

EPIC VS. ELEGIAC IDENTITY: A NEW MODEL FOR ROMAN LEADERSHIP IN OVID'S
FASTI

By

ROBERT WILLIAM BREWER

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2012

© 2012 Robert William Brewer

Parentibus beneficissimis et liberalissimis qui animum pueri annos decem nati ceperunt
accenderuntque ardorem bonarum artium

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I must first thank my parents for all of their love, support, and patience throughout these many years of education. Without their help and encouragement, I could never have achieved my academic goals. I would also like to thank my grandfather William Yancey, my first babysitter and the best male role model a young boy could have. There are many people that deserve acknowledgement here, but I will name just a few. I wish to thank my dissertation chair Jennifer Rea for her countless hours of editing my chapters and showing me what it takes to be a true academic professional. I would also like to thank Timothy Johnson, Konstantinos Kapparis, and R. Allen Shoaf whose comments and guidance helped me through the dissertation process. I must thank James Marks for his mentorship during not just my Master of Arts thesis but ongoing projects since then. I owe a great deal of gratitude to Shannon Byrne and Edmund Cueva for mentoring me when I was an undergraduate. In addition, I must thank Mary Lee McConaghy and the late Mark Tychonievich who first introduced me to Latin and Greek during my high school years. Finally, I will never forget the insight and help so many of my colleagues at University of Florida have offered me over the years particularly James Lohmar, Seth Boutin, Megan Daly, George Hendren, and Jay Arns, my best friend and fellow student at both Xavier University and the University of Florida.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
ABSTRACT.....	6
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	7
2 OVERVIEW OF THE ORIGINS OF AUGUSTAN LITERATURE	17
Callimachean Aesthetics.....	17
Tibullus 2.5	21
3 PROPERTIUS 4	34
4 ELEGIAC LEADERSHIP IN THE FASTI: JANUS, HERCULES, AND THE FABII.....	70
Janus	70
Hercules	76
The Fabii	82
5 FROM MORTAL TO GOD: ROMULUS	86
Romulus in the <i>Fasti</i>	101
Lupercalia	104
Quirinalia	110
Parilia	116
Lemuria.....	120
6 FROM MORTAL TO GOD: AUGUSTUS.....	123
7 CONCLUSION.....	142
LIST OF REFERENCES	148
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	156

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

EPIC VS. ELEGIAC IDENTITY: A NEW MODEL FOR ROMAN LEADERSHIP IN OVID'S
FASTI

By

Robert William Brewer

May 2012

Chair: Jennifer Ann Rea

Major: Classical Studies

I have attempted in this project to analyze how Ovid alters the epic-driven model of Roman identity that crystallized in the works of Livy and Vergil after Augustus' victory at Actium. Ovid's model emphasizes the historical value to the city of elegiac virtues such as diligence, patience, foresight, and piety, the crown virtue of Vergil's Aeneas. Ovid seeks to elevate the whole genre of elegy, establish himself as the elegiac equal to the epic Vergil, and thus demonstrate his significant contribution to elegy in forging a new elegiac identity for Rome. No project gave Ovid a better opportunity to treat Roman history and issues of Roman identity than the *Fasti*. I have shown how Tibullus 2.5 and Propertius 4 proved to Ovid that he could tackle a poem on Roman political themes in his elegiac couplets without abandoning his notion of Callimachean aesthetics or undermining his credibility by appearing too deferential to the imperial family. Through a critical analysis of the origins of Roman elegy and its Callimachean aesthetic, I suggest that Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid all found ways to compose elegiac poetry on epic topics and even include panegyrics to the imperial family and friends. They succeeded in doing this without losing their credibility as elegiac poets, marked as they were by leisure and life in the pursuit of erotic thrills and standing in opposition to the epic model of leadership promoted by Augustus and confirmed by Livy and Vergil.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

This project examines Ovid's commemoration of the elegiac hero in the *Fasti*. The thesis of this project argues that Ovid creates a new model for Roman leadership and identity when he contrasts "rash" epic heroes with their "contemplative" elegiac counterparts thereby elevating the whole genre of elegy. Many of Ovid's predecessors like Vergil and Livy provided epic models of leadership for Augustus in their works.¹ Ovid's elevation of elegy in the *Fasti* allows him to stand on equal footing with his predecessors as he strives to alter the epic and heroic driven model of Roman identity forged in the years after Actium. In this way he hopes to solidify his own poetic legacy as the last and greatest of the Roman elegists.

This project examines passages from the *Fasti* in order to demonstrate how Ovid's new literary code of conduct for Roman leaders alters a dialogue on Roman identity that originated in the years after Augustus' victory at Actium. By code of conduct, I mean how a legendary character in the poem behaves in both adversity and conquest. Does the legendary character adopt reckless, brutish behavior like Sextus Tarquinius or does he concern himself with religious piety like Numa? Ovid presents Romulus's character as one of transformation from epic to elegiac traits. By introducing a new leadership model in his commemoration of the city's past, Ovid's poetic calendar inaugurates his own Rome founded on elegiac principles such as patience, cleverness, foresight, piety, and not just epic *virtus*.

¹ Nappa (2005) 1 believes that Vergil's *Georgics* presents "potential courses available to [Octavian] and potential interpretations of his character, achievements, and motives, which would have been a central concern to the Roman and Italian elite." The date of the poem's publication (29 B.C.) left uncertainty as to whether Octavian's revolution would effectively restore stability to Italian politics. The date of composition for Ovid's *Fasti* occurs in a period when Augustus while at the peak of his glory struggled to find a capable successor. Thus, the question of succession and the subsequent political turmoil created an opportunity for a poet like Ovid to once more entertain the question: what constitutes appropriate leadership in what is now clearly an imperial system?

Because of the loss of works that cover this historical period, such as the *Histories* of Asinius Pollio, the writings of the historian Titus Labienus, and Livy's treatment of the Augustan Age, the poetry of the principate provides precious details for the historical record.² Tacitus' limited treatment of Augustus in the *Annales* and the gaps in the histories of Cassius Dio mean that we cannot obtain a complete picture of this period. The last years of Augustus reveal a particularly meager record despite the activity taking place at Rome. One may read Augustan poetry as each poet's response to the social and political revolution taking place before his eyes.

While discussions of Roman identity took place in archaic Latin literature, the rise of Italian pride that occurred upon Augustus' enfranchisement of the municipal men sparked a whole generation of literary attempts to define what it meant to be a Roman, for the term had expanded well beyond the *pomerium* deep into the Italian countryside. Vergil's *Aeneid* proved that a great poet could take on a political work, retain his own poetic sovereignty, and capture world renown.³ Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* celebrates the virtues of the ancient Romans and concludes that these virtues elevated the Roman state to its present greatness. While Vergil and Livy depict the early Romans as pious, their characters appear active, violent, and sometimes rash to their Augustan audience much like the Homeric heroes. In contrast, the Roman elegists working from an elegiac model sought to redefine Roman identity through their own depictions of legendary Romans. Tibullus 2.5, Propertius' fourth book, and Ovid's *Fasti* all contribute to this reevaluation of the early city. Their dialogue created a rival sense of identity to the harsh, old model of their stern ancestors so eloquently extolled by Vergil and Livy in the early part of

² Fishwick (1991) 36 notices that the poets often provide "the clearest reflection of popular attitudes and practices."

³ Galinsky (2005) 340-351 discusses how Vergil's epic went well beyond the simple expectations of panegyrics to great Roman politicians, a practice so typical in the republican patronage system. Vergil's epic encapsulated the whole Roman belief that its people's piety persevered in adversity throughout Roman history and elevated this small city on the Tiber to the level of the world capital.

Augustus' reign.⁴ Each attempt at the early history of Rome constitutes an opportunity for the poet to establish a new identity for the city by rewriting its origins.⁵

In Ovid's *Fasti* the poet composes a poem in elegiac couplets on the Roman calendar; a work with clear implications for Roman identity. By choosing an effective political medium for his poem, Ovid adds his voice to the chorus of poets contributing to the dialogue on Roman identity. I would not go so far as to say he feels compelled to write this work on the calendar with all its Augustan adornments by any sort of Augustan coercion. Ovid's choice of topic evolves from the defense of his choice of genre and lifestyle —elegy and love over epic and war— a lifetime effort that begins in his first published poem (*Amores* 1.1.1-2). His poem appears subversive because of its author's personality and sense of humor. Ovid never seems to take any topic seriously, a trait which renders even attempts at genuine praise ironic. Ovid's insistence on indulging this tendency eventually got him into trouble with Augustus even if his relegation had mostly political and not artistic causes. Like his predecessors Ovid has much to contribute to Rome and her identity. While like Livy he allows for Augustus' vision of Rome, he does not see it as the only perception of Rome or even the most important.⁶ In his poetry like other elegists he constantly privileges the popular view of Rome over any aristocratic or one dimensional approach to the city.

⁴ Although Horace will not be the focus of this project, I will refer to his works from time to time to compare his illustration of Roman identity to those presented in Vergil, Livy, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid. Horace's lyric model creates different expectations for his poems and thus puts him outside the dichotomy of elegiac and epic that I shall use in reference to the remaining authors including the historian Livy, who often depicts his characters like the heroes of ancient epics.

⁵ Edwards (1996) 6-8 points out Augustan authors considered their texts to be their monuments to posterity (Horace 3.30, Propertius 4.1.69, *Metamorphoses* 15.871ff). Jaeger (1997) 182 believes that Livy accepts Augustus' reconstruction of Rome but allows himself the same authority to create his own Rome in the *Ab Urbe Condita*.

⁶ Lowrie (2009) 279-308 believes Augustus' use of the term *auctoritas* in his *Res Gestae* suggests an interplay between the "lived moment and [its] memorialization" much like the Augustan poets. Therefore, we must allow the poets *auctoritas* in their own poems in the same manner in which we give Augustus license in the *Res Gestae*.

The *Fasti*, the ancient Roman calendar controlled by the *pontifex maximus* and recently reformed by Julius Caesar in the first century B.C., represented a strong political tool since it gave the *pontifex maximus* and later the Caesars virtual control over time. During the republic politicians had used this authority to augment or diminish the influence of the lower classes. To his colleagues in the Senate, Julius Caesar's reform of the calendar represented a great power grab since it further limited the monopoly of the wealthy on state functions in the republic.⁷ As the method by which the Romans organized time, the *Fasti* had considerable significance for much of the known world setting limits on commerce, the judicial system, and every aspect of daily life. With such power the calendar constituted an important part of Roman identity as it was perceived in the empire.

If the *Fasti* has such implications for Roman identity, should the audience be surprised that Ovid, the elegiac master of the *Amores*, the *Ars Amatoria*, and the *Heroides*, chose to write on a political and even epic topic at the height of his career? The poet realizes the monumental task in front of him, *quid volui demens elegis imponere tantum/ ponderis? heroi res erat ista pedis* (2.125-126). Nevertheless, since he never finished the poem, the audience might assume the project had certain unexpected pitfalls. He had just finished another poem on time, the *Metamorphoses*, deciding to compose it in dactylic hexameter, a meter he employed for this poem alone. While the *Metamorphoses* narrates the whole history of time from the world's conception to Augustus' ascension in Roman politics, the *Fasti* approaches time through a fundamentally Roman lens, the city's calendar. So when Ovid was considering how to compose

⁷ King (2006) 17-40. Cf. Plutarch *Life of Caesar* 59.6 where the biographer suggests that Caesar's enemies took his reform of the calendar as proof of his royal ambition;

οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο τοῖς βασκαίνουσι καὶ βαρνομένοις
τὴν δύναμιν αἰτίας παρεῖχε· Κικέρων γοῦν ὁ ῥήτωρ ὡς
ἔοικε, φήσαντός τινος αὔριον ἐπιτελεῖν Λύραν, “ναὶ”
εἶπεν, “ἐκ διατάγματος”, ὡς καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς ἀνάγκην
τῶν ἀνθρώπων δεχομένων.

a poem on the Roman calendar, he could have written it in epic verse. Why then does he choose elegiac couplets only to later lament his choice in Book 2? I propose that Ovid has chosen an epic topic and an elegiac meter for a reason. By composing this epic poem in elegiac couplets, Ovid sought to illustrate that an elegiac demeanor is as appropriate a model for Roman leaders as the epic patterns depicted by Vergil and Ovid's other predecessors. With the elevation of elegiac poetry, the elegiac poet Ovid secures his own poetic immortality by combating the anxiety he feels as he follows in the footsteps of Vergil's immense influence.⁸ Ovid hoped to fulfill the task Propertius had proposed years before (4.1.69) by writing a poem on strictly Roman *Aetia* while at the same time attempting to rival Rome's greatest epic poet Vergil through a reconciliation of Rome's ferocious militarism with the poet's elegiac sentiments.⁹

Prior to the 20th century, scholars often used the *Fasti* as a mere catalog of antiquarian and religious information. In the 20th century, scholars finally sought to evaluate the work for its own art. *Ovids elegische Erzählung* (1919) by Richard Heinze stands as the first important book on the *Fasti* in the 20th century. Heinze describes the generic tension between elegy and epic in the *Fasti* as the opposition of two concepts: τὸ ἐλεεινόν (the pitiable) and τὸ δεινόν (the terrible). Following Heinze John Miller's book *Ovid's Elegiac Festivals* (1991) seeks to rehabilitate the *Fasti* as a work of art and set off more than a decade of scholarship on Ovid's *Fasti*. In her book *Ovid and the Fasti: an Historical Study* (1994), Geraldine Herbert-Brown regards as genuine

8 Bloom (1973) 139-155 examines how a poet responds to the anxiety that occurs when following a world renowned writer like William Shakespeare. In Ovid's case Vergil's legacy caused him to seek similar glory but on his own elegiac terms.

