus leads the dance beneath the overhanging moon, and the beautiful Graces joined with the Nymphs shake the earth with feet in rhythm while the fiery Vulcan visits the grave workshops of the Cyclops. Now it is time to adorn your glittering head with green myrtle or flowers, which the liberated earth brings forth; now it is becoming to sacrifice to Faunus in the shady groves whether he demands a lamb or prefers a kid. Pale Death knocks with impartial foot on the huts of the poor and the towers of the rich. O Happy Sestius, the brief sum of life forbids us to form extended hopes. Soon night will press upon you and spirits of fable and Pluto’s meagre home; where as soon as you’ve passed, you will not draw lots for the

102 While it might be tempting to associate faunon the favouring west wind etymologically with Faunus, this is viewed as a false modern conception by Graf in Brill’s New Pauly. O’Hara (1996, 187) outlines the various etymologies for Faunus, citing Thomas (1982, 25) on Georgics 1.17-18. See also Thomas (1988, 72) on Georgics 1.17-18 in relation to fauens and faueo. This thesis has a discussion of the etymology of Faunus at 1.3.2.
control of wine, nor marvel at youthful Lycidas, who now arouses the young men and for whom soon the young girls will glow with love.

In this ode sharp, tiresome winter is replaced by the colourful freedom of spring. For Quinn (1980, 128) the first stanza is an accurately described spring scene which gives way to a more stylised image from the second stanza. Nonetheless by the third stanza *uiridi myrto aut flore* and *umbrosis lucis* recall familiar elements of Roman landscape. The description of the changing seasons within this ode underlines the importance of the Roman understanding of the land and how the natural environment could affect their lives and livelihoods. This important relationship was changed dramatically and social tensions occurred when political forces took control. Political uses of land for reasons such as redistribution to veterans after civil war created social tension regarding the Romans and their landscape, tension which appears alleviated in these odes. Now Faunus is rightly placed, due to his capacity as mediator, in an ode in which seasonal change has been interpreted as a metaphor for political change to a milder political climate (Corbeill, 1994, 3; Santirocco, 1986, 31). Babcock (1961, 17) recognises how the changing seasons affect the lives of the Romans and sees in Horace’s theme of the ‘inevitability of death’ still an uncertainty as to what next season and next year will bring; this is an uncertainty that Faunus helps to alleviate. The sacrifice to Faunus in the third stanza emphasises Horace’s depiction of the deity as important to the livelihood of the Sabine estate holder. Faunus has a role in ensuring the propagation of the flocks. Here Faunus is a god who receives sacrifices in the shady wood.

The fact that Horace sets the sacrifice to Faunus within *umbrosis lucis* shows that he views Faunus primarily as a woodland deity. The rustic sacrifice to Faunus is a precursor to that offered at 2.17.32, where it appears to further heighten the deity’s relationship with the woodland setting. The sacred grove so described in *Ode* 1.4 lacks the often sinister undertone of a shaded wood due to the lifting of the burden and the uncertainty of winter, yet Babcock (1961, 15, n. 2) still mentions the gloom of Faunus’ woods. The shade might provide welcome relief from the sun, but Romans were also very unsure about dark woods, frightened of
what they might conceal and of trespassing into the sacred realm of a god. Babcock (1961, 13-19) assesses the role of Faunus in Horace’s *Odes* 1.4 and comes to the conclusion that Faunus as guardian of herds and the oracular Faunus need not be distinguished in the poet’s mind. I do not think that the allusion to the grove of Faunus in v. 11-12 alone is enough to also suggest his prophetic abilities. Nonetheless we can see in the *Odes* signs of the apprehension with which Romans view their natural landscapes and there is evidence of the role Faunus plays to alleviate this apprehension.

The humanised view of landscape as reflected by the death of winter and the rebirth of spring is juxtaposed poetically with life and death for the Romans themselves. Wilkinson (1968, 34-42) and Jameson (1984, 225-237) have highlighted Horace’s fixation on the inevitability of death. One must make the most of life because death is never far away (Quinn, 1980, 127). Barr (1962, 9-10) discusses the connection in this ode between the *dies parentales*, the festival of the dead, and the festival of Faunus: ‘it was time to be thinking of death and the dead even while the altars of Faunus were being kindled for his spring-time sacrifice’. Faunus is clearly positioned within the landscape of ancient Rome, geographically and poetically.

**Odes** 1.17

With the next appearance of Faunus in the *Odes*, Horace’s own Sabine farm becomes the backdrop. Faunus’ role of protecting Horace’s Sabine farm helps us appreciate his role as mediator between the Romans and their landscape.

Dunn (1990, 203-8) following Holleman (1970, 751) sees in this ode and its invitation to Tyndaris the poet identifying himself as Faunus, since both protect from predators (Faunus protects the goats from the wolf while Horace protects Tyndaris from Cyrus) and ‘both are at home in the bucolic landscape’.

uelox amoenum saepe Lucretilem
mutat Lycaeo Faunus et igneam

---

103 See Chapter 3.3 An Oracular Italic Landscape and 3.5 Martial Epic and Displacement of Italic Gods, including Note 58 for details regarding Roman relationship to groves.

104 This story is recounted in 2.13 where the context of Horace’s own estate is clear through the reference to the poet as master of the tree to fall on him in 2.17.

105 For Faunus’ role as protector of the farm see Troxler-Keller (1964, 111); Thomas (1982, 24-30); Davis (1991, 199-205); Putnam (1994, 357-75); Bowditch (2001, 154-60).
defendit aestatem capellis
usque meis pluuiosque uentos.

impune tutum per nemus arbutos
quaeurent latentis et thyma deuiae
olentis uxores mariti,
nec uiridis metuunt colubras

nec Martialis Haediliae lupos,
uctumque dulci, Tyndari, fistula
ualles et Usticae cubantis
leuia personuere saxa.

di me tuentur, dis pietas mea
et musa cordi est. hic tibi copia
manabit ad plenum benigno
ruris honorum opulenta cornu:

hic in reducta ualle Caniculae
uitabis aestus et fide Teia
dices laborantis in uno
Penelopen uitreamque Circen:

hic innocentis pocula Lesbii
duces sub umbra, nec Semeleius
cum Marte confundet Thyoneus
proelia, nec metues proteruum

suspecta Cyrum, ne male dispari
incontinentis iniciat manus
et scindat haerentem coronam
crinibus inmeritamque uestem.

Hor. Odes 1.17

Swift Faunus often exchanges Lycaeus for pleasant Lucretilis and
always protects my goats from heat and rainy winds. The wandering
wives of the rank he-goat seek with impunity, through the safe groves for
the hidden arbutus and thyme, their kids do not fear the green serpents nor
the wolves of Mars whenever, Tyndaris, the long sloping valleys of Ustica and
its smooth rocks resound with his sweet piping. The gods protect me, my devotion and Muse are dear to the gods. Here
the plentiful abundance of the treasures of the countryside will flow to
you to the full from the generous horn: here in this sequestered valley
you will avoid the Dog Star’s heat and sing with the Teian lyre of
Penelope and vitreous Circe: fighting over one man. Here you will
drink cups of innocent Lesbian wine, under the shade, neither will
Thyoneus, Semeles’ child, make battle with Mars; nor shall you,
mistrusted, fear that violent Cyrus, may place his intemperate hands on
you; who are far too good for him, and tear off the garland clinging to
your hair or your innocent clothes.

The adjective *velox* emphasises how quickly Faunus can change a Greek setting
for a Roman one. Quinn (1980, 158) suggests that ‘The journey from Arcadia to
Horace’s Sabine farm is swiftly accomplished’. This would indicate that for
Horace, Faunus is syncrениsed with Pan. The setting is revealed as Sabine
through the use of the terms *Lucretitis* in v. 1 and *Ustica* in v. 11 and because the
reader becomes aware that Horace is referring to his own estate when he uses *meis*
in v. 4 in reference to *capellis*. There are conspicuous parallels between
Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura* and this ode such as the reference to the *corona*,
*musa* and the landscape the deities inhabit.¹⁰⁶ Putnam (1994, 368-70)
convincingly argues that Horace has derived or ‘personalised’ Faunus from the
Lucretian fauns and Pan. This scholar suggests an evolution from Lucretian
disbelief in the fauns and Pan to the Faunus of the Odes who has a creative
influence in the landscape. It is interesting that Putnam (1994, 372-3) then goes
on to cite Virgil’s *Eclogues* and *Georgics* as a great influence on this poem since
as discussed in my first chapter (1.2.6 and 1.2.7), Faunus is omitted from these
poems. Both Holleman (1970, 750) and Putnam (1994, 359) simply refer to
Faunus-Pan as though they are one and the same. Putnam (1994, 359, 368) argues

¹⁰⁶ *DRN* references: *corona* 1.117-8, 1.929, 4.4, 6.95, *musa* 4.572-594, 5.1379-1411, landscape
5.1380-6, 5.1391, 5.1398-1400. Also see Chapter 1.2.3 for the fauns and Pan in Lucretius.
that ‘Horace’s Pan becomes Faunus by exchanging Arcadia for the Sabine territory, whereas for Dunn (1990, 205) ‘Faunus exchanges his Greek home … for an Italian one’. Nisbet and Rudd (2004, 219) acknowledge that ‘at some stage an individual Faunus was identified with the pastoral god Pan’. West (2002, 155) argues for identification of Faunus with Pan here at v. 1-2. Davis (1991, 200) argues that Arcadian Pan is the equivalent of Faunus. Given the clear textual markers of an Arcadian landscape in this ode such as *Lycaea* and *Tyndaris* and other Greek words such as *Penelope, Circe, Lesbos, Semeleius* and *Thyoneus*, does this mean we have a case of syncretism with Pan? Does it not seem strange that Faunus would be in Arcadia to begin with? There does appear to be some interchangeability going on here.

Faunus the protector of flocks (and thus the livelihoods of Romans) shields creatures from the fierce summer and from the wind and rain. Faunus’ presence ensures the *adynta* of the goats wandering among the wolf in an idealised setting. The *copia cornu* in vv. 13-15 is an indicator of Horace’s love for the Italian landscape. It is Faunus’ presence which ensures the cornucopia of Horace’s farm. The Romans were very much aware of the dangers of the environment and the possible negative consequences for their livelihood so they needed a good relationship with the gods of the landscape. This can be quite a close, personal relationship as we see in this ode, with Horace naming Faunus as the protector of his own flocks. So Faunus is the god through whom Horace negotiates his own relationship to the landscape of the Sabine farm. The reiteration here of the groves as a place to be feared without the protection of the gods is a notion prevalent for the Romans and is frequently expressed in their poetry, religion and myth.107 Faunus provides protection here not just from the elements, but also from other dangers on the groves, such as predatory wolves and green snakes which are concealed by their colour of the grasses they inhabit.

Faunus is also a protector from the extremes of the seasons: from summers that are too hot and the rainy winds of winter. Faunus ‘offers protection against hardships, dangers and fears … the dark powers of Roman reality’ (Troxler-Keller, 1964, 111). Pucci (1975, 277) highlights the human pain and suffering in

---

107 See Chapter 3.3 An Oracular Italic Landscape for more on Roman fear of nature.
this ode, and the power of Faunus to ward off the negative forces of nature and the seasons. This intervention shows a way in which Faunus is a mediator between humans and the landscape.

Faunus also protects Horace, his guests and his livelihood as a poet. Holleman (1970, 753) argues that Horace impersonates Faunus in this ode, appropriating his forces in offering protection to Tyndaris. He further argues that Faunus ‘represents the sexual urges’ of his epithets amator and Ueneris sodalis of Odes 3.18 (1970, 751). Dunn (1980, 208) sees in velox an emphasis on the sexual nature of Faunus as a god of fertility and rapist of dreaming women. This view seems again reliant upon Faunus’ identification with other gods such as Pan, Inuus and Incubo, so any further investigation of Faunus and sexuality here will not assist our understanding of him as a distinct and individual deity. The Canicula of v. 16 has two connotations most pertinent to the discussion of Faunus in Horace’s Odes. Firstly this star usually appeared during the height of summer when the most relief was needed from heat, relief which Faunus offers both Tyndaris and the she-goats. The poet suggests in this poem that this god possesses the capacity to control the sun, wind and rain. There is also the implication that the presence of this star induces the lust of women; Faunus and his alter-ego Horace may be offering Tyndaris protection from the consequences of her sexuality in the case of Cyrus, but not, I think, the poet himself!

In Ode 1.17 Faunus acts as agent in transforming the landscape of the Sabine farm into a locus amoenus for the production of Horace’s poetry. Fraenkel (1957, 204) insists that the success of the estate, its flocks and the poet himself are due to the patronage of Faunus. In their commentary on Odes I, Nisbet and Hubbard analyse how Horace defines the role Faunus plays in bringing protection to his Sabine estate. They see a transition from a realistic country scene to a contrasting vignette and conclude that the ode reveals the fondness of the Italians for their bucolic landscapes (Nisbet & Hubbard, 1970, 104; 215). I suggest a fondness for Italian deities is a factor as well. The Sabine place-names, Lucretilis and Ustica link the Arcadian landscape with the Italian (Nisbet & Hubbard, 1970, 216).

---

108 For the correlation between Canicula and the heat of summer see Hesiod Op. 582-88; Theog. 1039; Carm. 3.13.9; 3.29.20; Virgil G. 2.353, 425.
109 For the effect of the Canicula on the female libido see Hesiod Op. 586-88 and Alc. Fr. 347.
Horace lends a Roman flavour to the landscape through *Lucretilem* which may represent the west range of Colle Rotondo\(^{110}\) (Nisbet & Hubbard, 1970, 218). Horace is the first to use the words Lucretilis and Ustica.\(^{111}\) In the environment of Horace’s Sabine farm, Faunus is ‘translated into the Latin language and into an Italian landscape’ (Oliensis, 1998, 121). But is the translation wholly necessary for an already Italic deity?

*Odes 2.17*

In the *Odes* Faunus has progressed from a simple rustic deity who protects flocks to one who is associated with cleverness. The *amicitia* between Horace and Maecenas is a feature of this poem which serves to dispel the patron’s fears about dying before his poet. Horace holds Faunus in similar affection as patron of his farm and of his poetic ability. He is protector and mediator. In his close connection to the landscape, Faunus has power over it when he is able to intervene and save Horace from the falling tree trunk. This relationship to the land becomes particularly interesting when we see in the next chapter that in Virgil’s *Aeneid* this ability to intervene is challenged and overridden by Trojan deities.\(^{112}\)

In this ode to Maecenas, Horace’s patron and dear friend, the markers for Greek gods such as *Chimaera, gigas, Libra, Scorpio and Hesperia Capricornus* are encapsulated in the two central stanzas of the poem. These are then followed by *Iuppiter, Saturnus, Faunus* and *Mercurialis*, demonstrating the evolution from the Greek in preparation for the wholly Roman context of the final Faunus ode:

\[
\text{cur me querelis examinas tuis?} \\
\text{nec dis amicum est nec mihi te prius} \\
\text{obire, Maecenas, mearum} \\
\text{grande decus columnque rerum.} \\
\text{a! te meae si partem animae rapit} \\
\text{maturior uis, quid moror altera,}
\]

---

\(^{110}\) This culminates in present Monte Gennaro.  
\(^{111}\) Porphyrio’s second/third century CE *Scholia on Horace* concludes they are Sabine hills.  
\(^{112}\) See Chapter 3.5 Martial Epic and Displacement of Italic gods.
nec carus aeque nec superstes
integer? ille dies utramque
ducet ruinam. non ego perfidum
dixi sacramentum: ibimus, ibimus,
ucumque praecedes, supremum
carpere iter comites parati.
me nec Chimaerae spiritus igneae
nec, si resurgat centimanus Gyas
duellet umquam: sic potenti
Iustitiae placitumque Parcis.
seu Libra seu me Scorpios aspicit
formidulosus, pars uiolentior
natalis horae, seu tyrannus
Hesperiae Capricornus undae,
utrumque nostrum incredibili modo
consentit astrum: te Iouis impio
tutela Saturno refulgens
eripuit uolucrisque Fati
tarduit alas, cum populus frequens
laetum theatris ter crepuit sonum:
me truncus illapsus cerebro
sustulerat, nisi Faunus ictum
dextra leuasset, Mercurialium
custos uirorum. reddere uictimas
aediumque uotium memento:
nos humilem feriemus agnam.

Hor. Odes 2.17

Why do you wear me out with your complaints? It is neither the gods’
will nor mine to die before you, Maecenas, the great glory and pillar of
my affairs. Ah! If a force prematurely snatches you, part of my life, why should I, the other half linger, not equally loved nor surviving whole. That day will lead both of us to ruin. I have not spoken a treacherous oath: we will go; we will go, whenever you lead the way, comrades prepared to proceed on the final journey. Neither Chimaera’s fiery breath, nor hundred-handed Gyas, should he rise against me, will ever tear me from you: this is pleasing to mighty Justice and the Fates. Whether Libra or frightening Scorpio watches over me, as the more potent influence of my natal hour, or Capricorn the ruler of the Western wave, our two stars accord in an incredible manner: the protection of Jupiter was shining for you more than wicked Saturn and rescued you, and held back the flying wings of Fate when the people in the crowded theatre broke out into happy applause three times: I would have sustained a falling tree trunk on my head if Faunus the guardian of Mercurial men had not mitigated it with a strike from his right hand. Remember to provide a sacrifice and a votive shrine: I will offer a humble lamb.

As Mercurialium custos uirorum ‘guardian of Mercurial men’, in this case Horace himself, Faunus possesses the power to ward off the blow from a tree trunk. The fact that Faunus wards off the blow with his hand suggests that the god is in fact closely related to man here. The idea of Faunus as a god who favours is evident in this ode as it is in 3.18. He is a god who averts death from humans, whilst as the same time may be undergoing a process of anthropomorphisation himself. I suggest Virgil continues this process when he includes Faunus in the line of kings in the Aeneid (7.47-9).

We have so far seen that the protection Faunus offers Horace is key to the poet’s characterisation of the god throughout the Odes. Nisbet and Hubbard (1978, 274) see in the offering ‘the reassuring and life-giving ritual of modest country sacrifice’. This calls to mind Faunus’ role as liberator of earth associated with the

---

113 See OLD, 1976, 1102, 1 for the definition of those especially favoured by Mercury, in this case lyric poets, from Mercury’s invention of the lyre (Horace Carm. 1.17.29).
114 See Chapter 1.2 and 1.3 where I present the various debates surrounding the etymology of Faunus as either favere or fari.
115 See Chapter 3.2 Genealogy and the Latin landscape.
changing seasons in 1.4, protector of the Sabine estate and the poet’s personal muse and also foreshadows his positive effect on the flocks in 3.18. Cairns (1972, 73; 222-5; 223) and Nisbet and Hubbard (1978, 273) classify this ode as a *soteria* since Horace escapes the blow of the tree trunk whilst Maecenas recovers from an illness. Faunus is given much status here as the recipient god of the *soteria*. In the ‘votive altar’ that Maecenas is to dedicate to Jupiter, Horace contrasts Maecenas’ grandiose offering with his own humble offering (probably to Faunus, although he doesn’t explicitly state this.) As Quinn’s (1980, 233) commentary states: ‘a temple to Jove is not something that can be put in hand overnight’. I agree with Nisbet and Hubbard who recognise Faunus as the recipient of the sacrifice (Nisbet and Hubbard, 1978, 287).

**Odes 3.18**

In this the final reference to Faunus in the *Odes*, the allusions to Pan and the Arcadian landscape have fallen away and Faunus is represented as an ancient god to whom Horace offers prayer in return for a beneficent approach to the poet’s flocks. Quinn (1980, 276) argues that the benevolence of gods was never assured and had to be sought and we see an example of this in the passage below.

```
Faune, Nympharum fugientum amator,
    per meos finis et aprica rura
lenis incedas abeasque paruis
aequus alumnis,

    si tener pleno cadit haedus anno,   5
larga nec desunt Ueneris sodali
uina craterae, uetus ara multo
fumat odore.

ludit herboso pecus omne campo,
cum tibi Nonae redeunt Decembres;   10
festus in pratis uacat otioso
cum boue pagus;

    inter audaces lupus errat agnos;
spargit agrestis tibi silua frondis;
```
Faunus, lover of fugitive Nymphs, may you go gently through my borders and my sunny fields as you go forth past the small newborns, if at the end of the year a young kid falls to you, and plentiful wine is not lacking to the mixing bowl, the friend of Venus, the ancient altar smoking with much incense. The whole flock plays over the grassy plain, when the Nones of December return for you; the festive people empty into the fields with the idle oxen; the wolf wanders among the bold lambs; for you the wild woods scatter their leaves; the ditcher rejoices in striking the earth he hates in triple time.

Babcock (1961, 18) suggests that the first lines of this poem, *Nympharum fugientum amator, … lenis incedas*, allude to the god’s ‘dark, even terrifying side’. Later, 8 CE, in Ovid’s *Fasti* 2.303-50 the idea of the *fugientum amator* is evident in Faunus’ failed attempt at the rape of Omphale. There too the sinister tone fades away, but in Ovid mistaken identity and subsequent laughter are the elevators of the mood. In *Ode* 3.18 it is because of Horace’s invocation to Faunus to ‘go gently through his borders’. In opposition to this we see Faunus protecting Tyndaris from rape by Cyrus in the final stanza of Horace’s *Ode* 1.17. The phrase *lenis incedas abeasque* in v. 3 recalls the *terriculas lamias* of Lucilius 12.524 with whom the fauns are associated. Yet here, as in 1.17, Faunus ultimately has a positive effect on the landscape of the Sabine farm.

Most Romans, including Horace, were deeply connected through such sacrifice to their landscape because of their reliance on it for economic success. The hymnic features of this ode highlight the importance of honouring Faunus by way of sacrifice; the address, the description of the god in apposition, the prayer in v. 3-4, and in the second stanza the sacrificial offering, libations of wine, and the conditional clauses in 5-6 (West, 2002, 159). The prayer for a favourable crossing

116 See Chapter 1.2.2 for a discussion of the Lucilius passage.
of the borders of the farm may well be an allusion to Faunus’ etymology of *fauere*.

In this hymn to Faunus, the lover of fugitive Nymphs, the god is associated again with the warmth of summer (*aprica rura*) after the growth of spring and now we witness the changing nature of the landscape with the approach of Autumn: *spargit agrestis tibi silu frondis*, ‘the wild woods scatter their leaves’. Quinn (1980, 277) suggests that there is a hint of pathetic fallacy here when the autumn leaves appear as a carpet to honour the advancing Faunus. The god is in close partnership with the land and those whose livelihood depends on it. The sunny meadows, upon which the flocks graze, and the necessity of sacrifice in thanks for a prosperous year are emphasised as is the reciprocal nature of the relationship between Faunus, the land and Horace.

Clearly Faunus has a transformative effect on the landscape. Reinforced by the Golden Age imagery, the realistic landscape becomes an idealised scene which accompanies the passage of the god. The Golden Age imagery includes the *otioso boue* the ‘herd now being idle’, the *audacis agnas* among the *lupus* and the *spargit silua frondes* the ‘woods scattering their leaves’ for the entrance of the god Faunus. The *adynaton* here results in unlikely peace among certain animals: the wolf amongst the bold lambs. For Holleman (1972, 494-6) the landscape is unreal and contains elements of Golden Age imagery and the seasons are more complex than they might first appear: spring is pictured at midwinter.

The break from realism and the alteration of the seasons in conjunction with a reading of *pardus* support the argument that there was no *Faunalia*. Warde Fowler (1899, 256-7) uses this ode as evidence for a festival which he calls *Faunalia rustica*, but which is not on any Roman calendar and references an ancient Italy and an ancient altar. In his commentary on the third book of Horace’s *Odes*, Williams (1969, 106-108) also argues that the festival existed. Scullard (1981, 72, 201) continues this tradition, recognising this day on the *Nones* of December in his list of festivals and ceremonies of the Roman Republic.

On the other hand, Holleman (1972, 492-4) convincingly argues that there was no such festival. Moreover in Johns’ (1986, 95) opinion the reference in Horace is
not strong enough evidence.\textsuperscript{117} West (2002, 162) cites Scullard as support for the
festival since \textit{pagus} means ‘a country district or community’ which might explain
that because the festival was held in the \textit{pagi} and not in Rome, it was not on the
calendar. But this interpretation rests on Porphyrio and on Bentley (Holleman,
1972, 492). Porphyrio’s second/third-century CE commentary on Horace
mentions the \textit{Faunalia} (3.18.10) and Bentley (1711, 131-2) suggested that the
manuscript reading \textit{pardus} was incorrectly transcribed and since then \textit{pagus} has
won general acceptance. Do we have an example of later authors imposing their
views in their desire to reinterpret the primary text? Let us consider the
proposition that Horace could be projecting an antiquity onto Faunus for which
there is little basis. We must keep in mind that Horace is the first extant author
who definitely refers to the individual deity Faunus. Horace may be saying that
Faunus is ancient, but how are we to determine what Horace means by this? The
poet may be referring to the late second century BCE temple mentioned in Livy.
Although the god Faunus might seem a good fit for this rustic festival, a
celebration of the Roman relationship to their pastoral landscape, the supporting
evidence is simply not strong enough to draw such a definite conclusion that the
festival existed.

2.3 Conclusion

We have seen that Faunus is protector of Horace’s Sabine estate, its production
and its inhabitants. As patron deity, Faunus also provides the \textit{locus amoenus} for
Horace’s poetic inspiration and protection of the poet’s livelihood. The idea of
sacrifice has also been shown to be central to Horace’s depiction of Faunus
throughout the \textit{Odes}. The Sabine estate is depicted as a pious landscape, deeply
rooted in the Roman countryside. Horace’s choice to give Faunus such
prominence in the \textit{Odes} highlights the important function that the god played as
patron deity of the Sabine estate and the poet’s own fondness for and
identification with Faunus. He has been the source of many an \textit{adynaton} and has
provided a safe, secure and productive environment for animals and humans alike.
Faunus has exhibited great power of the landscape, a key attribute in his crucial
role as mediator between the Romans and the places which they inhabited.

\textsuperscript{117} However it should be acknowledged that the reason it does not appear on any official \textit{fasti}
could be because it was celebrated in the \textit{pagi} (rural districts) and not in Rome itself.
In my analysis of the correlation between Pan and Faunus in the Faunus odes I have argued that Horace’s depiction of Faunus is unique and distinct from that of Pan. Horace seems to have acknowledged both Pan and an indigenous deity in his characterisation of Faunus the Italic god. This depiction seems driven by the needs of the Sabine estate and its poet. I was able to identify the Horatian landscape of the *Odes* in which Faunus has a presence as idealised with Golden Age imagery, but still firmly rooted in the actual Italian countryside. The Horatian Faunus is surrounded by some clear markers of the Golden Age, but it is not until Virgil’s *Aeneid* that he is fully slotted into the imagery, as part of a genealogy traced back to Saturn.
Chapter 3: Faunus and the fauns in Virgil’s *Aeneid*

3.1 Introduction

Faunus may have been a shadowy figure in the Republic whose antiquity was insecure, but under Augustus this situation changed dramatically: in Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Faunus is the father of king Latinus, the son of Picus and the grandson of Saturn. Faunus is presented both as an ancient Latin deity and as a king revered by the Latins but, as we have seen, neither of these representations can be supported by the extant Republican texts. Why is it that Virgil, who ignores Faunus in favour of the fauns and Pan in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, suddenly gives Faunus such prominence in the *Aeneid*?\(^{119}\)

Virgil’s readers would have been familiar with Faunus from Horace’s *Odes* as a god who receives sacrifices in the shady wood, a fast-paced protector of flocks who may harm or bless their young, a guard of poets\(^ {120}\) and a lover of fugitive nymphs. The Horatian Faunus is rustic and more clearly associated with the rural and woodland landscape than the Virgilian Faunus for whom kingship and oracular capabilities are given greater focus.\(^ {121}\) Thus it appears that Virgil largely rejected the Horatian Faunus in favour of his own representation more closely linked to that of the Republican oracular fauns.\(^ {122}\) Faunus may not have been entirely a construction of these Augustan poets, but the evidence suggests that he certainly seems to have been fleshed-out by them and in particular by Virgil. The next question worth asking is what do these different portrayals by Horace and Virgil tell us about Roman identity and the need Romans felt which compelled them to ‘introduce’ or ‘reintroduce’ an ‘ancient’ and indigenous god at this point in their history?

---

\(^{118}\) References to Faunus and the fauns in the *Aeneid*: 7.47, 48, 7.81, 7.102, 7.213, 7.254, 7.368, 8.314, 10.551, 12.766, 12.777.

\(^{119}\) See my first chapter 1.2.7 and 1.2.8 respectively for a discussion of the fauns in these two earlier works of Virgil. It is interesting to note that neither Propertius nor Tibullus refer to Faunus in their elegies, despite being contemporaries of Virgil. They instead include Pan in their poems. See Propertius *Elegiae* 3.3.30, 3.13.45, 3.17.16 and Tibullus, *Elegiae* 2.5.27.