9 Green (2004) 13-14 sets up a dichotomy between arma (1.13) and arae (13) believing that Ovid intends to concentrate on Caesar's religious reforms and downplay the warfare much like Augustus had sought to do himself when recalling his administration in the *Res Gestae*. As Green states, Ovid has to deal with warfare in his interpretation of the calendar; however, I feel the poet's commitment to speak of altars and not wars is Ovid's way of setting up his audience for a poem constructed on the model of Hesiod's *Works and Days* and Vergil's *Georgics* rather than the more warlike Homeric epics. Ovid's etiological poem allows him to expand elegy beyond his previous efforts at amatory (*Amores*), epistolary (*Heroides*), and didactic elegy (*Ars Amatoria*, *Remedia Amoris*).

Ovid's statements to Augustus in the preface to book 2. She views the *Fasti* as the poet's military service (*militia*) to the *princeps* and a true panegyric to the Augustan ideology. On the other hand, Carole Newlands' *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti* (1995) sees Ovid's narratives as an attempt to destabilize and undermine the imperial model and reveal his resistance to Augustan ideology. Finally, in his *Desiring Rome: Male Subjectivity and Reading Ovid's Fasti* (2006), Richard King encourages the reader to adopt "skewed" or "angular" views of the poem in order to see the antagonisms occurring between Roman culture and the poet exiled and removed as he was from the whole *milieu* at Rome. While the works of the aforementioned scholars will inform my reading of Ovid's *Fasti*, my project aims to call attention to Ovid's purpose as elegiac poet when he attempts to further demonstrate his versatility by adapting elegy to etiological poems in the vein of Propertius 4. In this way Ovid hopes to not only reveal himself to be the true Roman Callimachus but also elevate the whole genre of elegy. If Ovid succeeds in adapting his elegiac couplet to etiological poetry, he solidifies his status as the greatest Roman elegist since his contributions to diversifying elegy (erotic, epistolary, didactic, and now etiological) would be as significant as Vergil's development of Roman epic.¹⁰ In addition, by revealing the elegiac demeanor to be more important to political success throughout Roman history, he alters the epic model of Roman identity developed by Vergil in the early years of the principate and reappropriates piety as an elegiac virtue.

While scholars such as Nappa (2005) and Green (2009) have explored how early imperial poets offer new paradigms of leadership, my work extends the scholarly dialogue to contrast how Ovid's use of legendary figures like Aeneas, Romulus, and Remus differs from those of his

¹⁰ One may recall that Ovid boasts in the *Remedia Amoris* that elegy then owed as much to him as epic did to Vergil, *tantum se nobis elegi debere fatentur, / quantum Vergilio nobile debet epos* (396-397).

predecessors.¹¹ While previous authors employ Rome's foundation stories as a way to make sense out of Rome's post-civil war landscape, I am suggesting that Ovid writes about Rome's past because he believes that character interpretation is the most important attribute for one's political success.¹² More than twenty years after the appearances of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* and Vergil's *Aeneid*, Ovid would seek to alter the literary paradigm for Roman leadership by elevating the status of the elegiac hero in his *Fasti* and continuing the dialogue on Roman identity which his predecessors established.

In his book *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*, S.J. Harrison defines generic enrichment as “the way in which generically identifiable texts gain literary depth and texture from detailed confrontation with, and consequent inclusion of elements from, texts which appear to belong to other literary genres.”¹³ He has focused on the confrontations occurring in the poems of Vergil and Horace, during a period in Augustan literature when such occurrences are most numerous. His methodology is helpful in analyzing the *Fasti* where the interactions occur mostly

¹¹ I use the term legendary to describe the quasi-historical figures from early Rome such as Aeneas, Romulus, Numa Pompilius, and others. In this regard I follow Livy who expresses doubts about the historicity of Roman records prior to the Gallic sack of Rome (389 B.C.) because of poor record-keeping in early Rome and fire. *quae ab condita urbe Roma ad captam eandem Romani sub regibus primum, consulibus deinde ac dictatoribus decemuirisque ac tribunis consularibus gessere, foris bella, domi seditiones, quinque libris exposui, res cum uetustate nimia obscuras uelut quae magno ex interuallo loci uix cernuntur, tum quid rarae per eadem tempora litterae fuere, una custodia fidelis memoriae rerum gestarum, et quod, etiam si quae in commentariis pontificum aliisque publicis priuatisque erant monumentis, incensa urbe pleraeque interiere.* Livy 6.1.1-2

¹² Of the early Augustan poets, the land confiscations of the civil war that followed the assassination of Julius Caesar deprived Vergil (*Eclogue* 1), Propertius (4.1.130), and Tibullus (1.3.43-44) of their ancestral lands. Ovid's birth occurred during the civil war (*Tristia* 4.10.5-6) making him a generation younger than the other famous Augustan poets. There is no evidence that the Ovidii lost their property. For this reason he is removed from the immediate strife caused by the civil wars growing up as he did under better social conditions. Vergil deals with the memory of the civil war by couching it in the past (*Aeneid*) while poets like Tibullus and Propertius mostly avoid the subject all together with several key exceptions (Tibullus 2.5, Propertius 1.22 and book 4). Ovid's writing reflects his own period when civil war seemed more remote and the city much more secure under Augustus. Gowing (2005) 18 notices that the Augustan Age saw more commemorations of the past than any previous period in Roman history. Augustus sought to present his own regime as a continuation of the republic and yet a new beginning. Gowing calls this the “paradox of the Augustan period.”

¹³ Harrison (2007) 1.

between elegiac and epic. In these “enriched” passages, Ovid elevates his elegiac characters either at the expense of epic characters or in an attempt to capture epic praise for them. The model of Aristotelian criticism outlined in the *Poetics*, which continued to dominate literary criticism during the Hellenistic period and even the Age of Augustus, established a fixed hierarchy of genres in which epic sat at the top with tragedy and elegy following behind it. The length, weighty meter, and dignity of characters made epic the most exalted of all genres.¹⁴

While Harrison’s methodology involves a three-tiered approach that he defines as the formal repertoire, the thematic repertoire, and explicit metagenetic signals for approaching Vergilian and Horatian texts, I have developed my own approach. I will employ four categories when analyzing the confrontations between elegy and epic in the *Fasti*: the diction of the narrator or a character, his or her behavior, the character’s gender, and the setting of the narrative.¹⁵ Using these four criteria, I hope to examine how Ovid’s inclusion of these two genres in any given passage affects his overall goal of showing that elegiac models of temperament and preparation are appropriate for Roman leaders.

The first criterion for analyzing these “generically enriched” passages is diction. Ovid sets the scene for his epic characters by invoking epic diction such as military terms or lofty language. In contrast, he uses elegiac diction, terms appropriate to love poetry such as those that illustrate amorous relationships or describe *loci amoeni*. The second criterion is the temperament he ascribes to any individual character. Epic characters often act rashly or proceed on a particular task with no prior planning while he mostly associates elegiac characters with contemplative and resourceful behavior. I will also analyze the setting of the narrative, whether the setting gives any

¹⁴ Harrison (2007) 8.

¹⁵ Harrison (2007) 21-33.

clues or foreshadows in any way the event taking place there.¹⁶ Lastly, gender has certain important consequences when comparing Ovid's epic and elegiac characters since gender often colors a character as epic or elegiac: male and female characters have different expectations for their behavior. The traditional model for Roman men emphasizes courage in battle and piety to all obligations including public service. In contrast, women are expected to raise courageous children and run honorable households. Both epic and especially elegiac poets will play with the audience's expectations for each gender.

On the basis of these characteristics, I will determine whether the poet paints certain characters as epic, elegiac, or a mixture of both. With this information I will show how Ovid portrays these elegiac characteristics as remaining essential to contemporary Roman leaders (Augustus and Germanicus) and the city's continued dominance. Ovid suggests that both piety and elegiac resourcefulness have accomplished more for the Roman state than brute force. His dedication to the sophisticated Germanicus, a fellow poet, emphasizes the importance of knowledge and art for Rome's supremacy. Through a comparison of Ovid's accounts of legendary Rome with earlier Greek and Roman sources such as Ennius, Cicero, Livy, Dionysus of Halicarnassus, Tibullus, and Propertius, I hope to show how Ovid has manipulated the tales for his own particular use in the *Fasti*, often to illustrate the strengths of the elegiac temperament.

In Chapter 1 I will discuss the Callimachean precedents to Roman elegy and analyze how Tibullus approaches the task of praise poetry and the public sphere in elegy 2.5. In this solitary political poem, Tibullus seeks to honor the investiture of Messalinus, the son of his patron Marcus Valerius Messala Corvinus, and celebrate the peace that followed the battle of Actium.

¹⁶ Conte (1994) 311.

Chapter 2 will evaluate how Propertius, following the success of Tibullus 2.5, attempts to sing of Roman *Aetia* as the Roman Callimachus while broadening Roman identity through an artful display of diversity's value to the city's success. Chapter 3 illustrates how through the characters Janus, Hercules, and the Fabii Ovid privileges the leaders' elegiac virtues over their courage. Ovid proves that patience and cunning are superior to brute force in each narrative. Chapter 4 evaluates the portrait of Romulus in the *Fasti* and suggests that Ovid's depiction shows a transformation from epic warrior to pious king as the poet transforms the epic king into yet another elegiac leader. Finally, chapter 5 examines how in the *Fasti* Ovid approaches Augustus, his victories, and his monuments as he seeks to fashion his own Rome.

CHAPTER 2 OVERVIEW OF THE ORIGINS OF AUGUSTAN LITERATURE

Callimachean Aesthetics

Since Ovid stands as the last renowned poet of the Augustan Age, a period widely regarded as the most artistically prolific in Rome's history, his poem the *Fasti* has many diverse but important antecedents. In this chapter I will analyze the Callimachean aesthetic that appears with increasing frequency during the age of Augustus.¹ Callimachus' works, particularly the *Aetia*, had a greater impact on subsequent poetry than any work apart from the Homeric epics.² This monumental work inspired many passages in Augustan poetry including two Roman attempts at etiological poems in Propertius 4 and Ovid's *Fasti*. The unique position of the equestrian poets, who stand apart from the political life, finds parallels in the poems of the love-stricken elegist whose poetry and life style choices put him at odds with Augustus' program for the new state.³ In this chapter I will make use of two quotes from Callimachus, one from his *Hymns* and one from the *Aetia*,⁴ to establish his stylistic tendencies. I will then examine how Ovid's elegiac predecessors Tibullus (2.5) and Propertius (4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.6, 4.9, and 4.10) employed this Callimachean aesthetic when constructing their etiologies of legendary Rome.⁵ My analysis of how Ovid's predecessors recreate Rome's early origins and construct identities for heroes from

¹ I do not mean to suggest that earlier republican poets did not emulate Callimachus. Catullus makes several references to his idol Callimachus (*Carmen* 65) and even wrote a Latin adaptation of Callimachus' *Lock of Berenice* (*Carmen* 66).

² Easterling and Knox (1985) 261.

³ Cf. Syme (1939) 466-467 for Propertius' political aspirations, *Tristia* 4.10.35-38 and Syme (1939) 363 for Ovid's decision to reject Augustus' offer of the *latus clavus*, a necessary requirement for a *novus homo* to seek the office of quaestor.

⁴ Very little of Callimachus' prolific poetic output has survived.

⁵ Livy and Vergil are the first to construct their versions of legendary Rome in the 20's B.C. I will cover in detail their contributions to Roman identity when I compare their accounts of Roman history to those of Ovid's *Fasti* in chapters 2-4.

Rome's legendary past will inform my discussion in later chapters of Ovid's creation of epic and elegiac heroes.

While all poetry has the potential to give *encomia* to great political men, epic poetry emerged as the dominate genre of praise poetry early on, and the Homeric bards were considered the best poets for the task of granting immortality to their subjects. During the Hellenistic period, epic poetry continued to reign supreme as the meter for epic praise; however, the Alexandrian convention of playing with traditional genres emerged as a new poetic aesthetic in Callimachus, Theocritus, and Apollonius of Rhodes. In Rome literary writing developed slowly until the second century B.C. when the city experienced a Hellenistic emersion. Ennius composed the *Annales*, an epic poem on Rome's history from the Fall of Troy to the poet's own time. While he covered large historical periods, Ennius gave specific attention to the deeds of his patron Marcus Fulvius Nobilior and his campaign against the Greeks at Ambracia. Ennius even wrote a play about the capture of Ambracia. The Hellenization of Rome brought poetry into direct contact with Italian politics and illustrated the advantages of connecting one's family with the patronage of great poets.⁶ While Vergil may have received no initiative to write his *Aeneid* save immortal glory and compensation from Augustus, many future Romans saw the work as an epic poem in praise of the Augustan revolution. Ovid admitted years later that while Vergil wrote the poem many saw it as Augustus' own, *et tamen ille tuae felix Aeneidos auctor/ contulit in Tyrios arma virumque toros* (*Tristia* 2.533-534). The poem lent great strength to an Augustan regime that sought to portray the *princeps*' reign as a great revival of art and culture for the city.

⁶ King (2006) 30-32 Although Cato the Elder objected to Roman commanders using poets to augment their fame, many took advantage of this political opportunity. Ennius' *Annales* neatly complemented the posting of marble *Fasti* by his patron Marcus Fulvius Nobilior in the temple of Hercules of the Muses.

In Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*, the poet concludes his poem with a conversation between Envy and Apollo in which the poet places his own stylistic preferences in the mouth of the Greek god of poetry.

*ὁ Φθόνος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπ' οὐατα λάθριος εἶπεν·
'οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὄσα πόντος ἀεῖδει.'
τὸν Φθόνον ὠπόλλων ποδί τ' ἤλασεν ὧδέ τ' εἶπεν·
'Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ
λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἔλκει.
Δηοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι,
ἀλλ' ἦτις καθαρὴ τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει
πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβάς ἄκρον ἄωτον.'
χαῖρε, ἄναξ· ὁ δὲ Μῶμος, ἴν' ὁ Φθόνος, ἔνθα νέοιτο.
105-113*

Envy spoke secretly into the ears of Apollo, "I do not admire the poet who does not sing of things as numerous as the sea." Apollo struck Envy with his foot and spoke thusly: "The Assyrian River is a great torrent, but it drags a great deal of mud and filth in its water. The Melissae do not bring water to their goddess from just anywhere but only the clean and undefiled little trickle that wells up from the sacred spring, the best of waters." Hail, lord, let Blame go there where Envy is.

Clearly, Apollo speaks for Callimachus, and the reader understands Envy to represent the jealousy of the poet's critics who blame Callimachus for his aesthetic preference. As Apollo states, Callimachus prefers short, polished poems rather than the long, trite narratives of the rhapsodes, who in his day were still employing the method used by the Homeric bards of previous ages. While the strength of Homeric poetry lies in the bard's ability to lengthen or compress type-scenes like councils of the gods, battle narratives, or messenger speeches, the inferior quality of these later rhapsodes and the hackneyed nature of this style made it offensive to the new breed of scholar poets like Callimachus. Similarly, Homeric poetry develops out of an oral culture and benefits illiterate bards. This style of singing makes literacy a disadvantage since the ability to read reduces the singer's capacity for memorization.⁷

⁷ Cf. Lord (1960) on the oral development of Homeric poetry.

Callimachus and the Alexandrian poets fashioned a new style where the poet sought to limit the length of a work and spent a great deal of time polishing and perfecting these shorter poems. While Homeric bards often sang several books in a session, the Alexandrian convention was to write one or more books that were composed of either separate scenes or individual poems. In this way the Alexandrian poets seek to imitate the best aspects of Homeric poetry without being bogged down by the length of narratives and repetition of the same stories. This tendency towards obscure allusions found its pinnacle in the writings of Euphorion, a contemporary of Callimachus and the model for Gallus, the first Roman elegist.

Callimachus returns to a discussion of style at the beginning of the *Aetia* when he once more abuses his critics. In this passage the poet again employs Apollo so as to endorse his stylistic choice for short, innovative, and learned poems.

*ἔλλετε Βασκανίης ὀλοὸν γένο[ς]· αὐθι δὲ τέχνη
κρίνετε,] [μὴ σχοίν]ω Περσίδι τή[ν] σοφίην·
μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶ[τε μέγα ψοφέουσας αἰοιδὴν
τίκτεσθαι· βροντᾶ]ν οὐκ ἐμόν, [ἀλλὰ] Διός·
καὶ γὰρ ὅτ]ε πρ[ώ]τιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα
γούνασι]ν, Α[πό]λλων εἶπεν ὁ μοι Λύκιος·
'.....]...αἰοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον
θρέψαι, τή]ν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην·
πρὸς δέ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἄμαζαι
τὰ στείβε]ιν, ἑτέρων ἵχνια μὴ καθ' ὀμά
δίφρον ἐλ]ῆν μηδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους
ἀτρίπτο]υς, εἰ καὶ στε[μ]νότερην ἐλάσεις· '*

Fr. 1.17-32

Be gone, destructive race of Jealousy. From now on, judge poetry on skill and not the Persian league. Do not seek from me to produce a great, booming song; thundering belongs to Zeus and not me. When I first put the writing tablet on my knees, Lycian Apollo said to me, “poet, nourish as fat a sacrifice as possible, but, my good man, keep your Muse delicate. And I give you this command; tread where the wagons do not go and do not drive your chariot where there are the same footprints of others nor the broad road but rather on the unworn paths, even if you ride along a narrower course.

Here Callimachus lays out his aesthetic using terms like *πάχιστον* and *λεπταλέην* as he advises composing poetry that while “rich as possible” remains “delicate” or “charming.” One can see this style at play in Catullus’ dedication to Cornelius Nepos, *cui dono lepidum novum libellum/ arido modo pumice expoliturum* (1.1-2). Catullus uses the words *lepidum* “charming” and *expoliturum* “polished” to describe his own preference for the Callimachean model. The reader recognizes these terms as a Latin translation of *λεπταλέην*. Catullus’ use of *nugas* (4) further indicates that the reader should expect a book of individual poems in the Callimachean vein rather than any grander endeavor. This Callimachean style although employed by the Neoterics finds further development in the works of Propertius and Ovid during the age of Augustus.

Tibullus 2.5

In his previous poems, Tibullus had contented himself with writing elegies on love and the ideal country life. He touched on war and strife only to reinforce his commitment to simple living.⁸ Within Tibullus’ poetry lies the origins of the epic-elegiac model that Ovid will expand in the *Fasti*, and in this section I intend to discuss how Tibullus begins to blend epic and elegiac elements in his portrait of early Rome. Towards the end of his life in 20 or 19 B.C., Tibullus agreed to compose 2.5 in which like other Augustan poets he responds to the massive building projects undertaken by Augustus following the civil wars.⁹ The pressure to compose nationalistic

⁸ The first lines of 1.1 illustrate the concerns of the Tibullan corpus, namely love and leisure from the turmoil of a political life.

*Divitias alius fulvo sibi congerat auro
Et teneat culti iugera multa soli,
Quem labor adsiduus vicino terreat hoste,
Martia cui somnos classica pulsa fugent:
Me mea paupertas vita traducat inerti,
Dum meus adsiduo luceat igne focus.*
1-6

⁹ Suetonius makes it clear that Augustus considered it a high priority to create an appropriately splendid capital for the Roman empire. He mentions the temples to Mars Ultor, Palatine Apollo, and Jupiter the Thunderer as the best examples of his beautification of Rome.

Vrbem neque pro maiestate imperii ornatam et

poetry seems to have emanated from Maecenas, a political advisor to Augustus and patron of a large poetic circle that included Vergil, Horace, and Propertius amongst others.¹⁰ While Vergil eventually embraced the task of creating a national epic, Horace and Propertius made *recusationes* in poems throughout the first half of the 20's B.C. claiming that their genres of lyric and elegiac poetry respectively were not suitable for a national topic.¹¹ Both men would later relent to a certain extent. Horace penned numerous panegyrics to Augustus (*Odes* 1.2, 3.14, 4.2, 4.5, and 4.15) and the *Carmen Saeculare* for the *Ludi Saeculares* in 17 B.C. while Propertius claims his fourth book will cover sacred rites, days, and the old names for places, *sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum* (4.1.69). Tibullus lay outside the circle of Maecenas and for

inundationibus incendiisque obnoxiam excoluit adeo, ut iure sit gloriatus marmoream se relinquere, quam latericiam accepisset. tutam uero, quantum prouideri humana ratione potuit, etiam in posterum praestitit. publica opera plurima extruxit, e quibus uel praecipua: forum cum aede Martis Vltoris, templum Apollinis in Palatio, aedem Tonantis Iouis in Capitolio.

Suetonius Life of Augustus 28.3-29.1

Several passages in Augustan literature invite the reader to treat the text as a monument, such as the pictures on the temple of Juno at Carthage (*Aeneid* 1.453-494) and Propertius 4.2 in which an image of the god Vertumnus greets passers-by. Conte (1994) 263 points out that Vergil called his unfinished verses *tibicines*, the Latin term for “the props to support a building under construction.” Similarly, Horace (*Ode* 3.30) and Ovid (*Metamorphoses* 15.871ff.) describe their poems as monuments to posterity that like those to the *princeps* will grant them immortal fame. Jaeger (1997)

¹⁰ The tendency for Horace (*Epode* 1 and *Ode* 1.1), and Propertius (2.1) to address Maecenas at important places such as the first poem in a book or the outset of a multi-book work suggests that he played a part in the dialogue about poetic aesthetics taking place inside his circle.

¹¹ While discussing his poetic aesthetics in *Odes* 1, Horace commits himself to rivaling the Greek lyric poets (1.1.29-36) and offers ironic excuses as to why he is not the man to compose a panegyric to Agrippa (1.6) while showcasing the very epic capability Agrippa so desired in the proposed panegyric. Propertius reaffirms his preference for elegy in poems 2.1, 3.4, and 3.5. Even Ovid still a young man begins his *Amores* with a rejection of epic, a decision that compelled both Propertius and him to reinvent elegy.

Arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam

edere, materia conveniente modis.

par erat inferior versus—risisse Cupido

dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem.

1.1.1-4

This tendency in elegy is as old as the genre. A fragment of Archilochus confirms that the disparity between the hexameter and pentameter forced the elegist to balance themes of war and love.

εἰμὶ δ' ἐγὼ θεράπων μὲν Ἐνναλίῳ ἀνακτοῦ

καὶ Μουσῶν ἑρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος,

1.1-2

this reason may not have faced the same pressure to compose poetry in honor of the new *princeps*.

Elegy 2.5, the longest of his elegies (122 lines), is his only attempt at nationalistic poetry.¹² This elegy initiates movement in which poets like Horace (*Carmen Saeculare*), Propertius (book 4), and later Ovid (*Fasti*) attempt to compose poems on nationalistic themes and thereby create their own little Romes. For all three the task involves incorporating epic topics into their poetry.¹³

While Tibullus, like the new priest and honoree of the poem, enters new territory, namely the realm of nationalistic praise poetry, his return to elegiac themes during the description of the *Parilia* (87-104) and the references to his current love pains caused by Nemesis (111-114) reveal a poet unable to overcome the tension between his current project and his own poetic aesthetics. So strong is his commitment to elegy and his elegiac muse Nemesis that he cannot finish the panegyric without reverting back to his old poetic model. This shift in the poem from developing a national mythology (Apollo) to elegiac themes (Cupid) restores Tibullus to his true purpose as an elegiac poet and shows his profound unwillingness to write this kind of poetry. While Apollo

¹² I recognize that many will bristle at my use of the noun “nationalism” in connection with the Augustan Age. I contend that the noun is appropriate since Augustus’ revolution aimed at creating a national identity and was possible most of all because the many municipal men promised enfranchisement during the Social Wars did not gain such rights until after the final civil wars between Octavian and Antony. It was in their interest to recognize the rule of one man in Rome if he could finally offer them what they had been promised fifty years or more previously. While I would admit the use of the word “nationalism” before Actium in reference to the Roman state would be erroneous (Cicero had tried to form a *concordia totae Italiae* following Caesar’s murder, (Syme (1939) 88), it seems quite fitting for the period after Actium when Augustus sought to instill a sense of Italian pride in the Roman state. He even claimed in his *Res Gestae* that all of Italy swore allegiance to him before Actium, *iuravit in mea verba tota Italia sponte sua, et me belli quo vici ad Actium ducem depoposcit* (25). It is this nationalistic movement that drives Vergil to write a national epic that honors both Rome’s Trojan ancestors and the native Italic peoples while presenting an undeniable allegory for the civil wars of the poet’s youth. Propertius responded to this movement by recognizing himself as both an Umbrian and a Roman simultaneously, *ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Umbria libris, Umbria Romani patria Callimachi* (4.1.63-64). While Assisi was his birthplace, as a Roman knight he could rightly consider himself a real Roman with all the rights and privileges of the term.

¹³ I freely admit that these three make use of other genres as well; however, my project pertains to Roman identity and therefore the realm of epic and elegiac topics.

may have aided in securing Roman peace during the battle of Actium, in the time of Augustan peace that follows it is Cupid's arrows and not those of Apollo that have caused Tibullus pain and inspired his verses, *pace tua pereant arcus pereantque sagittae./ Phoebæ, modo in terris erret inermis Amor* (105-106). The end of the war ironically has not brought Tibullus the security one would expect but rather granted him the desired leisure to wage his own love wars, which offer him ample fodder for his elegies.¹⁴

Tibullus 2.5 stands as an influence for the elegiac genre-bending that occurred later in the works of his elegiac peers. 2.5, the second of four poems composed for Apollo *Palatinus*, represents a shift in focus for the elegist, who up to this point had not written any poetry on the public sphere.¹⁵ This poem is a hymn to Apollo in honor of the induction of M. Valerius Messalla Messallinus, M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus' eldest son, as one of the *quindecimviri sacris faciundis*. Tibullus' account follows the inauguration ceremony and juxtaposes Messallinus' entry into the priesthood with his own decision to enter the realm of praise poetry. Tibullus' project predates the attempts of his elegiac peers Propertius and Ovid.¹⁶ Tibullus 2.5 also had a strong influence on Horace's *Carmen Saeculare*, a hymn written several years later for

¹⁴ Propertius explains this elegiac conceit in his programmatic poem to Maecenas in which he discusses his choice of elegy over other genres like epic and assures his patron that Cynthia's actions and behavior give him all the material he needs for his poetry (*Iliadas* 14).