\(^{120}\) We know that Virgil and Horace were acquainted with one another so they would certainly have been aware of each other’s literary output. See Horace *Satires* 1.6.54-64 for evidence of their relationship.

\(^{121}\) Horace *Odes* 1.17.3, 3.18.2-3. Horace’s *Odes* were published 23 BCE and for the *Aeneid* various dates have been suggested for different books from between 29 BCE and 19 BCE. Faunus is not a feature of the *Aeneid* until Book 7, so I have placed Horace’s portrayal of the god chronologically prior to Virgil’s depiction.
The insertion of Faunus into the *Aeneid* is striking. A renewed interest in Faunus may well have been the result of Augustus’ revival of traditional Roman religion as a basis for his moral and political reforms.\(^{123}\) It is probable that the Romans, prompted by the disruptions caused by the land confiscations, began to reassess their relationship with the landscape; thus landscape may well have played an important role in the Augustan refashioning of Roman identity. Spencer (2010, 1) argues that landscape functions as a link between nature and culture and that Roman landscapes specifically in the last century BCE and the first century CE are places of identity formation. Faunus is a god who is intimately connected with the landscape, so an examination of early Augustan representations of Faunus may give us further insight into how Roman identity was being refashioned at this time in relation to their environment. It will therefore be useful to examine the relationship of Faunus and the fauns with the landscape, which may also prove important to determining the antiquity of Faunus.

In this chapter I shall cast further doubt on the long-held assumption perpetuated by modern scholars of Faunus’ antiquity. I will question whether the deity has any place in the early kings list. I will examine how Faunus is introduced into the epic and suggest reasons for Virgil’s innovative characterisation of the deity. I will then discuss the extent to which Virgil’s portrayal of Faunus has a basis in tradition. I will identify passages from the *Aeneid* where Faunus is associated with kingship and others where he is represented more like a god. Finally, I will argue that the treatment of Faunus by Virgil is representative of the relationship between the Trojans and the Latins and that we can map its breakdown by closely examining episodes which feature this deity as we move through books 7 to 12 of the *Aeneid*.

My analysis of Virgil’s characterisation of Faunus in the *Aeneid* will take a thematic approach which I have labelled as follows: ‘Genealogy and the Latin Landscape’, ‘An Oracular Italic Landscape’, ‘Trojan Intrusion’ and ‘Martial Epic and Displacement of Italic Gods’. I will analyse the ways in which Virgil’s portrayal of Faunus evolves with in the second half of the *Aeneid*. In ‘Genealogy

---

\(^{123}\) According to Wallace-Hadrill (2008, 450-2) during the Augustan age there was renegotiation of *Romanitas* and Roman identity was expressed through symbols of culture. Landscape can be a powerful symbol of culture and identity.
and the Latin Landscape’, I will examine how Virgil introduces Faunus into the poem. I will argue that there is evidence even within the *Aeneid* that the fauns preceded Faunus and that Virgil’s inventive genealogy asserts an otherwise unsupported antiquity for the deity.

In the section, ‘An Oracular Italic Landscape’, I explore another layer which Virgil adds to his characterisation of the deity: the oracle of Faunus which plays an important part in the narrative. Lucretian imagery alludes to the Republican fauns, but in these passages the landscape is clearly Italic. This emphasis on the sylvan Italic landscape is important to Roman identity.

Next in ‘Trojan Intrusion’ I analyse how Faunus serves as a mediator between the Trojans and the Latins when the Trojans begin to establish themselves within Latium. We will see how Virgil uses Faunus as a device through which to explore the Trojan-Latin relationship. Virgil places Latinus within a prophetic ancient Italic landscape where Latin predominance gives way to Trojan intrusion. I will argue that the oracle of Faunus provides a link between the first and second half of the poem where prophecy is crucial to cementing the relationship between the two peoples.

In the final section, ‘Martial Epic and Displacement of Italic Gods’, I will show how Faunus’ relationship to landscape intensifies just as the Trojan desecration of it begins. The Trojans’ violation of a tree sacred to Faunus represents the breakdown of Trojan and Latin relationship, and the inability of Faunus to give substantial help to Turnus heralds the displacement of Latin deities and the establishment of Roman identity. We will thus see the culmination of Trojan intrusion begun in general terms at Cumae and then more forcefully in the Latin context of the Tiber.

### 3.2 Genealogy and the Latin Landscape

*Aen. 7.45-9, 8.313-327*

Virgil places great emphasis on the history and significance of Italy in the second half of the *Aeneid*. Zetzel (1997, 189) argues that as we move from the first to the second half of the *Aeneid*, Virgil’s use of Homeric style and allusion is replaced by increased use of antiquarian sources for Italy and Rome. The epic becomes
Roman, but is rooted in the landscape of the Latins. Virgil emphasises the difference between the earliest Italians and the Trojans in Books 7 and 8 of the Aeneid and acknowledges the two distinct peoples. He associates Faunus with the Latins rather than the Trojans. Moreover, Virgil’s insertion of deities such as Faunus suggests that the poet wants to also place emphasis upon the agricultural nature of the landscape.

Later in Book 7 (vv. 177-78) Italus and Sabinus are included by Virgil as ancient ancestors of the Latins; they are part of the story the poet is introducing. Italus and Sabinus first appear as individual men in the Aeneid. So not only is Virgil using Italian legend, but he is shaping it and introducing new elements such as the royal lineage. The divine lineage provides a concise ‘cultural history’ and conveys a deep well established connection with Italy’s natural environment. At the beginning of Book 7, the Trojans are carried from Cumae, past the tomb of Aeneas’ nurse, then Circe’s island and onto the shores of Latium. The narrative is now firmly fixed in an Italian landscape. The appearance of Faunus as an ‘ancient’ Roman deity invites Virgil’s audience to identify with this landscape and feel a connection to the earliest generations of Italians through Faunus, a god himself strongly associated with nature. Faunus’ connection to these landscapes is overtly clear in his Aeneid episodes, particularly in connection with groves. It is interesting that the Faunus episodes in the Aeneid occur near the mouth of the Tiber which is the location of his island temple, as discussed in my first chapter (1.3.3). See Boas (1938, 53-59) for the originality of Virgil in the use of this location as the landing spot of Aeneas. As Aeneas lands on the banks of the Tiber, Virgil poses a series of questions about the kings of Latium, warfare and previous immigrants. He then proceeds to inform the reader about Latinus, his peaceful reign and his genealogy. Virgil gives Faunus a prominent role in the

---

124 This does not mean that it is altogether devoid of the influence of Homer. Quinn (1968, 66-7) identifies the first half of the Aeneid with the Odyssey and the second with the Iliad. Anderson (1990, 241-52) also identifies the second half of the Aeneid with the Iliad: the Trojans arrive from Troy defeated but are as victorious in Italy as the Greeks were at their expense earlier. In Book 7 Turnus begins as Achilles, but then this role is taken over by Aeneas as the Trojans are increasingly viewed as warring invaders.

125 Italus was the hero Italy was named for (1.533, 3.166), Sabinus was ancestor of the Sabines (Ahl, 2007, 385 n. 178). Williams (1973, 180) calls Sabinus a ‘shadowy Italian figure’ here an eponym of the Sabines. The commentator cites D H 2.49.1-5, but Dionysius does not specifically refer to Sabinus.

126 Note also the geographical closeness of Antium, where his temple dedication was found on the Fasti Antiiates Maiiores (Ch. 1.3.3).
ancestry of Latinus. Allusions to agricultural Laurentum and the woodland associations further establish Virgil’s characterisation of Faunus as an ‘ancient’ Italic deity in a line of kings.

Rex arua Latinus et urbes
iam senior longa placidas in pace regebat.
hunc Fauno et nympha genitum Laurente Marica
accipimus; Fauno Picus pater, isque parentem
te, Saturne, refert, tu sanguinis ultimus auctor.

_Aen_ 7.45-9

King Latinus had reigned over farmlands and tranquil cities through long peace. Now he was old. We hear he was born to Faunus and a Laurentine nymph Marica; Picus was father to Faunus, and he claimed that you, Saturn, fathered him and that you were the ultimate founder of his bloodline.

This is Faunus’ first appearance in the _Aeneid_ and he is constructed as part of the Italian landscape which will later be encroached upon by the Trojans. Virgil’s inclusion of the deity at this early stage in his description of Italy seems pointed. As previously mentioned, it is of interest that Faunus has no place in Livy’s history of early Rome 1.1.5, although Livy describes both Latinus and Aeneas’ conflict with Turnus at 1.1.1-1.1.2. This suggests that the tradition of Faunus as an early Laurentine king was not strong or widespread, and this is the reason why Livy did not pick it up. In late nineteenth century scholarship Warde-Fowler (1899, 257-8) suggested that the introduction of Faunus into Rome was by way of his temple in 196 BCE and that after this time annalists robbed the deity of his true character as a god of woodland and pasture. He quotes Dionysius of Halicarnassus _Antiquitates Romanae_ 1.31, for Faunus’ identification as a king of

127 While the story of Aeneas’ survival and destiny as a great king was known from Homer’s _Iliad_ (20.300-308), Virgil adapted earlier legends about Aeneas’ founding of the city from Cato and Varro for his poem (Cato, _Orig_. F4-12 in _Fragments of the Roman Historians_; Varro in Serv. _Aen_. 5.4 and Schol. Dan. _Aen_. 4.682), (Rutherford, 2008, 20; Cornell, 1995, 37). Virgil and Livy were writing at around the same time about the foundation of Italy by Aeneas, but Virgil chooses the version of the legend which involves war probably to provide a more dramatic narrative in this landscape. The reference to Caesar in _Propertius_’ mention of the Virgil’s work can be used to date the composition of the _Aeneid_ in the mid-20s BCE (Propertius, 2.34.61-64.). Two references to Caesar Augustus in Livy indicate that the historian was writing after January 27 BCE when Octavian took the name Augustus (1.19, 4.20). See Hill (1961, 88) for a discussion of when Augustan writers were producing their work, Gazda (2002, 14) for contemporary writers of the period, Warrior (2006, xiii-x) for internal evidence for the dating of Livy, Cairns (2003, 309-10) for the use of _Propertius_ to date the composition of the early books of the _Aeneid_.
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the Aborigines and then Virgil’s *Aeneid* 7.45 ff. for his place as king of Latium in the ancestry of Latinus.\textsuperscript{128} The annalistic tradition referred to here is not second century BCE, but early first century BCE, which casts further doubt on the supposed antiquity of Faunus. In fact, I posit that Dionysius is using Virgil as a source, just as he has used other writers such as Varro.\textsuperscript{129} Cary (1960, 160, n. 1) points out the closeness in similarity of Virgil and Dionysius’ accounts of the route of Aeneas from Troy to Lavinium and suggest that this is because they both used parts of Varro no longer extant. For Varro’s account we are relying on fragments from Servius’ fourth century CE commentary on the *Aeneid*. Dionysius was roughly contemporary with Augustans such as Horace, Virgil, Ovid and Livy as part of a ‘network’ of intellectuals who exchanged their ideas on language and literature (De Jonge, 2008, 26). As for Dionysius’ use of the authors he does quote, ‘his direct or indirect acquaintance with the sources cannot be demonstrated’ he chose to include those passages which suited his purpose and ‘the information of his sources is arranged to follow his theories’ (Gabba, 1991, 118).

In the first two lines of the passage above (45-6), the key characteristic of Latinus is his role as king. Boas (1938, 73) acknowledges that Saturnus, Picus and Faunus were seen as ancient kings in later times and argues that Latinus, ‘was an artificial product of Greek and Roman mythologists and antiquarians’. This is close to what I have suggested to be the case for the deity Faunus. Horsfall (2000, 76) also views Latinus’ role as a king in the *Aeneid* as a ‘striking novelty’. *Rex* as the first word and *regebat* as the last almost embrace Latinus and his long peaceful kingdom.\textsuperscript{130} In v. 46 Virgil stresses Latinus’ old age (*senior*) and the length of his reign (*longa in pace*), foreshadowing the antiquity of his father Faunus. There is a close relationship between *rex* ... *Latinus* and the landscape in the first two lines. It is worth noting the juxtaposition of the word *arua* ‘farmlands’, next to both *rex* ‘king’ and ‘Latinus’ which connect Latinus and his reign to the cultivated landscape. Here we can see a connection between the

\textsuperscript{128} See Chapter 3.3 for the references to Faunus in Dionysius.

\textsuperscript{129} Varro references: Dion. Hal. *AR* 1.14.1, 2.21.3, 2.47.3, 2.48.4. See also *AR* 1.7 where Dionysius lists the Greek and Roman historians he sources for his work.

\textsuperscript{130} Although Zetzel, (1997, 191) concedes that ‘the Italians are both warlike and peaceful’, he argues that ‘the Trojans are not saviour, but a disruptive influence in a peaceful and harmonious world’. Although Virgil depicts a peaceful picture, he also includes characters such as Turnus and Mezentius which hints at Virgil’s ambivalence regarding the peacefulness of the landscape.
Horatian Faunus in the realm of the rustic countryside and Virgil’s new role for him as ancestral king. Williams (1973, 170) comments on the interlaced order of the first two lines of this passage, noting that in prose it would be *rex Latinus iam senior arua et urbes placidas in longa pace regebat*. Virgil, in departing from the ‘normal’ word order, is emphasising ‘farmlands’ by encircling the word with ‘king’ and ‘Latinus’. Latinus’ role as king of farmlands may take precedence over his role as ruler of *urbes* ‘cities’ to some extent, because ‘cities’ is not as close to ‘king’ and ‘Latinus’ in these lines.

Faunus’ entrance in v. 47 almost immediately draws a clear link between the deity, the kingship and the rule of his son, the human king Latinus. ¹³¹ Virgil associates Faunus with kingship and gives the deity a more human characterisation. Faunus is still mentioned in connection with the landscape, but his relationship to Latinus seems to emphasise the deity’s humanity. While ultimately I do not support the euhemeristic arguments of scholars such as Rosivach and Papaioannou (see footnote 13 above), which support the view that Faunus was an ancient ruler deified, their readiness to entertain such theories lends weight to my argument that Virgil gives Faunus a more human characterisation in the *Aeneid*. Virgil emphasises alternate characterisations of Faunus to varying degrees: sometimes Faunus is more human, sometimes more kingly and at other times more god-like.