*seu nuda erepto mecum luctatur amictu,
tum vero longas condimus Iliadas:
seu quidquid fecit sivest quodcumque locuta,
maxima de nihilo nascitur historia.*
2.1.13-16

¹⁵ Propertius writes two poems on the Temple of Apollo *Palatinus*. The first of the two (2.31) was composed around 24 B.C. Propertius returns to the topic of Apollo's Palatine temple in 4.6 written sometime around 17 or 16 B.C. While the *Carmen Saeculare* was not written directly for Palatine Apollo, the location of the *Ludi Saeculares* near the Palatine hill and the opening invocation of Apollo and Diana justify associating this poem with the temple to Apollo on the Palatine. Cf. Miller (2009) 247-254.

¹⁶ In 17 or 16 B.C., Propertius proposes to cover sacred rites, days, and the old names for places in his fourth book of elegies. Similarly, sometime after 2 B.C. Ovid sets out to write his historical poem the *Fasti* on Rome's calendar in elegiac couplets rather than the hexameters he employed in the *Metamorphoses*.

the *Ludi Saeculares* of 17 B.C.¹⁷ While 2.5 drove elegy towards a wholly new program, it also impacted Horace's lyric model.¹⁸

Tibullus' elegy on Apollo *Palatinus* carries him into new territory; namely that of praise poetry.¹⁹ In the case of 2.5, Tibullus is writing his elegy in honor of Messalinus' investiture amongst the *quindecimviri*. The occasional nature of 2.5 marks it as distinct from book 4 of Propertius and Ovid's *Fasti*, later works that followed this model for elegiac genre-bending. While his poem announces Messalinus' entry to the priesthood of the *quindecimviri sacris faciundis* and serves as a hymn to Apollo, the poem contains elements of *epinicia* which include quick turns from topic to topic and a compressed narrative (see the little *Aeneid* 19-64).²⁰ As an *epinicion* it requires an honoree and though the occasion of the poem would suggest that this is Messalinus, I argue that the poem is a hymn to Rome and particularly the peace and stability her empire has given to Italy and the world at large. Tibullus does not mention Augustus since his presence would undermine Rome's greatness. Instead, Tibullus chooses to focus on how the

¹⁷ Miller (2009) 254 indicates that the *Carmen Saeculare* like Vergil's fourth Eclogue and Tibullus 2.5 visualizes Rome entering a special age (*saeculum*).

¹⁸ Tibullus 2.5 reflects a time when Romans began to feel more confident in the Augustan program since he had kept Italy at peace for 12 years. After the composition of Tibullus 2.5, Horace more freely embraces the genre of praise poetry composing the *Carmen Saeculare* and three panegyrics to Augustus in his final book of *Odes* (4.2, 4.5, and 4.15). I am not suggesting, however, that Horace would not have embraced panegyrics later in life without Tibullus 2.5. All the Augustan poets were responding to the same revolution taking place before their eyes. Like Tibullus Horace could not have been certain the Augustan program would be successful in the years just after Actium. Thus, Horace's decision to write more panegyrics to Augustus and his family in *Odes* 4 (13 B.C.) probably reflects the confidence of the Roman community in Augustus towards the end of Horace's life when it was clear the emperor had at least restored stability to Italian politics.

¹⁹ According to Gregory Nagy (1990) 146-148, Homeric epic poetry and lyrical *epinicia* are both forms of praise poetry that promise to grant glory (*kleos* or *ainos*) to their subjects. These two forms of praise poetry, epic and *epinicia* make no distinction between heroes and athletes; Homeric poetry brings an inclusive type of glory (*kleos*) to a hero no longer present on earth while *epinicia*, recited on the occasions of a victor's return to his city or at a funeral, confer on the athlete both *kleos* and *ainos*, a more exclusive type of praise than *kleos*, aimed at a specific social group. Performance and the degree of inclusivity then provide the distinction.

²⁰ Young (1968) Lord (1960) Nagy (1990) for discussions of how singers compress and expand their narratives.

empire was built on the labor and virtue of many people. Augustus' Actian victory required many able men not the least of which was Messalla.²¹

I divide Tibullus 2.5 into 6 parts: the invocation to Apollo with a description of his roles as god of poetry and prophecy (1-18), the narrator's history of Rome up to the Sibyl's prophecy for Aeneas (19-38), the Sibyl's prophecy of greatness for Aeneas and future Rome (39-66), an illustration of the bad omens associated with the civil wars (67-80), a prayer for a successful harvest and a depiction of the celebrations that attend the *Parilia* (81-104), and a return to Tibullus' anxious love for Nemesis with more praise for his patron's son Messalinus including a wish for a future triumph (105-122).

In the poem's first section, Tibullus invokes Apollo as patron of poetry with his lyre and songs.

*Phoebe, faue: nouus ingreditur tua templa sacerdos:
huc age cum cithara carminibusque ueni.
nunc te uocales impellere pollice chordas,
nunc precor ad laudes flectere uerba meas.
1-4*

He asks Apollo to aid him in his first attempt to compose praise poetry, (*laudes*) beseeching the god to bend his speech (*uerba*) unaccustomed as it is to panegyric. His use of the term *laudes* indicates to the reader that the poet is working from a new poetic model by composing a panegyric in elegiac couplets since the consummate elegiac reader would recognize panegyric as the realm of praise poetry and not elegy proper.²² Tibullus has yet to reveal the name of the new

²¹Murgatroyd (1994) 2.5 describes 2.5 as a κλητικὸς ὕμνος (an introductory cult hymn to a god, in this case Apollo) influenced by Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* and only the second one of its kind in Latin literature following Horace's *Ode* 1.30 (later examples are Martial 8.21 and 12.62 and Statius' *Silvae* 5.4). He calls 2.5 a "boldly experimental composition" and the starting point for the etiological elegies of Propertius in his fourth book and Ovid's *Fasti*.

²²Harrison (2007) 8 explains that the model of Aristotelian criticism outlined in the *Poetics*, which continued to dominate literary criticism during the Hellenistic period and even the Age of Augustus, established a fixed hierarchy of genres in which epic sat at the top with tragedy and elegy following behind it. The length, weighty meter, and

priest and leaves the audience in suspense until he mentions Messalinus (17). Given the poet's entrance into a new genre of poetry, the audience may momentarily regard Tibullus as the new *sacerdos*. The poet gets more specific with his invocation by requesting the Apollo who hymned Jupiter following his defeat of the Titans suggesting that his panegyric has been composed to celebrate a great national victory.

*sed nitidus pulcherque ueni: nunc indue uestem
sepositam, longas nunc bene pecte comas,
qualem te memorant Saturno rege fugato
uictori laudes concinuisse Ioui.*
7-10

While there is no explicit reference to Augustus in these lines, the audience would take the location of the poem as Apollo's Palatine temple, adjacent to Augustus' house, because the *quindecimviri* were considered priests of Apollo and tended the Sibylline books, housed by Augustus in the Palatine complex.²³ The poet still has not mentioned Messalinus but has alluded to some sort of grand victory on the level of Jupiter's victory over the Titans. Upon comparing these comments to Tibullus' reference later to the civil wars (67-80), the audience would conclude that Tibullus is referring to Augustus' victory at Actium. Why then is Tibullus so careful not to mention Augustus and Actium specifically when every major Augustan Age writer sought to define what the Augustan peace meant?²⁴ While I agree that Tibullus may have reasons for not wishing to praise Augustus (including the loss of his family farm), his omission of the emperor's name stems more out of respect for his patron and his patron's son, the honoree of this

dignity of characters made epic the most exalted of all genres. Any given poet could expect his audience to have clear expectations for a given genre.

²³ Miller (2009) 242.

²⁴ In addition to Tibullus 2.5, the Augustan writers composed numerous works about the early history of the city including Vergil's *Aeneid*, book 1 of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*, Horace's *Carmen Saeculare*, Propertius 4.1, 4.4, and 4.9 and Ovid's *Fasti*.

panegyric.²⁵ As a great general himself and partner in Augustus' Actian victory, Messalla has earned this panegyric for his family through his patronage of the arts.²⁶ Tibullus' panegyric while nominally for Messalinus, hymns Rome and the peace that the battle of Actium has restored to Italy. It is for these reasons that Tibullus merely alludes to the victory at Actium without any direct reference to the emperor.

By line 17 Tibullus finally introduces the subject of his poem, Marcus Valerius Messalla Messalinus. At this point the reader understands that the *sacerdos* (l) is not Tibullus but Messalinus. In section 2 Tibullus gives a history of proto-Rome prior to Aeneas' arrival in Italy. Tibullus segues from Messalinus to Aeneas through the prophecy of the Sibyl, Apollo's mouthpiece on earth. Lines 19-22 cover the first half of the *Aeneid* up to the hero's arrival at Cumae and conversation with the Sibyl.

*haec dedit Aeneae sortes, postquam ille parentem
dicitur et raptos sustinuisse Lares
nec fore credebat Romam, cum maestus ab alto
Ilion ardentem respiceretque deos.*

Tibullus, like other writers of praise poetry, chooses when to lengthen or compress a narrative.²⁷ Here he mentions only the most basic details of the first six books of the *Aeneid*; Aeneas carries

²⁵ Tibullus alludes to the confiscations of the Triumvirs that affected his family, *non fixus in agris qui reget certis finibus arva, lapis* (1.3.43-44). According to Tibullus in the age of Saturn, men either held property in common or suffered no disputes of ownership that would force them to mark off their property lines. In contrast Tibullus considers the age of Jupiter (Augustus) dangerous, *nunc Iove sub domino caedes et vulnera semper/ nunc mare, nunc leti mille repente viae* (1.3.49-50).

²⁶ Messalla although the most independent of the surviving Republicans after Pollio earned many favors from Augustus including his consulship in 31 B.C. and his son's induction to the priesthood honored in this elegy. Messalla resigned the title of *praefectus urbi* after a few days (Tacitus *Annales* 6.11.13) According to Syme (1939) 403 he seems to have either misunderstood the office or did not approve of it.

²⁷ The Homeric bard decided when to lengthen or compress a particular narrative, Lord (1960) 92. Extension and compression is also common in *epinicia* such as Pindar's famous "little *Oresteia*."

*τὸν δὴ φονευομένου πατρὸς Ἀρσινόα Κλυταιμῆστρας
χειρῶν ὑπο κ' ῥατερᾶν
ἐκ δόλου τροφῆς ἄνελε δυσπενθέος,
ὅποτε Δαρδανίδα κόραν Πριάμου
Κασσάνδραν πολιῶ χαλκῶ σὺν Ἀγαμεμνονία*

his father and his household gods out of the burning city never believing the city promised to him will come to be. Tibullus' use of *dicitur* reminds the reader of the poet's sources (*Aeneid*, Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*, and other early histories of Rome) while creating some distance within which he can create his own brief narrative about the events. The narrator continues his history with a reference to Romulus and Remus' death (23-24). Here again the poet has chosen what elements of legendary Rome to include and what to discard. He has to mention Romulus, the putative founder of Rome but includes Aeneas since the emperor by this time had succeeded in cultivating a connection between Aeneas and himself through his relationship as Caesar's adopted son. This jump in the narrative from Aeneas to Romulus skips over the lineage of Aeneas.

While Tibullus has reduced his history of the city to a few couplets about Aeneas and Romulus, he dedicates a full 14 lines to describing Rome prior to Aeneas' arrival (25-38). At the time Rome was little more than two hills, the grazing areas on the Palatine and the low huts on the Capitoline, *sed tunc pascebant herbosa Palatia vaccae/ et stabant humiles in Iovis arce casae* (25-26). One may recall that Tibullus has given a fairly lengthy and positive description of the Saturnian age in Italy prior to Aeneas' arrival from the east (1.3.35-50), yet his brief narrative here appears at odds with the passage from 1.3 when the reader considers the context of Tibullus 2.5, a panegyric to Messalinus. While Tibullus retains his passion for the rustic life of his predecessors, his current project concerns Messalinus, a new priest in the cult of Apollo, the emperor's patron deity and partner in his Actian victory. It is the emperor's Actian victory that

ψυχῆ πόρευ' Ἀχέροντος ἀκτὰν παρ' εὐσκιον
νηλῆς γυνά. πότερόν νιν ἄρ' Ἰφιδέει' ἐπ' Εὐρίπω
σφαχθεῖσα τῆλε πάτρας
ἔκ' νισεν βαρυπάλαμον ὄρσαι χόλον;
Pythian 11.17-24
Cf. Young (1968)

ushers in this new era of profound peace just as Aeneas' arrival to the region sets off a grand change in the political and social life in Italy. Tibullus modifies his cynicism towards the *novum saeculum* and composes honest panegyric for a new era that allows the poet the leisure to pursue his true love: elegy.