In the following three lines (47-9) Virgil assigns to Faunus a genealogy which can be traced back to Saturn and the Golden Age of Latium, where humans were in harmony with the environment. As the founder of a royal blood-line which includes Faunus, Saturn legitimises Faunus’ right to rule.¹³² This genealogy

¹³¹ In commenting on this passage Rosivach (1980, 140) suggests that Faunus and Picus were human rulers made divine after death and that even Marica may have been human once. Papaioannou (2003, 698) sees Faunus as a completely humanised legendary king with oracular powers. Although there is not a lot of primary evidence for it, this idea has been suggested by classical scholars since the nineteenth century. See my previous chapter, specifically the Republican fragments section for Fowler’s argument of an original race, wild or superhuman, half deified men from the hills, from whom figures such as Faunus developed. See Fowler (1899, 259-65) for a summary of the opinions of Wissowa, Nettleship and Schwegler on the human origins of Faunus and on the evolution of a single deity from the notion of a multiplex. The contributions of these late nineteenth century scholars are still relevant to our discussion, because late twentieth century scholars such as Horsfall (1990, 475) still cite Schwegler and Wissowa among others in their work as support for their current arguments.

¹³² Virgil makes clear Saturn’s strong associations with the Golden Age of primitive Italy in *Aeneid* 6.792-94.
further attempts to assert the legitimacy of Latinus’ rule. This new role for Faunus is interesting: in Horace a god of the rustic countryside, a protector of the cultivated landscape, he is now represented as a revered king. The inclusion of an ancient Faunus in this genealogy is an attempt by Virgil to project an antiquity onto Faunus for which there is no firm evidence. Horsfall (1990, 475) suggests that this genealogy is well attested by second century BCE annalistic tradition, but, as we have seen, this suggestion is not adequately supported by Republican sources.\textsuperscript{133}

So it seems that poets and historians were being inventive about the history of Roman religion with different cults being attributed to different times and to the worship of early ‘Roman’ kings. It is important that we spend some time to consider the tradition of these early kings since there are obvious implications regarding the antiquity of Faunus. Wissowa (1912, 66) suggests that kings lists and genealogies were created in order to construct a link between mythology and history regarding Rome’s foundation up until the present day of Virgil. This claim is speculative as there is no primary evidence, so we are dealing with Italian pre-history under construction. Kings lists and genealogies were used to bring the story up to the historical period. A middle class of heroes between gods and men was created and names were used which had become meaningless. These very old names were given a new narrative background and the most well-known example is the Laurentine list of kings. Poets started this and in doing so continued what historians and antiquarians did, continually adding to or padding-out the foundation myth of Rome.\textsuperscript{134}

Recent scholars take the works of scholars such as Wissowa, Schwegler and Fowler on this list generally as primary sources. For example, the circular arguments and citing of Schwegler and Wissowa by Horsfall (1990, 475) tends to unravel upon closer inspection. Fordyce (1977, 67-68) acknowledges Virgil’s

\textsuperscript{133} As discussed in my first chapter (1.3.1), the Cincius passage is extremely fragmentary and the associated Servius commentary of Virgil’s \textit{Georgics} is dated to the fourth century CE.

\textsuperscript{134} Horsfall (1990, 475) cites Wissowa (1912, 66) and Schwegler (1856, I.214 ff.) as his sources for the kings list, while Wissowa himself cites Schwegler (1856, I.212 ff.). Schwegler suggests that the kings list is constructed from many sources. The idea of the kings list from second century annalistic tradition in secondary scholarship seems to have originated in Schwegler, but none of the sources he cites are early enough: Verg. \textit{Aen.} 7.48, Falisc. \textit{Cynegeticus} 5.18, Plin. \textit{HN} 17.6, Dio Cass. Fr. 4.3, Lactant. \textit{Div. inst.} 1.22.9, Euseb. Chron. 1.45.8, August. \textit{De civ. D.} 18.15.
innovation in the royal lineage of Latinus. The commentator identifies Virgil’s use of *accipimus* in v. 48 as a formula of the scholarly poet who is concerned to claim the authority of tradition where there is none. Although *accipimus* might just indicate that Virgil is referring to a story, it still suggests the poet’s inability to claim that the presence of Faunus in Latinus’ genealogy is reliable. Schiebe (1986, 43) similarly disputes the long-held assertion of the great antiquity of the Saturn legend in the *Aeneid*. I agree with Schiebe (1997, 153) who argues that this Laurentine kings list has its origins in the *Aeneid*. Harrison (1991, 211) in his commentary on Book 10 of the *Aeneid* (vv. 551) refers back to the passage under discussion and concludes that Faunus as the father of Latinus was a Virgilian construction and Thomas (2004, 131) agrees. Rosivach (1984-91) discusses each of the genealogical traditions for Latinus and acknowledges that there is no untainted version and that later sources such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus are contaminated by the tradition. Faunus’ insertion into this genealogy, before the foundation of their civilisation, shows how he is to be seen as an important figure and guide for the Romans throughout their early history, a key point of my thesis.

In his choice of genealogy, Virgil embeds Faunus and Latinus into an Italian landscape with rustic farming origins. The connection to the landscape is strengthened by the inclusion of Saturn, Picus and the rural nymph Laurentine Marica, all Italian deities associated with woods, fields or agriculture. I agree with Moorton (1989, 120) who asserts that Virgil stresses the ‘rustic sanctity of [Latinus’] pedigree back through a line of sylvan deities.’ Saturn brought agriculture, law and a golden age. Picus the son of Saturn and also an ancientItalic Laurentian king is later turned into a woodpecker by a scorned Circe (7.189-191). There is thus a further emphasis on nature and the creatures which inhabit it. There are clear links to a particular type of physical landscape which is woodland and often mountainous and includes springs or rivers, and it is one with which Faunus is also associated in Horace’s *Odes* (discussed in Chapter 2) and in Republican sources (discussed in Chapter 1).

135 In Hesiod’s *Theogony* (1011-15), Latinus is the son of Circe and Odysseus and king of the Etruscans.
136 Compare Thomas (2004, 131 note 20) who also stresses the lack of authority.
137 Parry (1963, 68), Nethercut (1971-72, 123) and Rosivach (1980, 151) agree with this view, arguing that the second half of the *Aeneid* emphasises the rustic purity of the Italians in contrast to the warlike, encroaching Trojans.
Marica is an appropriate partner for Faunus, because she is a nymph who also possesses an intimate relationship with the landscape. Nymphs inhabit landscapes with similar features to those which Faunus and the fauns inhabit, natural settings which include trees, mountains or bodies of water.\textsuperscript{138} Virgil stresses Marica’s role as a Latin deity by assigning her the epithet Laurens ‘Laurentine’.\textsuperscript{139} As a result, Virgil cements the Italian and ancient origins of gods connected to Faunus and his line by embedding individuals such as Marica within the environs of Laurentum. Virgil may also be alluding to the ancient goddess Marica who was worshipped in a grove near the Liris River in central Italy perhaps as early as the seventh century BCE.\textsuperscript{140} This emphasises the deity’s status as an early Italian (deity).

In his description of Laurentum Virgil is writing about landscapes familiar to the Romans, or at least ones they knew of historically or geographically which lends an air of authenticity and significance to Faunus’ role.\textsuperscript{141} Although it is difficult to ascertain to what extent the Latin towns named in the *Aeneid* were real places\textsuperscript{142}, we can say that there is a degree of reality or authenticity to his description of the landscape.\textsuperscript{143} Many of the towns mentioned had certainly disappeared by Virgil’s time and those left were in decay, but some still had remains of temples and shrines (Cornell, 1995, 109).\textsuperscript{144} Cornell (1995, 70-73) concedes that archaeology has to some extent confirmed the prominent role played by Alba and Lavinium in the Roman foundation story. I agree with

\textsuperscript{138} See Käppel’s entry entitled ‘Nymphs’ in *Brill’s New Pauly*.
\textsuperscript{139} *Laurens* is probably used as a synecdoche; Virgil was using an adjective derived from a town in Latium to denote the entire region of Latium.
\textsuperscript{140} Von Stuckrad’s entry entitled ‘Marica’ in *Brill’s New Pauly* suggests this early time period.
\textsuperscript{141} According to Lewis and Short (1891, s.v.), Laurentum was a maritime town in Latium between Ostia and Lavinium, now Torre Paterno. Williams (1973, 171) in his commentary likewise suggests it was between the Tiber and Ardea and that the name Laurentum was the name either of this region or a town within it. According to the *OCD*, Laurentum is referred to in the Peutinger Table (a medieval copy of a map of the Roman Empire last revised in the fourth or early fifth century) which suggests it was a real place.
\textsuperscript{142} Virgil lists some ancient Italian towns at 6.773-5; Ahl’s note (2007, 375-6) on these lines explains that the cities listed had been destroyed by Rome, abandoned or absorbed into other towns by the time of Virgil. The towns may have disappeared, but their names were still known.
\textsuperscript{143} Lavinium was in an area close to the Laurentian woods and marshes which had once been thickly wooded but was then used for grazing animals and hunting wild boar. Varro (*Rust*. 3.13) describes Hortensius’ villa in the country near Laurentum as stocked with game including wild boars. Romans had summer seaside residences in the vicinity and Cicero (*De or.*, 2.6) tells us that Scipio and Laelius used to go to the Laurentine coast to escape the city.
\textsuperscript{144} Ancient Laurentum does not form part of the archaeological record; Lucan refers to Laurentum as one of the towns depopulated as a result of civil war (Luc. 7.394). Ancient Lavinium has been identified; the site is still inhabited and is a walled medieval style village, modern Pratica di Mare, in the commune of Pomezia (Horsfall, 1999, 269).
Fordyce who acknowledges this in his commentary (1977, 67): ‘Virgil builds a romantic past out of Italian legend’ but he also stresses that the poet is also largely responsible for creating the ‘Italian legend’.

In my first chapter I suggested that the *fauni* of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* may have evolved into the singular god Faunus of the *Aeneid* (Ch. 1.3.1, 1.5).\(^{145}\) This could prove key to our understanding of the reason for lack of Republican sources for Faunus and the explosion of them in the Augustan literature. The insertion of Faunus into the *Aeneid* is in itself largely responsible for later assumptions about the antiquity of this deity. The following passage from Book 8 contains the only reference to the fauns in the *Aeneid* and in it there are allusions to the Golden Age of Saturn which makes the discussion of the passage appropriate at this point in my thesis. I will use this passage as evidence for the fauns preceding Faunus, so its discussion here is an interesting supporting argument to the last which appears to suggest the god’s antiquity. There are clear parallels with the last passage discussed: Saturn’s reign of Latium was long and peaceful and the landscape and its inhabitants have similarities with those in the previous passage; the deities are native (with the obvious exception of Saturn), there are fauns and nymphs with important connections to the woodland setting. Prayer, portent and sacrifice serve as the prelude to the episode below which is part of Aeneas’ tour of Pallanteum, the future site of Rome. Aeneas seeks out Evander for an alliance after a ghostly visit from the god Tiberinus during an oracular dream.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{tum rex Euandrus Romanae conditor arcis:} \\
\text{haec nemora indigenae Fauni Nymphaeque tenebant} \\
gensque uirum truncis et duro robore nata, \ldots 315 \\
\text{quis neque mos neque cultus erat, nec iungere tauros} \\
\text{aut componere opes norant aut parcere parto,} \\
\text{sed rami atque asper uictu uenatus alebat.} \\
\text{primus ab aetherio uenit Saturnus Olympeo} \\
\text{arma Iouis fugiens et regnis exsul ademptis.} \quad 320
\end{align*}\]

\(^{145}\) Fordyce in his commentary (1977, 67) also cites this theory regarding the multiplicity of the fauns and the single figure Faunus. Fordyce states that the multiplicity of *fauni* (*Ecl. 6.27, G. 1.10, Aen. 8.314*) which appears as early as Ennius may be merely an assimilation to the *Panes* of Greek poetry but it may go back to an original conception of undifferentiated spirits of the woods and the countryside from which the figure of a single Faunus came to emerge (see Latte, *Rom. Relig.* 83).
Then king Evander, founder of the Roman citadel (said): these woods the native inhabitants, fauns and nymphs used to occupy and a race of people born from trunks and hard oak, who were without rule or culture, nor knew how to yoke oxen or gather resources or be sparing in what they had gained, but they were kept nourished by branches and by the savage food of hunting. Saturn was the first to come as exile from high Olympus fleeing the arms of Jupiter and stripped of power. This race, ignorant and scattered throughout high mountains he brought together and gave law and preferred that the land be called Latium, since he had lain hidden safe in this country. Under his reign were the golden ages which they talk of: in this way he ruled the people in perfect peace, until gradually came an age, meaner and without colour, susceptible to the madness of war and love of possessions.

Saturn comes to reign over Italy’s Golden Age after he has been expelled from Olympus by Jupiter. A scattered race is found by the god Saturn fleeing Olympus. The people allowed Saturn to lie hidden and so their respect earned them divine favour leading to the Golden Age. The people of Latium were given divine provenance as favour for their protection of Saturn who in turn greatly influenced their relationship with the land.\(^{146}\) Saturn’s role as bringer of agriculture\(^{147}\) is interesting, for it is not Faunus who is mentioned in this passage, but the fauns. One would expect Faunus to be at home in this passage, particularly considering the reference to tree trunks and oak, since as we shall see

---

\(^{146}\) This is mirrored later to some extent by Aeneas and his men landing on the shores of Latium (7.105-106).

\(^{147}\) Williams (1973, 249) notes the connection of Saturn with \textit{satus} sowing, which fits his role as bringer of agriculture.
in Book 12 he has a sacred *oleaster* (12.766) and it is in the trunk of this very tree that Aeneas’ javelin is held fast (12.772). In an earlier stage of development of the land which was subsequently called Latium, the fauns are appropriate because it is a pre-agricultural environment. Faunus is not yet a visible part of the mythology in this primitive landscape, but he should then be mentioned later after the arrival of Saturn, in connection with Latium. In a way, then, reference to the fauns in this instance and the lack of any allusion to Faunus, casts doubt upon the antiquity of Faunus and seems in some respects to be inconsistent with Virgil’s presentation of the deity in Book 7 as an ancient god who is firmly rooted in the Italian landscape.