Both the poet and Sibyl craft their own short histories of Rome, which prompts the reader to see the parallels between the two figures. While most of Tibullus' history describes the early Romans' pastoral activities (25-38), the Sibyl's song (39-64) covers the political circumstances surrounding Rome's origin. Initially, Tibullus seems to compare himself to the priest until he reveals Messalinus as the true priest of the hymn (17). Tibullus' history covers Rome prior to Aeneas' arrival with a short section (19-24) dedicated to Aeneas and Romulus. The Sibyl picks up the history from Aeneas' appearance at Cumae and carries it up to the birth of Romulus and Remus (51-54). The Sibyl's direct address to Aeneas brings to the surface the tension between Tibullus' current project and his typical elegiac model, *Impiger Aenea, volitantis frater Amoris* (38). As I mentioned above, epic poems and lyrical *epinicia* as types of praise poetry both treat their subjects (heroes and athletes) with equal reverence. The adjective *impiger* that the Sibyl applies to Aeneas is appropriate to epic but is not Vergil's ubiquitous modifier *pious* found throughout the *Aeneid*. The term *impiger* reminds the reader just how much Aeneas endures throughout his life before settling in Italy, conveys the sense of constant movement, and perfectly fits the active lifestyle of an epic hero. At the same time, Tibullus' use of *impiger* and not *pious* creates some separation between 2.5 and Vergil's current project the *Aeneid* allowing the poet to create his own legendary Rome distinct from that of Vergil.

While her address to Aeneas recognizes him as an epic hero, she immediately sets up a comparison between epic and elegy by referring to Aeneas as the brother of Cupid, the god most

associated with elegiac poetry, *volitantis frater Amoris* (38). Although Cupid seems out of place in this panegyric, he frequently appears in elegies. Likewise, Cupid has a brief role in the *Aeneid* as not only Aeneas' brother but also the driving force behind Dido's obsessive love for the Trojan (1.657-722). The god reappears later in line 106 when Tibullus moves from his epic topic to his elegiac mistress Nemesis and his usual poetic province.

The Sibyl's history concentrates on Aeneas' life and early Rome's legendary past while Tibullus' account mentions only the *Aeneid's* most minor details (19-22) and instead focuses on the early Romans' daily life (25-38). The Sibyl sings of Aeneas' victory over the Rutulians and the birth of Romulus and Remus, the city's real founders. In her narrative she follows the traditional versions of these two accounts, Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* and the *Aeneid*. She assures Aeneas that he will enter the ranks of the divine through the Numicus River (43-44) and that his son will establish the city Alba Longa (49-50). The *Aeneid* does not cover these two events, but Livy speaks of the divine Aeneas as Jupiter Indiges.²⁸

secundum inde proelium Latinis, Aeneae etiam ultimum operum mortalium fuit. situs est, quemcumque eum dici ius fasque est super Numicum flumen: Iouem indigetem appellant.

Ab Urbe Condita 1.2.6

Although most of the Sibyl's narrative follows a typical epic prophecy, she includes several elegiac details in her story of Rhea Silvia's rape. Much like Ovid's description of the rape in the *Fasti* (3.21ff), the Sibyl emphasizes Mars' love for Rhea Silvia. She downplays the violence in the story by using typical elegiac diction such as *placitura*, *concupitus*, and *cupidi*.

²⁸ Dionysius of Halicarnassus also mentions Aeneas' apotheosis.

τὸ δὲ Αἰνείου σῶμα φανερόν οὐδαμῆ γενόμενον οἱ μὲν εἰς θεοδὸς μεταστῆναι εἴκαζον, οἱ δ' ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ, παρ' ὃν ἡ μάχη ἐγένετο, διαφθαρήναι. καὶ αὐτῷ κατασκευάζουσιν οἱ Λατῖνοι ἥρωδον ἐπιγραφῆ τοιαύδε κοσμούμενον· Πατρός θεοῦ χθονίου, ὃς ποταμοῦ Νομικίου ῥέεσμα διέπει.

Antiquitates Romanae 1.64.4.-1.65

*te quoque iam video, Marti placitura sacerdos
Ilia, Vestales deseruisse focos,
Concubitusque tuos furtim vittasque iacentes
Et cupidi ad ripas arma relicta dei.*
51-54

In section 4 Tibullus gives a few details of the omens that surrounded the death of Julius Caesar and the subsequent civil wars, *haec fore dixerunt belli mala signa cometen,/ multus ut in terras deplueretque lapis* (71-72). He gives no direct reference to Julius Caesar or Augustus, the victor of the civil wars. It is possible that the poet does not wish to resurrect sad and powerful images of Italy's destruction since he asks Apollo to bury these omens under the sea, *haec fuerunt olim, sed tu iam mitis, Apollo/ prodigia indomitis merge sub aequoribus* (79-80).²⁹ The poet's use of *olim* strengthens the distance between the years of civil war and the present peace and allows him to emphasize the glory of peace without giving attention to the years of war that preceded it. If he had wished to elaborate on the battle at Actium, he could have lauded Messalla for his aid in securing Augustus' victory. Instead the poet moves away from the subject as quickly as possible bringing it up only to enhance his praise for the present peace.

Upon entering section 5, Tibullus can no longer restrain his desire for elegy. Here, he wishes for a bountiful harvest and describes the celebrations that occur on the *Parilia*, the founding day of Rome. While the feast has political consequences, Tibullus spends most of this section singing of a great harvest and the mingling of the boys and their girlfriends during the day's heavy drinking, topics very typical of his other elegies. Finally, at line 105, the poem begins its final section with another invocation to Apollo, *pace tua pereant arcus pereantque sagittae,/ Phoebe, modo in terris erret inermis Amor* (105-106). Tibullus asks Apollo to put

²⁹ Syme (1939) 317 points out that Augustus abandoned the legacy of Caesar during his reign since mention of that dictator would conjure up images of assassination and civil war. Tibullus like his contemporaries makes no reference to Caesar save an allusion to the *sidus Iulianum* (*cometen* 71).

away his arrows in peacetime and let Cupid reign freely with his amorous arrows. The poet without naming Augustus admits that the Augustan peace has allowed him the leisure to compose his elegies. Without the battle of Actium, Apollo would not have retired his weapons. In this way Tibullus reveals that his poem is an honest panegyric for the present age of peace rather than a mere celebration of Messalinus' induction as a priest of Apollo. This cult reached the pinnacle of its success following Augustus' victory at Actium when he built the temple to Apollo on the Palatine and moved the Sibylline books to the new temple.³⁰ Without the emperor the poet has neither the priest to honor in panegyric nor the leisure with which to pursue his passion. Thus, Tibullus paved the road for his elegiac successors and showed first Propertius and then Ovid how a Roman elegist could approach political topics and garner the praise typically reserved for epic poets while still expressing his distaste for war. 2.5 is quite indicative of Propertius 4 and Ovid's *Fasti* in that like those later projects it seeks to reorient political topics back towards the people and particularly their festivals.³¹ Collectively, these three elegists sought ways to craft their own elegiac histories of Rome and subsequently alter Roman identity forever by creating an elegiac model to rival Vergil's epic portrait of early Rome.

³⁰ Miller (2009) 239.

³¹ This emphasis on the many voices of Rome seen in Tibullus 2.5, Propertius 4, and the *Fasti* creates a new elegiac Rome built on the work of many including women, foreigners, and elegiac lovers. This popular stance contrasts with the imperial identity that asserted the uniqueness and necessity of one man for the city's development as depicted in the iconography of the temple to Mars Ultor and Anchises' prophecy of Rome in *Aeneid* 6.

CHAPTER 3 PROPERTIUS 4

Around 17 B.C. Propertius proposed a book of elegies on nationalistic topics such as “sacred rites, days, and the old names for places,” *sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum* (4.1.69). Propertius, like Tibullus, will set the stage for Ovid’s genre-bending through his discussion of Roman identity and his blending of epic and elegiac elements. Propertius opens his fourth book with a discussion of how aspects of both his Umbrian and Roman environments make up his identity. He follows this with his treatment of the diversity and plurality of Rome past and present; his comments lead to a more focused exegesis of the Roman hero as a mixture of both epic and elegiac characteristics.

There can be little doubt that Propertius sought to emulate Callimachus’ *Aetia* with his fourth book of elegies.¹ In addition to the numerous references to Callimachus in his earlier poems, Propertius follows up the program for his fourth book with a confident assertion.²

*Ennius hirsuta cingat sua dicta corona:
mi folia ex hedera porrige, Bacche, tua,
ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Umbria libris,
Umbria Romani patria Callimachi!*
61-64

Let Vergil and others seek Ennius’ shaggy, epic crown for their praises of legendary Rome. The adjective *hirsuta* suggests that Ennius’ *Annales* are both rough in style and shaggy like the bearded, primitive Romans who wore pelts and were mentioned earlier in this poem, *Curia*,

¹ Camps (1965) 3-4 Propertius 4 contains the broad perspective on genre so cherished by the Hellenistic poets and contains many common Hellenistic tendencies such as poems 4.1a in which a guide shows around a foreigner (Catullus 4), 4.1b in which a mentor warns a poet about his choice of genre (Callimachus’ warning from Apollo in the prologue to his *Aetia*), 4.2 where a statue talks about itself (Callimachus’ *Iambi* 5 and 7), 4.5, a curse poem, (Callimachus’ *Ibis*), 4.6, a hymn to Palatine Apollo (Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo*), and 4.11 in which a dead person speaks from the tomb (Callimachus *Palatina Anthologia* 8.525).

² Propertius makes five references to Callimachus in his four books of elegy. All these references occur in programmatic poems, which establish the plan for the rest of the book, or poems about his poetic immortality (2.1.40, 2.34.32, 3.1.1, 3.9.43, and 4.1.64).

praetexto quae nunc nitet alta senatu/ pellitos habuit, rustica corda, Patres (4.1.11-12).

Propertius always claimed to be the most Callimachean of Rome's poets and practiced the new style that the *Neoterics* established in Rome as antithetical to more traditional poetry like that of Ennius.

Propertius now had a project that matched his great ambition with his favorite poetic model. For years he had given excuses to Maecenas that his elegiac style did not befit praise poetry.

*sed neque Phlegraeos Iovis Enceladique tumultus
intonet angusto pectore Callimachus,
nec mea conveniunt duro praecordia versu
Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen avos.*
2.1.39-42

His refusal stems from the lack of congruence between the gravity of praise poetry and his light Callimachean style. Surely, his reference to singing about Augustus' ancestors is a not so subtle allusion to the *Aeneid*.

After seeing the pay and praise Vergil earned for his *Aeneid* and the fame Tibullus 2.5 and Horace's *Carmen Saeculare* garnered for their poets, Propertius found a compromise: he would write a book of nationalistic poetry but in the vein of his idol Callimachus. The work would bring glory not only to Rome but to Propertius and by extension his Umbrian birthplace, Assisi (4.1.63-64). This pan-Italic sentiment of Propertius 4.1 accords well with Augustus' known attempts to reward municipal *novi homines* in an attempt to bind them to the new state and place known partisans in the Senate.³ In this way Propertius 4.1 celebrates the new Italian state created by Augustus, which while centered in Rome enfranchised new, wealthy citizens throughout the

³ Syme (1939) 349-368 details how Augustus attempted to augment his partisans by rewarding *novi homines* from the rest of Italy. He could trust these men who owed their newfound rank to Augustus and his revolution. These men acted as a counterweight to the many nobles and partisans of previous dynasts like Pompey and Antony who felt anything but good will towards the new *princeps*.

peninsula. On the other hand, Propertius 4 allows many different voices to create Rome; a portrait that cannot help but contrast with the single-minded identity being fashioned by the *princeps*.⁴

Despite his grand designs, book four contains only six etiological poems. The remaining five poems are elegies similar to his efforts in the first three books. I agree with Miller that Propertius likely wrote 4.1 after completion of the book to explain why the work had come to be an anthology.⁵ The second half of 4.1 provides a generic explanation for this change: Horos the astrologer warns Propertius that he is summoning tears and embarking on a project without Apollo's endorsement, *accersis lacrimas: aversus cantat Apollo:/ poscis ab invita verba pigenda lyra* (73-74). He explains later that Apollo forbids Propertius to "thunder in the Forum," *tum tibi pauca suo de carmine dictat Apollo/ et vetat insano verba tonare foro* (133-134). Horos' statement reminds Propertius of his own previous *recusationes* and that of Callimachus at the outset of his *Aetia*, *μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶ/τε μέγα ψοφέουσιν ἀοιδήν/ τίκτεσθαι· βροντᾶ/ν οὐκ ἐμόν, /ἀλλὰ/ Διός* (fr. 1.19-20). This reflects not only Propertius' decision to write elegiac and not epic poetry but his choice to remain aloof from politics. Like his successor Ovid, Propertius chose to keep his knight's ring and reject any further duties in Augustus' new state, perhaps a point of

⁴Tara Welch (2005) views Propertius 4 as an artistic parallel to Augustus' program for urban planning similar to Jaeger's (1997) 182 views on Livy's plan for the *Ab Urbe Condita*. By presenting his own literary Rome, Propertius creates a rival model to Augustus' Rome and allows for many different voices to contribute to the whole that is the city of Rome. To Welch, Propertius 4 views the Augustan program as an attempt to force new models of morality, identity, and behavior on the Roman people that are more suitable to the *princeps*' new state. Debroun (2003) sees in Propertius 4 a third level of discourse or "third." She defines a "third" as a "manipulative space in which two poles may meet." She also notes that when two opposites meet, one usually dominates the other. Thus, in Propertius 4 the grandeur of Rome "threatens to undermine elegiac discourse." Her application of the theory of "thirds" to Propertius 4 accurately articulates the clash of contrasts such as epic and elegy, war and love, male and female, native and foreign, private and public, and poet and prince.