It is interesting that the fauns are the focus in the context of Evander as king and founder of the first settlement on the Palatine. This is important because in this passage we find represented an earlier time in Rome’s history. The fauns are of the woods here, they are associated with a pre-agrarian race, uncultured and uncivilised, but connected to the landscape having been born from *trunci* ‘trunks’ and *duro robore* ‘hard oak’. It is true that this is not the place for Virgil’s Faunus who in the *Aeneid* thus far has largely been portrayed as an ancient king and is part of the civilised world: as the father of Latinus he comes later. Virgil applies *indigenae* ‘indigenous inhabitants’ to the fauni which suggests that fauns are considered ancient. I agree with Fordyce (1977, 239) who sees the multiplicity of *fauni* in this passage as inconsistent with Virgil’s Latin king Faunus and also suggests that it recalls Lucretius 4.575-589 (discussed in chapter 1.2.4). Either Virgil has not reconciled his sources or he does envisage that the fauns are of an older and more primitive generation than Faunus.

3.3 An Oracular Italic Landscape

*Aen. 7.81-91, 95, 102-106*

The troubled king approaches his oracle which is situated in the sacred grove Albunea at Tibur. Here Faunus is represented as an aged seer who instils future insight in dreamers. Latinus is worried by the divine portents which seem to be casting doubt upon the choice of Turnus as bridegroom for his daughter Lavinia.

At rex sollicitus monstris oracula Fauni,

fatidici genitoris, adit lucosque sub alta
But troubled by prodigies the king approached the oracle of his prophetic father Faunus and he takes counsel in the sacred grove under Albunea’s heights, which is the greatest of groves. It echoes with a sacred spring and darkly breathes forth a deadly vapour. From here peoples of Italy, the whole Oenotria land seek answers in difficult times, the priestess brings offerings with her and under night’s silence lies on spread-out slaughtered sheep skins seeking sleep, she sees many images flying about in wonderful ways and hears various voices and enjoys conversations with the gods and also speaks to Acheron in deepest Avernus.

Faunus is associated with the Republican oracular fauns as Virgil adds prophecy to his characterisation of the deity which also suggests that the deity, like the fauns, is long-established and firmly-rooted in the landscape. These impressive oracular powers are linked with the grove which he inhabits: Virgil employs the adjective *fatidici*¹⁴⁸, ‘prophetic’ or ‘speaking the fates’. Virgil uses *fatidicus* on just two other occasions in the *Aeneid*¹⁴⁹ which gives the use of it in the emphasis of Faunus’ oracular capabilities special significance. Virgil situates the oracular Faunus in the sacred grove of Albunea.¹⁵⁰ When discussing this passage Rosivach (1980, 141), suggests that Virgil’s readers would think of Faunus as a god of

---

¹⁴⁸ This compound word *fatidicus* is used in Latin literature 55 times; Cicero is first to use it, in *De Legibus* 2.20.11 and then *De Natura Deorum* 1.18.6 and 2.73.7.

¹⁴⁹ The only other use of *fatidicus* by Virgil is in the form of *fatidicae*; said of the nymph Carmentis and then Manto, wife of Tiberinus, *Aeneid* 8.340, 10.199.

¹⁵⁰ See Boas (1938, 193-206) for a detailed discussion of the various possible locations of Albunea. Williams in his commentary (1973, 173) identifies Albunea as the grove and its fountain near Lavinium as distinct from the Tiburtine Albunea of Horace. Williams attributes the confusion between the two to Servius. Indeed the two are considered one and the same in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (4 Ed.).
woodland and pasture rather than one possessing oracular capabilities, but he cites Ovid’s *Fasti* 4.649 as evidence to support this suggestion. The Ovidian reference is later than Virgil and the oracular nature of the fauns is well attested in Cicero’s works of the mid first century BCE. Virgil’s readers could just as easily associate Faunus with the oracular fauns. Perhaps we are to recall the voices of the fauns of the woods and countryside, particularly so when we consider the following lines where elusive images are flitting about and voices are heard from the depths of a grove (*Aen.* 7.89-91, 95). Virgil may be alluding to Lucretius (4.575-589), a passage discussed in chapter 1.2.3, in which there is a similar emphasis on the sound of the forest and an association with this and the noise of the fauns.

Faunus’ oracle in the grove Albunea is described as *nemorum maxima* (*Aen.* 7.82). *Maxima* ‘greatest’ emphasises also the depths of the large grove and the idea of the darkness of the woods. This grove seems almost impenetrable, an image reinforced by the adjective *opaca*, ‘dark’. The uncertainty and danger of this landscape is clear in the dark, fumy nature of the grove. It is my argument that the Romans, unsure of how to negotiate their physical landscapes, especially those just described (sacred groves which also possessed the potential to do harm to those who entered them), had to rely on their relationship with the gods to do so successfully.

The Roman relationship to their environment was one which involved ‘constant struggle against considerable odds’, as reflected in ‘the pastoral tradition of the foundation’ of Rome and ‘the exaggeration of the wooded wilderness where the city later arose’ (Purcell, 1996, 189). It was important to avoid trespass into sacred realms of the gods such as sacred ground, tombs, shrines, pools, springs, trees and groves. I think Romans needed gods who could harness the power of the landscape in order to ensure their positive relationship with it. It was through

---

151 Clarke (2001, 167) discusses Catullus’ use of *opacus* in relation to *nemus* in C. 63 which gives ‘the Roman reader an impression of a wood so dense and overgrown that the sun’s rays struggle to penetrate it’.

152 The link between Roman imperialism and the power over landscape is explored by Purcell (1996, 180-212), who stresses the close relationship of the physical landscape with religion and ideology. Purcell uses Pliny’s description of the flooding of the Tiber (*HN* 3. 54-5) as an example of the religious awe with which Romans regarded their physical landscapes. How appropriate that Faunus’ temple found its home on the Tiber Island.

153 Ovid in his discussion of the rites of the Parilia festival offers advice for shepherds who may have wandered into such places unknowingly whilst grazing their flocks (*Fasti*, 4.748-760). At 760 there is also the suggestion that every grove is inhabited by gods.
their observance of rites associated with gods that a beneficial relationship between humans and the landscape was ensured. Newby (2012, 355, 368) suggests that the Romans saw nature as ‘sacred and potentially dangerous’ and that Latin literature created ‘an image of the natural world as a place of the gods, into which men tread at their peril’. I agree with Newby’s observation that the Romans thought wild untouched landscapes such as Faunus’ grove were imbued with sacred power, but I think that this power is not necessarily destructive in the case of Faunus. The beneficent presence of Faunus neutralises the potential danger of the environment suggested by *mephitis* ‘deadly vapour’. Appropriate interaction with the landscape through correct religious observance when visiting the oracle would ensure a safe passage and a favourable relationship with this environment. Faunus’ presence in the landscape ensures Latinus’ successful negotiation of it, particularly since he has such a close family connection with him.

Virgil creates a picture of a landscape with specific features already known to Romans that could be associated with the area in which the action of the poem is set, in the description of Laurentum at the beginning of Book 7 (vv. 81-6). Horsfall (2000, 96-7) asks us to contemplate 7.81-106 as a poetic construct of Virgil which may owe much to Helicon, but the commentator then follows with possible real geographical connections between ‘Albunea’ and the Tibur. Although the features that Virgil assigns to the grove may be considered standard or set *topoi* of sacred landscapes, there are also elements that lend it an Italian, even a Latin, flavour. The use of *Italae* for example asserts the Italian nature of the landscape. Fordyce in his commentary (1977, 75) notes the similarity of *mephitim* to *mephitis* which is an Italic word of the region where sulphurous exhalation was common. *Mephitim*, probably Oscan in origin, lends a sense of antiquity to the passage (OLD, 1976, 1101). *Oenotria* may well be an allusion to the Oenotri, an ancient Italian tribe in southern Italy and its use may be an attempt by Virgil to lend credence to Faunus’ antiquity (Marasco, 2006). So Italian-ness

---

154 Guarducci (1955, 120) identifies the location of Virgil’s Albunea in the region of Laurentum, Tilly (1947, 103) locates it in Ardea now Zolforata, although Rehm (1932, 75) believes the description to be purely poetic. The site of Albunea near Lavinium was abundant with sulphurous springs as were many other places such as Tivoli, Sicily, Ampsantus, Baiae, Cutilia and Ardea (Edlund-Berry, 2006, 179). The sulphurous springs in Etruria are those which have been most extensively excavated and well documented (Chellini, 2002, 217-20).
is an important antecedent to Roman identity, or at least an essential element in its foundation in the *Aeneid*.

Virgil’s choice to include the oracle of Faunus this early in his description of Italy is interesting; it is perhaps a way of suggesting that this ‘ancient’ god is firmly rooted in the Italian religious landscape. Pogorzelski (2009, 263) claims that ‘the *Aeneid* defines Roman identity … by a positive geographical association of Roman-ness with Italy’. Although I agree with Fordyce who states in his commentary (1977, 75) that the landscape Virgil creates is not one of absolute reality, such places did in fact exist. Even though the exact location may not be identifiable, elements of the landscape itself are familiar. It was one that the Romans knew and with which they could identify. That all the tribes sought answers at Faunus’ oracle serves to demonstrate the sacred nature Romans attributed to their environments. The Roman identification with the natural landscape is crucial when we consider the location of oracles in groves.

According to Virgil (7.85-6) peoples from all of Oenotria come to this grove and the oracle of Faunus to seek answers to their queries during troubled times. Guidance, clarity of mind and purpose were sought from the voice of father Faunus. Perhaps there are subtle suggestions of the god’s humanity in *genitor*, which paves the way for safe access to this grove in particular. The oracle of Faunus which Virgil describes as located in the grove Albunea is a nexus between humans, the landscape and the gods, which extends across generations.

Latinus comes to his father Faunus’ oracle seeking answers, performs the necessary sacrifice and prepares himself for the response. Latinus has been advised to seek an alliance other than Latin in the marriage of his daughter. A foreign son-in-law will bring the known world under the rule of their descendants.

… subita ex alto uox reddita luco est:

*Aen.* 7.95

… Suddenly a voice answered from the depths of the grove:

---

155 Horsfall (1985, 197-208) on the other hand, argues that there is not reality in the geography of the *Aeneid* and that it was not Virgil’s concern nor an expectation of his audience. Horsfall’s views are in opposition to scholars such as Wellesley (1980, 169) who suggests that Virgil wrote about places he in fact knew. But Papaioannou (2003, 687-689) provides examples of topographic reality in the *Aeneid*, particularly in Book 8.
When the voice is ‘returned’ *reddita*, this phrase recalls *reddant* (576) ‘sending back’ and *reddere* (579) ‘returning’ (of echoes) from the Lucretius passage discussed in Chapter 1.2.4 (*DRN* 4.575-589). More generally this passage recalls Chapter 1.2\(^{156}\) where I make reference to the disembodied voices of the fauns. And although Faunus’ oracular capabilities are the focus for Virgil, he places Faunus within a landscape in which the Lucretian fauns or even the Horatian Faunus would be at home. These locations usually include woodland features such as a dense or shady grove (*alto lupo* in the current passage).\(^{157}\) It is night in the Lucretian and Virgilian passages and, as we have seen, Virgil also emphasises the darkness of the grove, an appropriate setting for an oracle such as this.

When Faunus had concluded his prophecies, Latinus reveals their contents and Rumour swiftly carries them around the Italian cities, before the Trojans led by Aeneas moor their ships in Latium. Boas (1938, 63) heralds Aeneas’ arrival as the announcement of a new world era.

```latex
haec responsa patris Fauni monitusque silenti
nocte datos non ipse suo premit ore Latinus,
sed circum late uolitans iam Fama per urbes
Ausonias tulerat, cum Laomedontia pubes
gramineo ripae religuit ab aggere classem.

*Aen. 7.102-106*
```

These responses and warnings from his father Faunus given in the silent night Latinus himself did not hold fast within his own lips. But now Rumour flitting about had carried them around the Ausonian cities, when the Trojan youths moored their fleet to the grassy mound of the bank.

Rumour’s swift travel through Ausonia underlines the significance of the prophecies of Faunus. This elevation of Faunus is also key in Virgil’s depiction of the deity. Rumour *uolitans* ‘flitting about’ is reminiscent of *uolitantia* at 7.89 in the description of images flying about, again bringing to mind that which is


\(^{157}\) Lucret. 4.577, 589; Hor. *Odes* 1.4.11, 1.17.5.
difficult to contain or pin down, much like the noises of the fauns. This may also be reminiscent of the Sibyl’s prophecy-inscribed leaves in 3.450 scattering and fluttering about from the wind when the doors to her cave are opened, leaving many who approach with unanswered questions. In contrast to the noise of Rumour, Faunus is associated with silence *silenti nocte.* When he is in the role of father Faunus’ connection to the physical landscape is not so pronounced. Faunus as *pater* ‘father’ elevates the lineage of the Latins not only in a historical sense but also in a divine one. Faunus as father applies not just to Latinus but to the whole of the Latin race. These prophecies are only received by those who are divine or in close contact with the divine. The future of the Latins is destined to be historic. The descendants of Faunus will be favoured by the gods, if they observe the warnings of the ‘ancient’ and indigenous deities, whilst the reverse places them in danger.

3.4 Trojan Intrusion

*Aen. 7.212-215, 249-258, 365-370*

The Trojan intrusion is multi-layered; land, progeny and identity are all threatened. Aeneas and his men are initially respectful of Faunus and Latinus’ lineage, but they will then wantonly disregard Faunus’ association with the landscape. Aeneas and the Trojans arrive in Latium during the rule of Latinus. Trojan acknowledgement of Faunus paves the way for friendly relations and acceptance of them by the Latins. The prophecy of Faunus (7.97) invites the Trojans by way of Aeneas as a foreign son-in-law, but they are in fact intruding since Lavinia has already been promised to Turnus. It is the interpretation of this prophecy which Amata goes on to debate with crazed conviction.

It is significant that when the Trojans appear, Virgil presents them as making use of the name of Faunus to establish a bond between themselves and the Italians. This Trojan acknowledgement of Faunus as father of Latinus serves as a genealogical link between this section of the discussion and the first.

Dixerat, et dicta Ilioneus sic uoce secutus:

'rex, genus egregium Fauni, nec fluctibus actos

---

158 *Volitans* also recalls the description of *Rumour* at 4.174-190 where the same verb is used.
159 See Boas (1938, 208) for a discussion of *silentio noctis* in connection with the *incubatio.*
atra subegit hiems uestris succedere terris,
nec sidus regione uiae litusue fefellit:

*Aen. 7.212-215*

He finished speaking, and Ilioneus followed his words with this reply:
‘King distinguished stock of Faunus, neither forced by black winter nor
driven by waves to enter your land, nor has star nor coastline misled us in
the direction of our path:

Ilioneus has come to try to negotiate with Latinus and is attempting to flatter the
king by laying emphasis on the fact that Latinus is descended from a god, just like
Aeneas. Latinus asks the Trojans’ representative Ilioneus what has brought him
here. In his response he does not just include Faunus, but places him as the fourth
word in his speech to Latinus. Horsfall (2000, 171) suggests the
acknowledgement here of Faunus by Ilioneus is either because scouts have found
out the information or that it is due to convention and good manners. The name
Ilioneus contains Ilion, the name of the original founder of Troy. Virgil in his
choice of envoy may be alluding to the foundation of the next Trojan city. The
Trojans know of the oracular powers of Faunus which estab
lishes a connection
with the other prophecies in the *Aeneid*. Ilioneus has heard of Faunus and grants
the god his dues, but of course later this relationship will be destroyed by the
cutting down of the tree sacred to the god (12.765-771).

In the following line Latinus’ status is greatly elevated through his association
with Faunus. The closeness of *rex* and *egregium* further stresses Faunus’
association with kingship. The excellent quality of any offspring of Faunus is
made evident by *egregium* ‘distinguished’. The fact that *genus* can mean
‘stock’ reinforces Faunus’ relationship to the rural landscape. It continues the
agricultural theme begun with Saturn as his grandfather in this book and
confirmed with Saturn as the bringer of agriculture in the following book; 8.313-
323. But *genus* can also mean ‘child’ which suggests a more human nature.161
Virgil may highlight Faunus’ human nature in relation to the line of kings in order
to prepare us for another change in his characterisation of the deity. Virgil’s

160 The *OLD* (1968, 760-61) defines *genus* as ‘1 stock, descent, birth, origin and 2 offspring’, 1b
with the implication of high or noble descent.
Faunus has been king, father, and oracle, but we will soon see him as a god whose strong attachment to the landscape is threatened by Trojan intrusion. *Genus* here prepares us for the transition to come where we see Faunus as a god who is deeply connected to a landscape he can no longer defend against the intruding Trojans and their gods. Aeneas himself is the son of a goddess which establishes his right to be a future ruler. Virgil likewise gives Latinus a semi-divine ancestry to oppose or equate him with Aeneas, the son of Venus and Anchises. As previously mentioned, in Greek tradition Latinus was the son of Odysseus and Circe (Hes. *Theog.* 1011-15). By changing his parents to Faunus and the Italian nymph Marica Virgil is perhaps underlining Latinus’ right to rule and his natural place in the landscape.

In the passage above (7.212-215) kings are represented as from the world of men and not of gods, which is why the conversation takes place between two mortal heroes. Virgil shows that these ‘men’ are somehow favoured when signs or portents from the realm of the divine feature in this passage. Because they have been respectful of the oracle they have not been misled. Faunus’ lineage bestows prestige and favour on the king without the king necessarily being divine. Ilioneus’ reference to Faunus helps to legitimise the prophecy of destiny that the Trojans have received. There is a series of connecting prophecies about the destiny of Aeneas; not all of the information is revealed at once. Prophecy is important in the *Aeneid* and it is a major aspect of Virgil’s characterisation of Faunus. The Trojans invoke Faunus, a native and ‘ancient’ Latin deity as a sign of respect, which also serves to emphasise the antiquity of the deity. What is most significant about the manner in which Ilioneus addresses Latinus is that he singles out his lineage from Faunus as a way of honouring him and of establishing a bond of respect between the two peoples.

Latinus has received the envoys of Aeneas who sought an alliance with the king. They offer him gifts from Troy as Latinus comes to the realisation that Aeneas is the prophesied and much desired foreign son-in-law.

_Talibus Ilionei dictis defixa Latinus_

---

1.257-288 prophecy of Roman rule in Italy from Aeneas to Caesar Augustus; 4.229-231 Aeneas to rule the whole of Italy pregnant with empires; 5.729-30 Anchises tells Aeneas to take the best young men to Italy to defeat the Latins.
obtutu tenet ora soloque immobilita haeret,
intentos uoluens oculos. nec purpura regem
picta mouet nec scaptra mouent Priameia tantum
quantum in conubio natae thalamoque moratur,
et ueteris Fauni uoluit sub pectore sortem:
hunc illum fatis externa ab sede profectum
portendi generum paribusque in regna uocari
auspiciis, huic progeniem uirtute futuram
egregiam et totum quae uiribus occupet orbem.

Aen. 7.249-258

Such being the words which Ilioneus speaks Latinus holds his eyes fixed
downwards in a steady gaze and unchanging he fastens on the ground
moving his attentive eyes. Neither embroidered purple affects the king nor
Priam’s Sceptre moves him so much as he dwells on his daughter’s
wedding and on her marriage-bed, and he turned round old Faunus’
prophecy within his heart: this is the man that by the fates was foretold
had set out from foreign land and as a son-in-law summoned into rule with
equal power, his future descendants outstanding in respect to their virtue
would seize the whole world with their power.

Faunus plays a crucial role in the formation of Roman identity through Virgil’s
characterisation of him as oracular and ancient. The weight of Faunus’ words is
stated clearly in this passage in the burden of his sortem ‘prophecy’ in the king’s
heart. In this passage Faunus’ oracular capabilities are the focus and these are
given great importance through the use of sortem, fatis, portendi and auspiciis.
Moreover, Virgil in the passage further identifies the destiny of Aeneas’ people
with their connection to the favour of the gods. Whilst it may be a decision to
concern and trouble the heart of this man, Latinus, the greater purpose, often
beyond mortal deliberations, becomes clear. Latinus’ choice will ultimately affect
the identity of the Italians and the Trojans. These two ancient peoples will
become the Romans. The antiquity of Faunus is suggested by ueteris (254)\textsuperscript{163}

\textsuperscript{163} The OLD (1968, 2051) includes in its definition of uetus 1 having lived a long time, old, Verg.
Ecl. 9.9; 2 having been long in a given capacity, Verg. Ecl. 9.4; 3 Long-established, long-standing, Verg. G. 1.378; 5a-b (of men) belonging to a past age Verg. Aen. 1.23, 8.600. For vetus, Lewis and Short (1891, 1983) include old, of long-standing, of a former time, earlier, ancient and for
‘old’, ‘having lived for a long time’. When *uetus* is taken as ‘long-established’ there are implications of Faunus being venerable, so perhaps Faunus is wise because of his age. Again, *egregiam* is used in connection with Latinus’ descendants through his future son-in-law Aeneas. In addition to the exceptional quality of the offspring the emphasis is also on total world domination *totum uiribus orbem*. The use of these words and *regna* two lines earlier foretell the future kingdom and the success of the dynasty of which Faunus is made an important part. According to Toll (1997, 40), ‘Virgil was in an excellent position to see that Roman-ness and Italian-ness were not inevitably the same thing’. For the poet’s audience a single identity had not yet been absolutely constructed and Romans still considered themselves apart from the Italians. In sum, Virgil is emphasising differences between the Italians and the Romans and introducing Faunus as a means of uniting them. It is the oracle of Faunus which suggests or at least introduces, the possibility of a foreign bridegroom for Lavinia, paving the way for Aeneas. It is also the acknowledgement of Faunus by Ilioneus which encourages negotiation between the Trojans and the Latins.

In the episode below Virgil not only highlights the ambiguity of oracles but also the cultural diversity of ancient Italy which can be traced back through the ancestry of the Romans. At Juno’s behest the fury Allecto maddens Amata who reminds Latinus of his promise to Turnus and attempts to convince her husband that Turnus can in fact be considered foreign. Juno lays the foundation for the war to come. Williams (1996, 191) sees this as reflective of Virgil’s own experience of the civil wars in Italy (*Ecl*. 1.71-2, *G*. 1.506-8). Perhaps the Romans empathised with Amata’s anger and anxiety. Many towns such as Turnus’ Ardea at 7.411-13 had once been great, but were now abandoned by fortune. This loss may not only be an allusion to the destruction of such towns

---

*uetera*, old things, the old, antiquity. The emphasis on antiquity and a past age seems most appropriate given the context of this passage.

164 It had only been since 42 BCE that almost the whole of Italy was unified, so when Virgil began his epic in 29 BCE a unified nation psychologically was an ideal rather than a reality (Pogorzelski, 2009, 263).

165 See Reed (2007, 132) for how the epithet *antiquus* is applied to this town. See also Chapter 5 of the same work by Reed for a discussion of such ancient cities and their implication for the ‘future ancient city of Rome’. 
but also to Virgil’s personal loss due to the confiscation of his father’s farm during the land redistribution after the Battle of Philippi (42 BCE).  

quid tua sancta fides? quid cura antiqua tuorum et consanguineo totiens data dextera Turno? si gener externa petitur de gente Latinis, idque sedet, Faunique premunt te iussa parentis, omnem equidem sceptris terram quae libera nostris dissidet externam reor et sic dicere diuos. 

Aen. 7.365-70

What of your sacred beliefs? What of the ancient concern for your people and frequently given handshake to your kindred Turnus? If it is a foreign son-in-law that is sought for the Latin people, if it is settled, and you are pressed by your father Faunus’ commands, all the land that is indeed separate and free from our power I think is foreign and this is what the gods are declaring.

It becomes clear from Amata’s words that she has a very strong agenda. Amata is trying to twist the words of the oracle of Faunus and trying to interpret it to her advantage by viewing Turnus as a stranger. Horsfall (2000, 55) reminds us of Faunus’ words at 98: externi uenient generi ‘they will come’, indicating that they have not yet arrived. The queen is desperate, as she has been maddened by the fury Allecto (7.341) and wants her daughter to be married to Turnus. In one breath she refers to Turnus as consanguineus ‘kindred’ and then in the next as externus ‘foreign’.

Amata points out that the Italian communities are not an amalgam (Pogorzelski, 2009, 265-66). From this we see an ancient Italy of many distinct states, to be unified into one Roman people under the leadership of Aeneas, despite the wishes of Amata.

The use of iussus ‘command’ rather than sors ‘prophecy’ may be part of Amata’s undermining of the oracle of Faunus. Faunus is characterised as ‘father’ by Virgil for the fourth time in Book 7, reinforcing the importance of this connection

166 See Chapter 3.2 for further discussion of such towns. Also see Chapter 1.2.7 and 1.2.8 where I mention land confiscation in Virgil’s bucolic works.

167 See Bleisch (1996, 453-472) who discusses on the possibility that Faunus’ oracle is deliberately misleading and on the choice of foreign bridegroom.
between gods and men. But for Amata, *parens* ‘father’ rather than *deus* ‘god’ disassociates the commands of Latinus’ father Faunus from the commands of the deity Faunus, contributing to her subtle undermining of his oracle. Amata is trying to juxtapose Faunus’ commands against Latinus’ long-standing *cura* ‘concern’ for his people. It is significant that she applies the adjective *antiquus* to the noun *cura*; she is implying that Latinus used to care but no longer does (Horsfall, 2000, 254).168

Faunus represents the strength and legitimacy of Italy in Rome’s history. He is a guide of his people, not only as a man and ruler, sire to wise children but also a deified being who brings the will of the gods to his kin. He serves as a connection between the divine and the human, the landscape and its foundations. The passage above is also the fourth instance of Faunus’ association with the oracular, another important attribute of this deity in the *Aeneid*. Faunus guides his people and lands into history, defining greatness. It is the words of these god-like men who will shape what will come to be the foundations of Rome.169 Virgil pays homage to ancient Italy in his representation of Roman identity by inserting ‘native’ deities such as Faunus and Italian figures such as Latinus in his poem.170

### 3.5 Martial Epic and Displacement of Italic Gods

* *Aen. 10.550-558, 12.766-787*

The war between the Trojans and the Latins in Books 9-12 on what will become Roman soil reflects the major external and internal crises of Roman history, the civil wars of the first century BCE and to a lesser extent the Punic Wars of the third and second centuries BCE (Zetzel, 1997, 189). In the final two passages we see the complete breakdown of the Trojan and Latin relationship. Aeneas and his men desecrate the Italian landscape, its deities and its population. War takes place in Iliadic fashion in the Latin woodlands, a landscape which is associated with

---

168 See Reed (2007, 107, 130-133, 137-143, 152) for the implications of *antiquus* in the *Aeneid* which include ‘sentimental and venerable’, ‘honour due to age’, ‘existing for a long time’ and ‘continuing to exist’, ‘no longer existing’, ‘no longer what it was’, ‘revered and no longer relevant’.

169 This seems appropriate given that Julius Caesar, a history-making Roman man is deified. ‘Indigenous’ and ‘historical’ figures such as Faunus the Latin king echo the deification of Julius Caesar. Caesar is the adoptive father of Augustus and Faunus is the father of Latinus; a reminder to the reader of Caesar’s deification and a subtle compliment to Augustus.

170 For another example, see Farron (1981, 103) who argues that Virgil ‘further emphasises Turnus’ extreme Italian-ness by his family’.

105
almost every Faunus passage in the *Aeneid*. Faunus’ connection to this landscape is clear in both of the passages below. Virgil assigns Faunus the epithet *siluicola* ‘sylvan inhabiting woodlands’ (10.551) and further defines the landscape by locating a sacred olive tree at this site (12.766). We will see, surprisingly, that the strength of this connection seems to diminish the god’s power to negotiate successfully and powerfully within this landscape. In these passages, the ultimate victory of the Trojans results in the displacement of Latin deities of whom Faunus is the chief representative. Aeneas beheads a direct descendant of Faunus, Tarquitus, Trojan warriors cut down the ancient *oleaster* and prayers to the Latin deity are overruled by the stronger pro-Trojan goddess Venus, mother of Aeneas.

Tarquitus exsultans contra fulgentibus armis, siluicolae Fauno Dryope quem nympha crearat, obuius ardenti sese obtulit. ille reducta loricam clipeique ingens onus impedit hasta, tum caput orantis nequiquam et multa parantis dicere deturbat terrae, truncumque tepentem prouoluens super haec inimico pectore fatur: 'istic nunc, metuende, iace. non te optima mater condet humi patrioque onerabit membra sepulcro:

*Aen.* 10.550-58

Tarquitus triumphing in his shining armour, whom the nymph Dryope had born to sylvan Faunus, brought himself in the way of fiery (Aeneas), he (Aeneas) drawing back his spear, pins the breastplate and the huge bulk of the shield together, then as he (Tarquitus) was pleading in vain and preparing to say much He (Aeneas) dislodged his head to the ground, rolling over the warm trunk from his hostile heart he said the following things above him: ‘Lie where you are now, feared one. Your great mother will not lay you on the ground and your limbs will not burden your family tomb:

Significantly, we can see how within this passage, Faunus is demoted, relegated to the environs of the woods, and stripped of his kingly status and its associated power. Faunus’ close relationship with the woodland setting is evident through
his encasement by *siluicola*, *Dryope* and *nympha*. Tarquitus’ lineage from Dryope and Faunus is probably an invention of Virgil.\(^{171}\) One way that this invention works is that Dryope is a nymph like Marica in 7.47 and thus a good match for sylvan Faunus. The etymology of her name from oak tree\(^{172}\) cements Dryope’s suitability for the woodland Faunus. Although the epithet ‘sylvan’ *siluicola*, in v. 551 affirms Faunus’ connection to the landscape, it appears to reduce the deity’s potency. This can be contrasted earlier in Book 7 with Latinus, who is the offspring of a nymph and Faunus; his ancestry gives him strength and legitimacy.