⁵ Miller (1982) 382.

tension between both poets and the *princeps*.⁶ Propertius would follow Tibullus in creating his own image of legendary Rome. The six etiological elegies (4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.6, 4.9, and 4.10) depict Rome as a sight of constant change and struggle and a place that rose from humble origins to the greatness of Augustus' age because of its commitment to innovation and hard work, a Callimachean and Roman combination that perfectly fit Propertius' task in creating his Roman *Aetia*.

In Book 4 Propertius gives a multifaceted depiction of Roman identity showing many examples of different people who comprise the whole of Roman identity. While elegy 4.1 introduces many of these different types of Romans including military men, elegiac lovers, farmers, and women, Propertius begins his programmatic poem with a reference to a foreigner (*hospes*). In book 4 the term *hospes* appears five times in three different poems, and for this reason I believe that Propertius finds immigration an essential contribution to Roman identity. Rome itself has evolved as a result of immigration whether the immigrant is a god like Hercules (4.9) or foreign kings like Evander and Aeneas (4.1) or Tatius (4.4). In poem 4.1 Propertius reveals his plan for Book 4, *sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum* (4.1.69). He will sing of holy things, festivals, and the ancient names of places. As I mentioned above, not all of the poems conform to the poet's plan, such as 4.3, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8, and 4.11. I will restrict my comments in this chapter to the six etiological poems and what they reveal about the notion of Roman identity in the early Augustan age.

While the poem as a whole introduces the topic of Book 4, the first line emphasizes to the reader the importance of the *hospes* to the goal of his present work, *hoc quodcumque vides*,

⁶ Syme (1939) 466-467 for Propertius' political aspirations, *Tristia* 4.10.35-38 and Syme (1939) 363 for Ovid's decision to reject Augustus' offer of the *latus clavus*, a necessary requirement for a *novus homo* to seek the office of quaestor and thus admission to the Senate.

hospes, qua maxima Roma est (4.1.1). Both Rome and the foreigner appear side by side in the very first line. In much of the first 50 lines of the poem, the narrator describes the state of primitive Rome by comparing it to what the foreigner presumably sees before his own eyes on their walk. The poet then invites the foreigner and the reader, who has become a traveler himself, to think of primitive Rome as a point of contrast to Augustan Rome. As the poet explains throughout this book, the development of Rome and Roman identity was a result of the constant influx of new peoples. The second line and fourth lines of the poem add the names of two heroes particularly responsible for the early development of the city, namely the foreign exiles Aeneas and Evander. Like Tibullus 2.5 Propertius concentrates on Aeneas' contribution to Rome's settlement; he, however, includes Evander amongst these early settlers and draws attention to his status as not just a foreigner but an exile, *Euandri profugae procubuere boves* (4.1.4). Through hard work and innovation, exiles and immigrants built Rome into a world empire.

Like his Augustan contemporaries, Propertius throughout 4.1 contrasts Rome's humble origins with its present splendor in the Augustan Age. Rome was little more than a grassy hill before Aeneas arrived (4.1.2) in contrast to the greatness of Augustan Rome, *maxima Roma est* (4.1.1). In lines 9 and 10, the poet continues his history of early Rome with his first mention of Romulus, the legendary founder of the city, and his brother Remus (4.1.9-10). Livy asserts that Romulus and Remus were the children of Rhea Silvia from Alba Longa (1.4). Since according to legendary accounts Rome began at the moment Romulus marked out the walls, the reader would expect the first men associated with the city to be foreigners. Propertius emphasizes the foreign element by placing this list of historical immigrants in a dialogue between the narrator and an actual *hospes*. The narrator appears to be walking through the city and pointing out various elements to a foreigner (whether it is Horos or not). The first lines of the poem indicate just how

important the *hospes* has been to the development of Rome throughout her history.⁷ Immigrants like Evander, Aeneas, Romulus, and Remus contributed to the development of the early city just as immigrants like Propertius and Horos in the Augustan Age are establishing a new Rome and sense of identity.

Propertius contrasts Rome's primitive origins with the diverse and cosmopolitan Augustan Rome. Propertius attempts to demonstrate that while Rome's earliest foundations were forged by various and diverse peoples (4.1a), the multiple characteristics of Augustan Rome included not only the population, but also various cultural and religious traditions from outside influences (4.1b). I argue that Propertius offers this contrast between the types of diversity in the first and second halves of poem 4.1 to highlight not only his own lack of connection to Rome's primitive foundation story but also to challenge the image of Roman identity presented through Augustan reforms. While the Romans of the Augustan Age adorn their temples with gold and marble, the images of the gods were made of clay in the early city and the houses constructed without any artifice, *fictilibus crevere deis haec aurea templa, nec fuit opprobrio facta sine arte casa* (4.1.5-6). Similarly, the concept of the theatre had not yet arrived at Rome since it would be an import from Greece and the Greek settlements of southern Italy, *nec sinuosa cavo pendebant vela theatro* (4.1.15). Furthermore, the primitive Romans did not seek out new cults, *nulli cura fuit externos quaerere divos* (4.1.17). All of these depictions contrast with what the foreigner sees of Augustus' Rome. The poet will emphasize the prevalence of foreign cults in his own Rome through the extended discussion of astrology in the second half of 4.1. Although various emperors carried out purges of foreign cults, they often reemerged since the city of Rome had

⁷ Tara Welch (2005) 13 points out that the first section of the poem relates the early history of Rome but without emphasis on any particular topographical location. This presentation of Roman history contrasts with later illustrations of the past in poems 4.4., 4.6, 4.9, and 4.10 where the poet uses a specific location as a jumping off point for his history. It is for this reason I have described 4.1 as programmatic and not topographical.

become a fully cosmopolitan city fit to be the capital of the world. Augustus' revival of traditional Italian religion could not ultimately eliminate the prevalence of foreign religions.⁸

Propertius continues his description of old Rome with a couplet that illustrates the state of ancient warfare, *nec rudis infestis miles radiabat in armis: miscebant usta proelia nuda sude* (4.1.27-28). Soldiers committed to battle with no significant armor and a fired stake as a spear. Of course these descriptions of primitive warfare contrast strongly with the poet's own understanding of warfare in the Augustan Age when the Roman army had subdued the whole of the Mediterranean. Finally, the poet ends this list with a description of early Rome's economy, *magnaue pars Tatio rerum erat inter oves* (4.1.30). Tatio, as I explained above, came as a foreigner himself and co-ruled Rome with Romulus. Yet even a king of early Rome drew little income from anything other than his livestock. Propertius' audience would know of countless equestrians who had made fortunes through overseas trade and other activities, but this type of economy did not exist during early Rome.⁹

Propertius' contrast of past and present brings him to a conclusion that after further analysis threatens to undermine much of the Augustan ideology: Romans have nothing in common with their ancestors except the name of Roman, *nil patrium nisi nomen habet Romanus alumnus/ sanguinis altricem non putet esse lupam* (4.1.37-38). In one sense Propertius' couplet confirms the greatness of the Augustan renovation, for clearly contemporary Romans would

⁸ Tibullus mentions his girlfriend Delia's commitment to the cult of Isis (1.3.23-32).

⁹ Prior to Augustus' Roman revolution, many equestrians remained aloof from politics and pursued only monetary gains. The Senatorial class chastised the knights for their lack of service to the state. After the Senate had failed for over fifty years to enfranchise these wealthy municipal men as they promised following the Social War, Augustus, the only remaining dynast, proved capable of the task and earned their loyalty. Syme (1939) 328 Augustus' success at creating a new state stemmed in part from his ability to bring these equestrians into the Senatorial order. Augustus needed many administrators for his imperial model but feared putting *nobiles* in charge of powerful proconsular armies. He found a solution by elevating a number of *novi homines*, who owed their recent rise in Italian politics to Augustus' revolution alone.

have a hard time reconciling the beauty of Augustan Rome with its primitive origins.¹⁰ Over the centuries Rome underwent vast changes, many of which were established by foreign elements immigrating to the city as Propertius points out in book 4; however, in the present age, Augustus was taking great pains to conceal his changes of traditional Roman customs by housing them in republican ritual. In this way he could make changes to government and society without arousing the public outcry that usually attends true revolution. He wanted Romans to view their own age as special and ordained by fate, and yet he hoped they would not recognize that he turned a free republic into a militaristic monarchy within one lifetime.

At the same time, the poet's denial of the traditional founding story of Rome undermines the emperor's attempt to link his own reign with the history of both the regal and republican periods as seen in the statuary of the temple to Mars Ultor. The statues associated Augustus with Mars and Venus and by extension Aeneas, Romulus, and all the kings of Alba Long. Romans had long associated Alba Longa with the founding of Rome since they believed the city to be the birthplace of Romulus and Remus. Similarly, Iulus, son of Aeneas, supposedly founded the town, *nouam ipse aliam sub Albano monte condidit quae ab situ porrectae in dorso urbis Longa Alba appellata* (Livy 1.3.3). It was from Iulus that the whole Julian clan had supposedly acquired its name, *quem Iulum eundem Iulia gens auctorem nominis sui nuncupat* (Livy 1.3.3). Likewise, Augustus had added a colonnade of *summi viri*, other great men from republican Rome, in an attempt to connect his own reign with the republic. His imaging, however, rewrites Roman history by obscuring the tensions of republican history. For instance, he places pairs of enemies next to one another such as Marius and Sulla and Lucullus and Pompey.¹¹ This arrangement of

¹⁰ According to Suetonius Augustus boasted he had found a Rome a city of brick and left it a city of marble. *urbem neque pro maiestate imperii ornatam et inundationibus incendiisque obnoxiam excoluit adeo, ut iure sit gloriatus marmoream se relinquere, quam latericiam accepisset* (*Life of Augustus* 28.3).

statues presents a unified history of Rome by eliminating the complex historical circumstances that actually determined the fate of Rome.

Propertius then is casting suspicion on the emperor's interpretation of Roman history by undermining the story of Romulus and Remus' birth and subsequent rearing by the she-wolf. If the poet offers resistance to this myth, he is confronting the very images of Roman identity endorsed and proffered by Augustus and even portrayed in the works of contemporary writers like Vergil and Livy. Without Vergil's *Aeneid* and Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*, the imperial program might have lacked the necessary support it needed to bequeath a new system of government to Augustus' successors.¹²

When Propertius concludes his concise history and brings the reader down to the present age, he reminds the audience of the specter of civil war by mentioning the death of Remus, *si modo Avernalis tremulae cortina Sibyllae/ dixit Aventino rura pianda Remo* (4.1.49-50).¹³ His audience would likely associate the murder of Remus with other famous and more recent battles from the Roman civil wars such as Pharsalus, Philippi, and Actium. Propertius' couplet here calls to mind awful memories of the past that could threaten the stability of Augustus' fledgling

¹¹ Zanker (1988) 210-211.

¹² Suetonius says that Augustus had considered restoring the republic twice but decided against it for fear he could not retire without endangering himself and because he was not confident that the imperial system he had established would last.

De reddenda re p. bis cogitavit: primum post oppressum statim Antonium, memor obiectum sibi ab eo saepius, quasi per ipsum staret ne redderetur; ac rursus taedio diuturnae ualitudinis, cum etiam magistratibus ac senatu domum accitis rationarium imperii tradidit. sed reputans et se priuatam non sine periculo fore et illam plurium arbitrio temere committi, in retinenda perseuerauit, dubium euentu meliore an uoluntate.
Life of Augustus 28.1

¹³ Richardson (1977) 4.1.49-50 explains that *si modo* is colloquial and should be translated as "since" or "when." Wiseman (1995) believes the myth of Remus' death emerges in plays from the fourth century B.C in order to explain the struggles between the patricians (Romulus) and the plebs (Remus). He also suggests that the myth may hide the grim reality of a human sacrifice made to propitiate the gods during a crisis in 296 B.C. Debroun (2003) 61ff believes that Propertius has mentioned the most tragic element of Rome's foundation in the most positive light by claiming the blood sacrifice was necessary to ensure a fortunate future for the city.

imperial system. Horos may well refer to these lines from 4.1a when he warns Propertius that he is both summoning sad events and pursuing a poetic project without Apollo's permission, *accersis lacrimas cantans, aversus Apollo* (73).

Finally, at the end of poem 4.1a, the poet discusses his own origin hailing himself as both Umbrian and Roman and promising to give glory to both his homelands. Propertius is an Umbrian and thus a foreigner himself by Roman standards (4.1.63-64). He like the *hospes* came to Rome as a traveler and settled there. Like Titus Tatius (4.4), Hercules (4.9), and so many other foreigners who have come to Rome before him, he strives to honor the city that has offered him an outlet for his poetry. It is for this reason he dedicates his work to Rome but still asks that it give glory to his homeland of Umbria (4.1.63, 4.1.67). Like all immigrants to Rome, Propertius has a double personality: one foreign and one Roman. For Propertius both aspects of his identity are Italian and perhaps more acceptable to native, contemporary Romans than those of other foreigners such as the Babylonian Horos. Propertius, however, is suggesting in an indirect way that someday soon the Romans will regard other non-Italian foreign elements as equal contributors to Roman identity. While Augustus sought to revive traditional Italic religion, he elevated several non-Italian men to positions of prominence such as Lucius Cornelius Balbus from Gades and Lucius Annaeus Seneca of Corduba.¹⁴

At the end of 4.1a, Propertius describes his present project and hopes to establish himself as the Roman heir to Callimachus. The poet promises to sing of sacred festivals and the ancient names for places in the city, *sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum* (4.1.69). His plan for book 4 contrasts greatly with those of his three previous books. His project borders on an epic poem which he hints at by mentioning the great epic writer of Roman history Ennius,

¹⁴ Syme (1939) 292, While neither of these men entered the Senate, Seneca secured senatorial rank for two of his sons as did Balbus for his son of the same name.

Ennius hirsuta cingat sua dicta corona (4.1.61). Propertius, however, is not writing epic but instead the poetry of Bacchus, which represents a style of poetry less grandiose than epic but more serious than elegy.¹⁵ The work will have grand topics like epic because of the greatness of Rome, yet Propertius will compose his verses in light, Callimachean style. By placing the name of Callimachus right after this discussion, he suggests that he will balance the two extremes of poetry represented by Ennius and Callimachus. Propertius will not write a great epic of Roman history, nor will he compose love elegies. Instead, he will sing of Callimachean etiologies about the grand topic of Rome. His audience would have recognized that elegists in the past had played a very small role in recording Roman history. Therefore, his long explanation of his present plan seems logical since he would want to assure his audience that he was the right poet for this project. At the end of 4.1a, the poet has promised a book in elegiac couplets on epic themes, and he wishes for a good omen for the present work, *date candida, cives/, omina; et inceptis dextera cantet avis* (4.1.67-68).

In poem 4.1b, Horos, a Babylonian astrologer and perhaps the *hospes* from line 1, introduces himself to the audience and to Propertius himself. The name Horos and his Babylonian ancestor Conon remind the audience of Callimachus who himself wrote a poem about the lock of Bernice. Supposedly, the queen of Egypt Bernice had vowed a lock of hair if her husband Ptolemy III Euergetes returned safely from a campaign. She donated the hair to a temple as a dedication upon his return, but soon it went missing. The court astronomer Conon claimed he found it in the stars as a new constellation. Callimachus then wrote a section of his *Aetia* about the event.¹⁶

¹⁵ Fox (1996) 146-147.

¹⁶ Although this portion of the *Aetia* does not survive, Catullus 66 is an imitation of the Lock of Bernice, which also references the astronomer Conon.

Horos begins his soliloquy by questioning Propertius' current project since the threads are not spun on the "right" distaff and Apollo has not endorsed Propertius' work, *non sunt a dextro condita fila colo/ accersis lacrimas cantans, aversus Apollo* (4.1.72-73). Horos' reference to a distaff reminds the audience of epic poetry as weaving has often been a metaphor for composing epic.¹⁷ His suggestion that Apollo has turned away and will not support the project indicates that Propertius' request for a good omen in lines 67 and 68 has been rejected.¹⁸ Likewise, the reference to Apollo reminds the audience of the emperor Augustus who associated himself with Apollo and built a temple to him next to the *princeps*' house on the Palatine hill. Horos could be suggesting that the emperor is opposed to Propertius' project as well if the poet should endorse a history of Rome that differs from that of the *princeps*. In this way the astrologer attempts to dissuade the poet from these more grandiose themes and induce him to write typical elegies. Horos knows that Roman history is full of tears and will require a gravity which an elegist does not possess. For this reason Horos speaks mainly of women during his speech because women and feminine topics best fit elegy in its purest form.

Horos attempts to persuade Propertius of his ability as an astrologer so as to persuade him to abandon his poetic program. If Propertius trusts him, he will heed Horos' advice about the poet's current project. Horos showcases his astrological skills by relating two stories of prophecies he gave to two Roman women. Of course, both of the prophecies were accurate. In the first story, Horos foretold that Arria's sons would not come home if they went on campaigns abroad (4.1.89-91). Indeed, both young men meet tragedy on their campaigns as Lupercus is crushed by his horse (4.1.93-94) and Gallus covers the standard with his own blood while trying

¹⁷ Cf. Pantelia (2002) for a discussion of Helen's weaving in the *Iliad* as a parallel to the bard's task of singing.

¹⁸ Tara Welch (2005) 32.

to protect it (4.1.95-96). These are the sorts of brutal tales required for the poet wishing to write a history of Rome.¹⁹ Horos is illustrating the sort of material Propertius has suggested for his fourth book of elegies in the first half of the poem. Perhaps, these are the tears to which Horos had indicated at the outset of his soliloquy.

The name Gallus is a curious choice since Cornelius Gallus, a friend of Augustus, elegiac poet, and prefect of Egypt had been forced to kill himself in 26 B.C. after making some less than flattering comments about the emperor.²⁰ Horos has chosen this name to recall the tragedy that befalls those who try to meddle in politics. Gallus would have been better served according to Horos if he had stuck to his elegies and kept out of politics. It is the same message the astrologer wishes to convey to Propertius. For this reason he later states that Apollo forbids the poet from engaging in political debates in the forum, *tum tibi pauca suo de carmine dictat Apollo et vetat insano verba tonare foro* (4.1.134-135). Horos' prohibition reminds the reader of Callimachus' description of his own poetry, *βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμόν, [ἀλλὰ] Διός* (Fr. 1.20). The warning to Propertius is clear in light of the reference to Gallus. The poet must avoid political topics and return to his elegies. Horos' catalogue of female characters in the second half of 4.1 mirrors the list of men mentioned by Propertius in the first half.²¹ Horos has balanced the grandiose epic theme of the first half with a feminized, elegiac second half. These two halves comprise the two different projects of Propertius in his fourth book. Poems 4.2, 4.4, 4.6, 4.9, and 4.10 stay true to Propertius' intentions in the first half of 4.1. In contrast, poems 4.3, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8, and 4.11

¹⁹ 4.10, an *aetion* for the temple to Jupiter Feretrius, seems to revel perhaps ironically in the gory details surrounding the *spolia opimia*.

²⁰ Propertius makes numerous references to Gallus in his first book of elegies including poems 1.5, 1.10, 1.13, 1.20, and 1.21. Ovid mentions Gallus as the first elegiac poet with Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid following after him successively (*Tristia* 4.53-54). Suetonius' *Life of Augustus* (66.1-2) describes the downfall of Augustus' friend Gallus.

²¹ Tara Welch (2005) 30.

correspond to the program recommended by the seer Horos and are reminiscent of the poet's earlier works.

Horos' portrait of his astrology offers a new religious outlet to the Romans. In lines 103 to 106 the astrologer decries other methods available for prophecy namely oracles, haruspicy, augury, and necromancy.²² These other methods, some of which like augury are native to Rome while others like haruspicy and necromancy have come with immigrants to the city namely Etruscans and Persians respectively, will not produce the accurate results that astrology can. Horos is competing with other Roman immigrants for customers, and for this reason he has tried to persuade Propertius of his ability. This extended discussion about various forms of prophecy reminds one of the poet's claim in the first half of 4.1 that the early Romans had no need for importing foreign gods, (4.1.17). Obviously, the appearance of Horos, the astrologer, in the second half further illustrates the great differences between early and Augustan Rome. Roman identity like the city has become complex. In book 4 Propertius will build his own city of Rome with words and not stones. While epic lives in the forum, elegy inhabits other parts of the city.²³

Although in 4.1a Propertius outlined an ambitious project on Roman *Aetia*, Horos, the astrologer in 4.1b, advised him to proceed with caution and not forget that his fate was to set an example for Roman elegists by establishing himself as the pure elegist par excellence, *at tu finge elegos, pellax opus (haec tua castra!)/ scribat ut exemplo cetera turba tuo* (135-136). Horos' advice has important consequences for Latin elegy since he persuades Propertius to maintain his elegiac persona and not completely embrace his plan to cover epic topics in his light Callimachean style. Propertius left this honor to his successor and friend Ovid, who twenty or

²² Richardson (1977) 4.1.103-105.

²³ Tara Welch (2005) 29.

more years later would embark on his *Fasti*, a project whose style and scope would guarantee that its author was the true Roman Callimachus even if he never made the claim.

Propertius follows 4.1 with his first of five etiological poems, (4.2, 4.4, 4.6, 4.9, and 4.10). In this poem a small shrine to the Etruscan Vertumnus appears to address a passer-by so as to explain how the god ended up in Rome. The sign most likely stood in the Velabrum, the marshy area between the Capitoline and Palatine hills that bordered the Forum Boarium.²⁴ The god begins by describing his lineage. Like Propertius and the astrologer Horos, Vertumnus was not originally a Roman. As he explains, he comes from the Tuscan region of Volsini but left his homeland for Rome.²⁵ The god announces that he does not miss his homeland but enjoys standing in a busy area of the city overlooking the Roman Forum and needs no elaborate, ivory temple, *haec me turba iuvat, nec templo laetor eburno:/ Romanum satis est posse videre Forum* (5-6).²⁶ Vertumnus, an immigrant and foreign deity, finds life in Rome no less satisfactory than in Volsinii. Like Propertius he is mindful of his native land but feels a connection and sense of

²⁴ Richardson (1977) 4.2.

²⁵ The Romans most likely called the god out of his temple through the ritual of *evocatio* during one of the wars between Rome and Volsinii. In the rite of *evocatio*, Romans would call a deity out of the city that they intended to besiege and promise the god a more splendid temple in Rome should they prevail. Livy describes the ritual when the Roman dictator Marcus Furius Camillus called the gods out of their shrines in Veii before the Romans attacked the city in 396 B.C.

*ingens profecta multitudo repleuit castra. tum dictator
auspicato egressus cum edixisset ut arma milites caperent,
'tuo ductu' inquit, 'Pythice Apollo, tuoque numine instinctus pergo ad delendam urbem Ueios, tibi hinc decimam
partem praedae uoueo. te simul, Iuno regina, quae nunc
Ueios colis, precor, ut nos uictores in nostram tuamque mox
futuram urbem sequare, ubi te dignum amplitudine tua
templum accipiat'. haec precatus, superante multitudine
ab omnibus locis urbem adgreditur, quo minor ab cuniculo
ingruentis periculi sensus esset. Ueientes ignari se iam
a suis uatibus, iam ab externis oraculis proditos, iam in
partem praedae suae uocatos deos, alios uotis ex urbe sua
euocatos hostium templa nouasque sedes spectare,*

Ab Urbe Condita 5.21.1-5

Cf. Richardson (1977) 4.2.3-4

²⁶ Richardson (1977) 4.2.5, although several temples had ivory, the most famous example in the city was the ivory doors on Augustus' temple of Palatine Apollo.

duty to his new home in Rome. Vertumnus is one in a list of foreigners who appear in book 4 and reveal how they have profoundly affected social and political life at Rome. This sentiment common to immigrants to Rome at this time shows the duality of Roman citizenship: while the person never lost his own identity, he inherited a new one through his enfranchisement at Rome.

As Vertumnus continues to explain his name, he touches on the theme of cross-dressing, a reference to the status of the elegiac man in Rome. In the etymology of his name, Vertumnus says that one can dress him in any costume and he will look good whether he wears the Coian silk of a courtesan or the toga of a Roman man.

*opportuna meast cunctis natura figuris:
in quamcumque voles verte, decorus ero.
indue me Cois, fiam non dura puella:
meque virum sumpta quis neget esse toga?*
21-24

In 4.9 Propertius' thirsty Hercules attempts to enter the sanctuary of the Bona Dea whose rites were restricted to women. When speaking to the priestess, he announces that he once served as a female slave and worked the loom in a woman's *palla*, *idem ego Sidonia feci servilia palla/ officia et Lydo pensa diurna colo* (47-48). Likewise, Ovid revisits the cross-dressing theme in his *Fasti*, (2.305ff). Cross-dressing in elegy represents the effeminate stereotype at Rome towards elegists. The masculine epic ideal called for men to commit their lives to service to the state through warfare and politics.²⁷

Propertius uses Vertumnus, the god of many forms, to showcase the flexibility of his own elegiac verse. When Vertumnus instructs the reader to believe what the god says about himself, he is speaking as Propertius' mouthpiece for the poet's vision of the cosmopolitan world of

²⁷ Propertius and Ovid had chosen to retain their status as knights but forgo the *cursus honorum*. Propertius and the young Ovid devoted their time to composing erotic poetry. To the Roman perception, their decision made them effeminate dandies at best, at worst worthless cowards. It is for this reason that both men continually call their vocation a *servitium*.

Augustan Rome, *de se narranti tu modo crede deo* (20). Vertumnus can wear the attire of a woman (23), politician (24), farmer (25), soldier (27), orator (29), reveler (30), Bacchus (31), Apollo (32), hunter (33), fowler (34), charioteer (35), acrobat (36), fisherman (37), peddler (38), shepherd (39), and a gardener (40). Propertius' fourth book of elegies will capture the vast diversity that is Augustan Rome through a sort of cubist approach offering views from many angles. Through his portraits of these men and women, Propertius will verbally create Rome for his reader. The catalogue of Roman occupations creates a feast for the senses as the reader can not only see Rome but practically feel the fresh cut grass (*gramina secta*), taste the food sold by the peddler (*institor*), hear the crashes of the charioteers' chariots (*aurigae*), and smell the fisherman's catch (*calamo*).