Tarquitus’ genealogy, in which sylvan Faunus plays a major role is not enough to save him from Aeneas and in fact appears to weaken the warrior. Harrison (1991, 201) discusses Tarquitus’ worthiness as an opponent to Aeneas, but although Tarquitus is *metuendus*, he is still overcome. The placement of Faunus in the context of the death of Tarquitus points to a weakening of the god here.\(^{173}\) Tarquitus’ body is lying there, cut off like the trunk of a tree *truncumque tepentem* foreshadowing the fate of Faunus’ sacred *oleaster*. *Truncus* in v. 555 also recalls the first peoples born from trunks (*truncus*) and hard oak of Book 8 v. 315. The translation of *truncus* as ‘trunk’ rather than ‘body’ emphasises the sylvan origins of nymph Dryope and Faunus. Moreover I suggest that Gowers’ theory (2011, 90) regarding Virgil’s pressing of arboreal imagery in order to draw links between men and trees can also be applied to this passage because of the imagery associated with the use of *truncus*. *Truncus* is also used when Pyrrhus (Neoptolemus) beheads Priam in 2.557 and when Nisus beheads Rhamnes in 9.332. Gowers (2011, 110) identifies the Roman vocabularly of familial relationships in the use of metaphors from plant life, asking us to read the *Aeneid*

---

\(^{171}\) See Bloch’s entry entitled ‘Dryope’ in *Brill’s New Pauly*.

\(^{172}\) See Harrison, 1991, 211 for this etymology.

\(^{173}\) The only reference we have to Tarquitus in Latin literature is in fact in the passage under discussion from Virgil. The Etruscan origin of the name Tarquitus for the descendant of Faunus recalls the ancient city Tarquini in central Italy and the Tarquin kings of Rome (Harrison 1991, 211). The use of names such as Tarquitus who is a Rutilian also emphasises the antiquity of the setting which is of great importance in Virgil’s poem as the Rutilians were an ancient tribe located not far from Rome. This is a further attempt to legitimise the antiquity of Faunus’ status as an ancient king in the *Aeneid*. Regarding Tarquitus’ genealogy I agree with Harrison (1991, 211) that Tarquitus is Latinus’ half-brother. Williams (1996, 358) sees Faunus in this passage not as the father of Latinus but as one of the many rural deities with the same name, a faun. I disagree and suggest that this is in fact the singular god Faunus, that there was in fact only one singular god Faunus.
on ‘aboricultural lines’. Trees and their mutilation or decapitation are at the forefront of episodes in which Aeneas interacts with Hector, Priam, Deiphobus and others. Terms such as *stemmata* ‘garlands’, *rami* ‘branches’ and *stirps* ‘stock’ are used of people and not only in a genealogical sense. In the *Aeneid* trees stand for people and people for trees. Aeneas cuts down this hero just as the Trojans, in their disregard of the sylvan aspects of the landscape, have cut down the Italians’ sacred tree. Faunus, an ‘Italic’ god, cannot stand strongly against the encroaching Trojans. Although they initially acknowledge his importance, they now do not do so as they decapitate Faunus’ descendant, just as they cut down the sacred oleaster.

We have seen the weakening of Faunus as the Trojans assert themselves upon the Italic landscape. Aeneas denies the Italians burial in their own landscape, heightening allusions to the invading Greeks of the *Iliad* who too deny such burial (11.452, 21.122). This denial of burial for Tarquitus signifies violence and dishonour to Faunus whose tomb is a burial vault of the landscape so threatened by the Trojans. We learn of the connection between the burial of bones and ennoblement from the burial place of Aeneas’ nurse Caieta (*Aen*. 7.1-3) (Putnam, 1970, 412). Honour requires proper burial in a tomb. Denial of burial to Tarquitus is a way of dishonouring Faunus due to connection by blood. ¹⁷⁴ We can see as Ahl (2007, 425) suggests, that ‘Aeneas becomes progressively less civilised’ in his increasingly successful defeat of the Italians. Faunus too is deprived of the civilising ‘kingly’ title when he is adorned with the wooded adjective sylvan. Is there a stripping of humanity and a return to previous states for both here: uncivilised man and rustic deity?

The only allusion to Faunus as a god in the *Aeneid* comes with the final reference to him in Book 12. But although Faunus is a god, he appears to have lost his

---

¹⁷⁴ Also of interest here is the connection between Faunus and Tarquinius founded on the Tiber Island. As discussed in the previous chapter, Faunus’ temple was located on the Tiber Island. After the fall of Tarquinius in 509 BCE the island was said to have formed from wheat and grain having been thrown into the Tiber. The crops had been grown on Tarquin land which was consecrated to Mars and so could not be consumed (*Livy History*, 2.5.2-4).
kingly attributes and ultimately his capacity to reign over the Trojans. We see here the culmination of martial epic and displacement of ‘Italic’ gods.\footnote{Deus is not used specifically of Faunus anywhere else in the Aeneid. At 7.370 Amata uses 
\textit{divi} when she tries to convince Latinus that Turnus is a foreign son-in-law, but the plural is used here and Faunus is not singled out by name.}

Forte sacer Fauno foliis oleaster amaris
hic steterat, nautis olim uenerabile lignum,
seruati ex undis ubi figere dona solebant
Laurenti diuo et uotas suspendere uestis;
sed stirpem Teucri nullo discrimine sacrum
sustulerant, puro ut possent concurreere campo.
hic hasta Aeneae stabat, huc impetus illam
detulerat fixam et lenta radice tenebat.
incubuit uoluitque manu conuellere ferrum
Dardanides, teloque sequi quem prendere cursu
non poterat. tum uero amens formidine Turnus
'Faune, precor, miserere' inquit 'tuque optima ferrum
Terra tene, colui uestros si semper honores,
quos contra Aeneadæ bello fecere profanos.'
dixit, opemque dei non cassa in uota uocauit.
namque diu luctans lentoque in stirpe moratus
uiribus haud ullis ualuit discludere morsus
roboris Aeneas. dum nititur acer et instat,
rursus in aurigae faciem mutata Metisci
procurrit fratrique ense dea Daunia reddit.
quod Uenus audaci nymphae indignata licere
accessit telumque alta ab radice reuellit.

\textit{Aen. 12.766-87}

Here, by chance, a wild olive tree with bitter leaves had stood sacred to Faunus; revered by sailors when saved from the waves used to nail gifts to its ancient wood. To the god of Laurentum they were accustomed to hang up their votive clothing. But the Trojans without thinking cut it down to the lower part of the trunk though it was of sacred origin so they would be able
to gather on a clear field. Here the javelin of Aeneas stood; fixed in this place by the attack he delivered and held fast in the tough root. The Dardanian leaned over and wanted to remove the weapon by his hand, and pursue with spear that man whom he couldn’t catch in a race then Turnus frantic with a real fear said ‘Faunus, I beg you, have pity and you great earth hold that weapon, If I have always reverenced your honours, which on the other hand Aeneas’ men have defiled by war.’ He spoke and he did not invoke the help of the god in a vain prayer. For although he struggled for a long time and lingered over the stubborn stem not by any strength was Aeneas able to prise open its hardwood bite while he stood there straining intensely, the Daunian goddess again in the form of the chariot driver Metiscus runs forward and gives back the sword to her brother. Venus offended because this was permitted to a bold nymph approached and wrenched the spear out of the deep root.

Faunus is called *Laurentius diius*, at the point where the old is giving way to the new in Aeneas’ defeat of Turnus. Gowers (2011, 87) argues that ‘tree-chopping in the *Aeneid* has long been seen as a disturbingly violent symbol of the Trojans’ colonisation of Italy’. Faunus’ stump, symbolic of his place in the foundation of the Latin landscape, grips the spear of Aeneas. Faunus protects his people by refusing to relinquish the spear, in answer to the strained prayers of Turnus. A parallel might be drawn with the episode of the golden bough in *Aeneid* 6.210-211 which doesn’t yield easily to Aeneas’ grasp. Venus’ intervention is symbolic of how the Trojans must not just invade, but uproot this foundation. Venus’ presence indicates the god-like power of Faunus through the necessity of her intervention. It takes a god to overturn another god’s protection, something a human alone cannot accomplish.

Faunus must give way to pro-Trojan deities such as Venus. Not only is the appearance of the *nympha* ‘nymph’ Juturna in this passage striking, but also the fact that Venus is offended by her daring. Both Latinus and Tarquitus are the offspring of a nymph and Faunus. It seems that nymphs are an integral part of the ‘old Italy’ which is in opposition to the Olympian deities. Nymphs are made Italian by Virgil in opposition to Olympian deities. Coleman (1982, 157) who
views the *Aeneid* as a sequel to the *Iliad* sees this as an example of a ‘superior deity upstaging a lesser one’. Just before this passage at 763-5 there are Homeric allusions to *Iliad* 22 and then again at 766 as noted in Williams’ commentary (1996, 492). So right at the moment when Virgil places Faunus in the god’s familiar landscape over which he should have great power, the poet draws links to another battle where the strength of the invading warrior was too great for the local hero. This sets the scene for the acceptance of like victories in the Latin context. I agree with Southwell (1964, 35) who recognises Virgil’s careful insertion of Faunus here as a ‘native Italian god’ who can only temporarily intervene in the same way that ‘Turnus, the Italian hero’ cannot ultimately prevent the victory of Aeneas. The killing of Turnus is the death of an ‘essentially and deeply Italian’ element of the kingdom (Putnam, 1965, 190).

Virgil places particular emphasis here on Faunus not only as an Italian god, but also as a woodland god: from the first line he is surrounded by words describing the setting (*sacer*, *folium* and *oleaster*). Woodland associations are also clear in *lignum*, *stirpes*, *radix* and *robus*. The sacred nature of Faunus’ olive tree binds humans to the landscape via the religious rites of the required sacrifices to the deity at this location. This religious observance is expressed in the offerings the sailors nailed to its wood. We have seen earlier in the *Aeneid* good favour bestowed upon those who listen to or worship Faunus.\(^ {176} \) Virgil’s suggestive language shows Faunus in an environment in which we would expect the deity to exact power, but the poet deprives him of it. The significance of the land itself is emphasised by *campus* v. 771 and *terra* v. 778. Once again, Faunus is strongly associated with the land. There is an interesting parallel between the use of *optima … terra* in this passage and at 10.557 above which demonstrates the connection between Faunus and the earth since these terms are used in close conjunction with the deity. This same land will support the roots of Faunus’ sacred olive tree, which Turnus hopes will hold Aeneas’ spear. Virgil lays emphasis on the sanctity of the landscape and the importance of honouring both it and Faunus by employing words such as *sacer* v. 766, *sacrum* v. 770, *honoro* v. 778, *uenerabilis* v. 767; this is opposed to the great sacrilege of the Trojans with *profano* in v. 779.

\(^ {176} \) 7. 85-86, 213, 257-258.
The felling of Faunus’ tree by the Trojans demonstrates their ignorance of an important religious belief of the Latins, one that was integral to the way in which they interact with the landscape (vv. 770-771: note the emphatic placement of *sacrum* at the end of 770). Tarrant (2012, 284) acknowledges the disregard of the Trojans ‘in the religious sense’ and sees this as responsible for Aeneas’ temporary set-back. The irreligious nature of the desecration is supported by ancient inscription; even thinning of a grove was dangerous in both Rome and Greece.\(^{177}\) Turnus prays to Faunus to hold fast the spear of Aeneas which is lodged into the stump of the god’s sacred tree. In the way it holds fast to Aeneas’ spear, the stump of Faunus’ olive tree represents the landscape’s strong resistance to the encroaching Trojans. Faunus was able to assist until Venus intervened. I therefore agree with Thomas (1988, 270) who sees Faunus’ failure as indicative of the fact that Aeneas will soon take over Italy and so Faunus as an Italic god no longer has great power over his realm. The Italian Turnus will soon fail against the Trojan ‘civiliser’ Aeneas. Aeneas is thus in many ways represented as a foreigner future king, on Latin soil, who conquers the landscape.

The power of the *oleaster* stump is suggested by *morsus* and *robur* and the Italian landscape intervenes in the conflict via the stump and momentarily renders the Trojan leader, Aeneas, helpless (Losada, 1984, 38). Although Venus ultimately overrides, it is clear that Aeneas alone cannot stand against Faunus, the ‘Italic’ deity even when his *oleaster* has been so desecrated. Nethercut (1968, 88-95) examines the transition the Trojans undergo from invaded in Book 2 to invaders in the second half of the *Aeneid*. In the episodes which allude to Faunus we see the violent conclusion of the martial epic and the displacement of Italic gods.

\(^{177}\) There are two almost identical inscriptions (CIL XI 4766; cf. 4767) dated to the mid-third century BCE from Spoletium which forbid the violation of a grove, including the cutting of trees excluding certain festival days. Violation required sacrifice and if committed intentionally, a fine. Lucan presents Caesar’s cutting down of an ancient forest as a terrible desecration in *De Bello Civili* 3.399-449. Commentators have interpreted this episode as a general indictment by Lucan against Cicero and then specifically one regarding Pompey’s impending defeat and dismemberment (Augoustakis, 2006, 634; Narducci, 1979, 110; Ahl, 1976, 199; Rowland, 1969, 204-8). For Greece, see the sanctuary of Erithasean Apollo in Attica (Dittenberger, *SIG* no. 986), Andania in Messenia (Dittenberger, no. 736.78, p 408), and the precinct of Dictaean Zeus in Crete (Dittenberger, no. 685.80, II p 278).
Aeneas’ Achilles-like behaviour, demonstrated through the ferociousness of his attacks on the Italians, assaults both their gods and their landscape.  

3.6 Conclusion
Virgil does not include Faunus in his earlier works, the *Eclogues* or the *Georgics*, works in which one would expect to find this deity who is associated with the woods, groves and the agricultural landscape. The poet instead includes Pan, possibly because Faunus was not yet or no longer relevant to the Romans. Pan, who has Greek origins, would not be an appropriate choice for an epic about early Italian history and the origins of the Roman civilisation.

Perhaps Faunus was not as ancient as was claimed and had no legitimate place as an early Laurentine king. I have questioned the assumption of Faunus’ antiquity by Horsfall and other secondary scholars, and drawing on the findings of Fordyce and Schiebe, have suggested that Faunus has no place in the early kings list. Faunus, for whom there is a temple attested in the late second century BCE, may have been mostly forgotten or neglected in the *urbs* at the dawn of the Augustan age and so proved an excellent candidate for renewal.

My analysis of references to Faunus in the *Aeneid* has revealed a prophetic deity, who is a father and king with meaningful connections to an ancient landscape, a landscape that is threatened by Trojan intrusion and is eventually desecrated by these future Romans. For the most part it is the poets and not the historians who write about Faunus, which suggests that Faunus may have been largely a poetic construction. It is even more striking that not all poets write about Faunus, only those who are closest to Augustus such as Horace and Virgil. Although Augustus is driving the Faunus ‘revival’, it seems he did not push for a particular representation of Faunus: that may have been up to the individual poet in keeping with the subject of his work.

I have shown that Virgil’s characterisation is different from that employed by Horace. Virgil stresses different aspects of his characterisation of Faunus in order

178 Aeneas appropriates the role of Achilles that Turnus previously played and Virgil’s Homeric allusions confirm the Trojans to be invaders as were the Greeks in the *Iliad*. See Anderson (1957, 17-30) for Virgil’s use of the *Iliad*. See Nethercut (1968, 88) for the changing position of Homer’s Greeks, Homer’s Trojans and Virgil’s Trojans as invader and invaded. See Mountford (2007, 53-61) for an analysis of *Iliad* 22 and *Aeneid* 12 in particular.

179 See Chapter 1.3.3 of this thesis for further information on the temple to Faunus.
to clarify each particular role that the deity plays. When he is in the realm of
kingship, Faunus appears more human, but when his divine characteristics are
accentuated he appears more closely connected to the landscape he inhabits.

I have demonstrated that Faunus in the *Aeneid* may be largely a creation of Virgil
because there is little evidence of Faunus as an ancient oracular deity who is a
king and ancestor of Latinus in earlier sources. We have seen that the allusions to
Lucretian passages link Faunus with the landscape previously inhabited by the
fauns and this Italic landscape is important to Roman identity. He is represented
as an ‘ancient’ and oracular deity, who is a prominent figure in the Latin
landscape, in the second half of the *Aeneid*. The ambiguity of oracles explored
through Amata’s Allecto-driven interpretation begins to weaken the potency of
Faunus and his ability to influence the action in his native landscape.

Although initially presented as a mediator between the two peoples, Faunus is
ultimately an ally of the Italians and so is anti-Trojan. As we have seen, the
Trojans don’t just settle: they invade, which threatens the upheaval of Italic roots
and Latium’s very foundations. Faunus is characterised as an ‘ancient’ and native
god whose position is jeopardised by this invasion. Anti-Trojan does not mean
anti-Roman in terms of the Augustan agenda. Ancient Italic roots and Trojan
intrusion are deemed essential elements of early Roman history and Faunus is
placed at the centre of both. Was the reintroduction of this ‘ancient’ god part of
the Augustan renegotiation of Roman identity and revival of early ideals?
Conclusion

In the last two decades scholars such as Rüpke, Beard, North and Price, Scheid and Lipka have reassessed the various approaches to Roman religion. Augustan reshaping of Roman identity and the role of landscape have been explored by Leach, Gruen, Orlin, Spencer and Backer and Terrenato. Although scholars such as Wiseman, Fantham and Goldschmidt include Faunus in their discussions of Republican Rome, its poets and its gods, a closer examination of the primary sources for Faunus, particularly in relation to his role in the renegotiation of Roman identity was due.

My reassessment of the evidence for Faunus is timely given the recent resurgence in literature on the subject of Roman religion. The deity’s assumed antiquity by later scholars was a major catalyst for this study. A native Italian deity such as Faunus is integral to an understanding of the Augustan reassessment of national identity. Reviewing evidence from Republican times through to the early Empire has enabled me to establish a more accurate picture of Faunus as an individual who is distinct from yet still related closely to the fauns.

In my study I posed questions regarding the antiquity of Faunus and his chronology in regard to the fauns. I have argued that the fauns precede Faunus and questioned the antiquity of this god. I have suggested that there is little evidence that Faunus was an early Republican god or, one of the most ancient deities of the Latins. We have seen that it is the fauns who truly have a presence in the Republican sources. These ancient deities often appear to be disembodied voices who perform an oracular function in troubled times. This places the fauns in the role of mediator between the Romans and their landscapes. They inhabit landscapes usually remote, rocky or part of a woodland setting which they share with other creatures such as nymphs. The reciprocity of the relationship between landscape and culture for the Romans has greatly informed this thesis, as indeed has the way in which deities such as the fauns and Faunus are used as mediators between landscape and culture.

I have shown that the earliest we can date Faunus is to the mid to late first century BCE using the Fasti Antiiates Maiores. Even if we accept Livy as evidence for a
second century BCE Faunus, this does not prove that the deity is one of the most ancient of the Latins. I have suggested that the fragments which refer to Faunus as an early Republican god can be questioned for several reasons. They may belong to a later author and later authors often have their own priorities, they may instead refer to the fauns or it is simply that the information is not as direct as we might like to think.

I have outlined the relationship between Faunus and Pan and concluded that, initially a distinct individual deity of the early Empire, Faunus later suffered from syncretism or confusion with Pan, which resulted in the deity being almost interchangeable for some authors such as Ovid. Faunus and Pan are not simply interchangeable in the early Empire.

I have compared and contrasted the two very different characterisations which poets of the early empire use to describe Faunus. We have seen that Horace, whom I consider the first poet to mention this deity, introduces Faunus as a mediator between the Romans and their landscape in his role as protector of the Sabine estate and the poet’s literary creativity. I have shown that close attachment to a landscape appears to be integral to Roman reassessment of identity which involves a desire to strengthen such ties.

I have drawn attention to the fact that Virgil ignores Faunus in his Republican bucolic and agricultural works but then gives him a great deal of prominence in the *Aeneid*. Virgil chooses a characterisation much closer to the oracular fauns of the Republic, but with the added layer of ancient kingship steeped in Golden Age imagery. Virgil gives Faunus a prominent role as an ancient king whose genealogy traces back to Saturn. I have illuminated Faunus’ connection to the landscape and shown how in his role as Latin king and oracular deity he is an important mediator between the Trojans and the Latins. We witness the desecration of the Latin landscape and the displacement of its gods through the Faunus episodes.

After the Augustan age, Faunus is still well-referenced in Latin literature, retaining the descriptors of indigenous and ancient up until the works of Suetonius. The explosion of references to Faunus in the Augustan age prompts
The interconnectedness of Faunus and Pan in post Virgilian sources could be further investigated in another study. The extent to which the Augustan agenda was a driving force in the sudden focus on Faunus could also be the subject of further work. Finally, the importance of Faunus’ role in the *Aeneid* deserves further study. This could provide a new framework through which to link the prophetic episodes in the *Aeneid*.

---

180 See table in Appendix 2.
### Appendices

#### Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republican Chronology</th>
<th>People, Events &amp; Publications</th>
<th>Faunus/Fauns</th>
<th>Characterisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>509 BCE–27 BCE</td>
<td>Roman Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 BCE</td>
<td>Cincius <em>Grammatica</em> (Could be Aug Age)</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>Oracular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196 BCE (9 BCE)</td>
<td>Temple to Faunus vowed (Livy)</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194 BCE (9 BCE)</td>
<td>Temple to Faunus dedicated (Livy)</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 BCE</td>
<td>Ennius <em>Annales</em></td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Ancient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-2nd Century BCE</td>
<td>Acilius (Plutarch 75 CE)</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>Ancient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-107 BCE</td>
<td>Lucilius <em>Saturae fragmenta</em></td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Institutor of ancient rites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84/46 BCE</td>
<td><em>Fasti Antiates Maiores</em></td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 BCE</td>
<td>Lucretius <em>Carus De rerum natura</em></td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Woodland, playful, Pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 BCE</td>
<td>Cicero <em>Brutus</em></td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Oracular, ancient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 BCE</td>
<td>Cicero <em>De divination</em></td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Oracular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 BCE</td>
<td>Cicero <em>De natura deorum</em></td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Woodland, oracular, gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 BCE</td>
<td>Cicero <em>De natura deorum</em></td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Oracular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 BCE</td>
<td>Varro <em>De lingua Latina</em></td>
<td>Fauns, Fauna</td>
<td>Oracular, ancient, gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 BCE</td>
<td>Cicero <em>De divination</em></td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Oracular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 BCE</td>
<td>Cicero <em>De divination</em></td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Oracular, ancient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-39 BCE</td>
<td>Virgil <em>Eclogae</em></td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Woodland, dancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 BCE</td>
<td>Virgil <em>Georgica</em></td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Woodland, rustic, numina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above provides a historical overview of Faunus/Fauns from 509 BCE to 29 BCE, detailing their appearances in literature and religious contexts. Each entry includes the year, the relevant author/poem, and the nature of Faunus/Fauns.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author/Work</th>
<th>Fauns</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 January 27 BCE</td>
<td>Augustus becomes emperor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 BCE</td>
<td>Roman Empire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 BCE</td>
<td>Horace Odes I-III</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>God, woodland, protector, lover of nymphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 BCE-19 BCE</td>
<td>Virgil Aeneid</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>Lover of nymphs, father, son, ancient king, oracular, woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 BCE</td>
<td>Horace Ars Poetica</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fauns Woodland, poet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-16 BCE</td>
<td>Ovid Epistulae vel Heroides</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Horned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 BCE</td>
<td>Vitruvius De architectura</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 BCE</td>
<td>Horace Epistulae</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Poets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 BCE</td>
<td>Livy Ab Urbe Condita</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 BCE-8 CE</td>
<td>Grattius Cynegética</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>God, woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 BCE-8 CE</td>
<td>Priapea</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Rubicund, Pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CE</td>
<td>Ovid Metamorphoses</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Father, husband, woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8CE</td>
<td>Ovid Fasti</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>Rustic, god, temple, shrine, Lupercalia, horned, hoofed, half goat, Pan, woodland, father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 CE-12 CE</td>
<td>Ovid Ibis</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Demi-gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 August 14 CE</td>
<td>Augustus dies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 CE-68 CE</td>
<td>Nero's principate</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 CE-68 CE</td>
<td>Bucolica Einsiedelhisia</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>Father, woodland, shrine, god, oracular, Pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 CE-68 CE</td>
<td>Calpurnius Siculus Eclogae</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>Frightening, nightmare, woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 CE-79 CE</td>
<td>Pliny Naturalis Historia</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Father, fertilisation of Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 CE-92 CE</td>
<td>Statius Thebais</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Woodland, sacred rites, plunderers, Pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 CE-103 CE</td>
<td>Silius Italicus Punica</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>Father, father of Rutulians, native, god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 CE-103 CE</td>
<td>Martial Epigrammata</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Mountain dwellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 CE-96 CE</td>
<td>Statius Silvae</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Temple Tiber River, poets, Pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 CE</td>
<td>Valerius Flaccus Argonautica</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Woodland, agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 CE-95 CE</td>
<td>Statius Achilleis</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 CE</td>
<td>Quintilian Institutio Oratoria</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Oracular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Century</td>
<td>Sex Pomponus Festus De Verborum Significatione</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Oracular, Picus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 CE-170 CE</td>
<td>M Cornelius Fronto Ad Antonin Imp De Eloquentia</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Oracular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 CE</td>
<td>Suetonius De Vita Caesarum &amp; Fragments</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>God, temple, shrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 CE</td>
<td>Gellius Noctes Atticae</td>
<td>Fauns</td>
<td>Ancient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faunus</th>
<th>fauns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Augustus to 150 CE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republican fauns oracular</th>
<th>Cincius Grammatica</th>
<th>32.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>210 BCE</td>
<td>Ennius Annales</td>
<td>7.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 BCE</td>
<td>Cicero Brutus</td>
<td>71.7, 75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 BCE</td>
<td>Cicero Orator</td>
<td>171.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 BCE</td>
<td>Cicero De natura deorum</td>
<td>2.6.17, 3.15.12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 BCE</td>
<td>Varro De lingua Latina</td>
<td>7.36.1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 BCE</td>
<td>Cicero De divinatione</td>
<td>1.101.1, 1.114.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pan</th>
<th>Panisci</th>
<th>Panes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIG. 1. PRAENESTINE MIRROR, THIRD CENTURY B.C. (ETR. SPIEGEL V. 54, TAF. 45; ILLEP 1301; ROMA MEDIO-REPUBLICANA 200–2): PANISKOS AND MARSYAS.

FIG. 2. PRAENESTINE MIRROR, FOURTH CENTURY B.C. (ETR. SPIEGEL V. 172; B. ADAM AND D. BRIGELI, MEER(S) 94 (1982), 33–65): ON THE LEFT, PAN LYRAIOS?
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Augustan references to Faunus and to the fauns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>fauns</th>
<th>Faunus</th>
<th>Prose</th>
<th>fauns</th>
<th>Faunus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horace Odes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vitruvius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De Architectura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil Aeneid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Livy Ab Urbe Condita</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Ars Poetica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid Heroides</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Epistulae</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grattius Cynegetica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priapea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid Metamorphoses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid Fasti</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid Ibis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Augustan chronology references to Faunus and the fauns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 January 27 BCE</td>
<td>Augustus becomes emperor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 BCE</td>
<td>Roman Empire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 BCE</td>
<td>Horace Odes I-III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 BCE-19 BCE</td>
<td>Virgil Aeneid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 BCE</td>
<td>Horace Ars poetica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-16 BCE</td>
<td>Ovid Heroides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 BCE</td>
<td>Vitruvius De architectura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 BCE</td>
<td>Horace Epistulae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 BCE</td>
<td>Livy Ab urbe condita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 BCE-8 CE</td>
<td>Grattius Cynegetica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 BCE-8 CE</td>
<td>Priapea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CE</td>
<td>Ovid Metamorphoses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CE</td>
<td>Ovid Fasti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 CE-12 CE</td>
<td>Ovid Ibis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 August 14 CE</td>
<td>Augustus dies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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