*opportuna meast cunctis natura figuris
in quamcumque voles verte, decorus ero.
indue me Cois, fiam non dura puella:
meque virum sumpta quis neget esse toga?
da falcem et torto frontem mihi comprime faeno:
iurabis nostra gramina secta manu.
arma tuli quondam et, memini, laudabar in illis:
corbis in imposito pondere messor eram.
sobrius ad lites: at cumst imposta corona,
clamabis capiti vina subisse meo.
cinge caput mitra, speciem furabor Iacchi;
furabor Phoebi, si modo plectra dabis.
est etiam aurigae species cum verbere et eius
traicit alterno qui leve corpus equo.
cassibus impositis venor: sed harundine sumpta
fautor plumoso sum deus aucupio.
sub petaso pisces calamo praedabor, et ibo
mundus demissis institor in tunicis.
pastor me ad baculum possum curvare vel idem
sirpiculis medio pulvere ferre rosam.*
21-40

Rome is many things to many people, and Propertius refuses to narrow his vision of the city to any one person or characteristic. He allows the city to literally speak for itself as the shrine to

Vertumnus gives the reader a little tour of his neighborhood, *Vicus Tuscus*. All the poems in book 4 will give the reader a glimpse at a particular section of Roman life. These people and places will tell their own stories.

Propertius 4.4 appears as the next etiological poem in book 4.²⁸ The poem brings together two different poetic forms, the *aetion* and the love elegy and for this reason is the best individual example of Propertius' genre-bending in book 4.²⁹ The narrator proposes to explain the origin of the Tarpeian Rock on the Capitoline hill, *Tarpeium scelus et Tarpeiae turpe sepulcrum/ fabor et antiqui limina capta Iovis* (1-2). As in 4.1a Propertius once more contrasts the untouched forests of primitive Rome with the splendor of the poet's own city. Then, Rome, the current capital of the world, could scarcely defend its own stone-constructed walls from the neighboring Curites.

*atque ubi nunc terris dicuntur iura subactis,
stabant Romano pila Sabina Foro.
murus erant montes; ubi nunc est Curia saepta,
bellicus ex illo fonte bibebat equus,*
11-14

Propertius now turns to the protagonist of 4.4, Tarpeia. She is the first female character to appear in these etiological poems and like the men will give the reader her own perspective on Roman life. Upon seeing the handsome king of the Curites Titus Tatius, the young woman loses her senses and drops her water jar, (19-22). Propertius puts the actual love elegy of this poem in

²⁸ While Propertius 4.3, presented as a letter from a wife to her husband on campaign, contributes to the poet's development of Roman identity in book 4, I have decided not to address these non-etiological poems since they play a smaller role in influencing Ovid's *Fasti*. In fact, Propertius 4.3 and 4.11 more closely resemble Ovid's *Heroides* than his *Fasti*. Although Ovid claimed to have developed a new genre with his *Heroides*, one cannot help but think he owed some debt to Propertius 4.3.

Vel tibi composita cantetur Epistola voce:

Ignotum hoc aliis ille novavit opus.'

Ars Amatoria 3.345-346

Elegies 4.5, 4.7, and 4.8 resemble pieces found in the first three books of Propertius.

²⁹ Richardson (1977) 4.4.

the mouth of his heroine. Tarpeia's song acknowledges that her name will dishonor the reputation of all Roman girls, *quantum ego sum Ausoniis crimen factura puellis,/ improba virgineo lecta ministra foco* (43-44). Roman custom demanded that Roman women set a virtuous example for their sons and daughters by rearing strong children and running a successful household. Tarpeia as a traitress will bring infinite dishonor on future Roman women. Her treachery would have greater infamy because as a Vestal virgin she would be dishonoring the goddess as well through an illicit affair with a known Roman enemy. Tarpeia's love for Tatius leads her to treasonous talk as she wishes Tatius wore the royal purple of the Roman king rather than the harsh nursling of the she-wolf Romulus, *te toga picta decet, non quem sine matris honore/ nutrit inhumanae dura papilla lupae* (53-54). In this couplet Tarpeia extols Tatius and considers him worthy of Roman kingship in the hexameter line while with the pentameter she condemns Romulus for the very trait that made him so acceptable to his young followers, his harsh upbringing and warlike nature.³⁰ As a Roman woman and elegiac speaker, Tarpeia finds Romulus' epic ferocity unbearable. Like the author Propertius, Tarpeia would prefer to spend her time in the embrace of her lover seeking the delights of love. To her Romulus' savagery makes him unworthy of kingly honor while Tatius' elegiac beauty and elegance mark him as deserving of royalty. Tarpeia imagines marrying Tatius and as a Sabine queen rearing his children. Her address to him recognizes the distance between him and her as she calls him a foreigner (*hospes* 55). This distance does not in any way overcome her passion for the man. So powerful is love that it has clouded her judgment and turned a Vestal virgin into a traitress.

While Propertius and Livy both describe Tarpeia's death at the hands of the Sabines, Propertius assigns her motive to love and not greed so as to elegize an otherwise epic story.

³⁰ Richardson (1977) 4.4.53 points out that the early kings of Rome and triumphators in classical Rome wore the *toga picta* because of its associations with Jupiter Capitolinus.

Propertius emphasizes Tarpeia's detachment from reality as soon as she ends her elegy and the narrator returns. While her elegy contained grand illusions about marrying an enemy chieftain, the narrator returns to reality by discussing the anger Vesta felt towards her disloyal priestess. Rather than strike her down, Vesta strengthens Tarpeia's dangerous love for Tatius turning her into a crazed Bacchant, (69-72). The girl would destroy herself as Propertius' audience already knew.

*accepti obrutam armis necauere, seu ut ui capta potius arx uideretur seu prodendi
exempli causa ne quid usquam fidum proditori esset. additur fabula, quod uolgo Sabini
aureas armillas magni ponderis brachio laeuo gemmatosque magna specie anulos
habuerint, pepigisse eam quod in sinistris manibus haberent; eo scuta illi pro aureis
donis congesta.*

Ab Urbe Condita 1.11.7-9

While Livy blames greed for the girl's treason, Propertius changes the story by making love the cause of her downfall. Our elegiac poet has elegized an epic tale about early Rome and made it more acceptable to his elegiac vision of the city. In Propertius' mind only love could drive someone to make as reckless a choice as Tarpeia did when she betrayed the city. Love and not gold tempted the woman to debase herself and her city.

With 4.6 Propertius gives his long awaited panegyric to Augustus' victory at Actium. He had previously composed a poem on the temple of Palatine Apollo (2.31) but mentioned nothing about the battle of Actium. In 4.6 the poet had finally found a way to reconcile his elegiac couplets with an epic theme. In his attempt he follows the efforts of Vergil and Horace, who had composed their own poems on the battle.³¹ Propertius opens the poem by calling his audience to a sacrifice and requesting a good omen for the rites. Just like Tibullus in 2.5, the poet has set his panegyric in a religious context at the actual temple on the Palatine. Vergil and Tibullus had already linked the god with Octavian's victory at Actium (*Aeneid* 7.704-70, 2.5.6-10).

³¹ For Vergil's account of the battle of Actium see *Aeneid* 8.671-713 and for Horace's account see *Ode* 1.37.

Propertius makes his model for this elegy clear as he intends to rival Philetas of Cos and the Cyrenaen Callimachus, *cera Philiteis certet Romana corymbis/, et Cyrenaeas urna ministret aquas.* (3-4).³² Propertius hopes to produce a Bacchic poem (*corymbis*) in the style of Philetas. The reader may recall that in 4.1a Propertius had chosen to compete for Bacchus' ivy rather than the shaggy, epic crown of Ennius.³³

*Ennius hirsuta cingat sua dicta corona:
mi folia ex hedera porrige, Bacche, tua,
ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Umbria libris,
Umbria Romani patria Callimachi!*
61-64

Propertius, while claiming to seek epic praise through the epic Muse Calliope, is in fact creating a new genre-bending style of elegy that he calls Bacchic poetry and resembles the elegies of Callimachus and Philetas. While he insists he is writing a Bacchic poem in the style of the Hellenistic poet, Propertius calls on Calliope, the Muse of epic poetry, *Musa, Palatini referemus Apollinis aedem:/ res est, Calliope, digna favore tuo* (11-12).³⁴ This poem will approach the topics he had refused for so long with his earlier *recusationes*. As he closes his invocation, Propertius like Tibullus 2.5 compares himself to a seer (*vati*) as he prepares to construct his historical poem, (10). Propertius unlike Tibullus has no problem mentioning the emperor in his panegyric since he is hymning Augustus himself and not Messalla Corvinus, *Caesaris in nomen ducuntur carmina: Caesar/ dum canitur, quaeso, Iuppiter, ipse vaces* (13-14). The thirteen years since the battle of Actium have softened Propertius' *recusationes*. While the audience sees

³² I agree with Richardson's reading (1977) 4.6.3 because it preserves the alliteration of *cera certet corymbis*.

³³ Fox (1996) 146-147 defines the poetry of Bacchus as less grandiose than epic but more serious than elegy.

³⁴ Although Propertius mentions Calliope many times in his four books of poetry and often merely as a stand-in for the whole company of the nine Muses (1.2.28, 2.1.3, 3.2.16, 3.3.38, and 3.3.51), in this instance he clearly intends the reader to view her in her capacity as the Muse of epic poetry since he mentions his epic topic (temple of Apollo Palatinus) in the previous line.

Tibullus 2.5 as a panegyric for Augustan peace, Propertius 4.6 contains genuine praise for the man behind the age, Augustus. Callimachus expresses praise to his patron Ptolemy in the *Hymn to Zeus* (85-90), which shows Propertius a way to coordinate his elegiacs with a panegyric.³⁵

Like his predecessors Vergil and Horace, Propertius draws up the battle as a contest between the luxurious and effeminate easterners and the honorable and brave descendants of Romulus and accepts the imperial memory of this battle.

*altera classis erat Teucro damnata Quirino,
pilaque femineae turpiter apta manu:
hinc Augusta ratis plenis Iovis omine velis,
signaque iam patriae vincere docta suae.*
21-24

Propertius here accepts the emperor's propaganda that Romulus traced his lineage back through the Trojan Aeneas, (*Teucro Quirino*). The Julian clan had claimed an association with Aeneas since at least the dictatorship of Julius Caesar.³⁶ While Propertius' fourth book seeks to create his own Rome, he does not dispute the emperor's dynastic claim. The poet supports Augustus' pedigree and suggests that his royal lineage made him fated to overcome these eastern hordes and become sole ruler of Rome, *altera classis erat Teucro damnata Quirino,/ pilaque femineae turpiter apta manu*.

Propertius, like Vergil and Horace, makes Apollo the impetus for Augustus' Actian victory, yet unlike his predecessors his Apollo addresses the young Caesar and predicts his victory before the battle. Propertius specifies which incarnation of Apollo aided Augustus calling to mind the horrific image of the plague-bringing Apollo from *Iliad* 1.

³⁵ Miller (2009) 226-228 explains that Propertius 4.6 follows the model of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*.

³⁶ Zanker (1988) 35, figure 27a. shows a denarius minted by Julius Caesar in 46 B.C. depicting Aeneas carrying his father Anchises and the *palladium* out of burning Troy. Figure 27 b. shows a denarius minted by L. Regulus in 42 B.C. that also depicts Aeneas carrying his father, who in this image is holding the *palladium*. Augustus succeeded in connecting Aeneas with all the Alban Kings and Romulus creating the belief that he and his family had been destined to rule Rome since the earliest origins of the city.

*non ille attulerat crines in colla solutos
aut testudineae carmen inerme lyrae,
sed quali aspexit Pelopeum Agamemnona vultu,
egessitque avidis Dorica castra rogis,*
31-35

He takes pains so the audience knows that it is Apollo the epic destroyer and not Apollo the elegiac musician who aided Augustus. The audience would recall that in Tibullus 2.5 the poet called on Apollo the musician, who had hymned Zeus after his victory over the Titans, *qualem te memorant Saturno rege fugato/ Victori laudes concinuisse Iovi* (9-10). Tibullus fearing a resurface of strife invokes the peaceful god of poetry and not the god who wreaked havoc on the Greek camp. Writing several years later, Propertius had enough distance from the civil wars that he could confidently laud Augustus for truly ending the civil wars and ushering in a period of peace unseen in recent Roman history. Tibullus' panegyric shrinks in fear from reminiscing about the civil wars while Propertius embraces these details as the last violent events before a new age.

If Propertius had not yet convinced his audience that this panegyric to Augustus was genuine, Apollo's address to Augustus, which divinely confirms Octavian's destiny to rule Rome, makes it clear that this elegy seeks to honor the victor of Actium. Apollo's whole speech seeks to validate aspects of Augustan propaganda such as his descent from Aeneas and Romulus, *o Longa mundi servator ab Alba, Auguste* (37), his supremacy over other great heroes, *Hectoreis cognite maior avis* (38), and that his divine right to rule had been destined since the first founding of Rome under Romulus, *quam nisi defendes, murorum Romulus augur/ ire Palatinas non bene vidit aves* (43-44). Apollo conspicuously addresses the future emperor as Augustus though he would not take that title until the first settlement in 27 B.C.³⁷ The fact that Propertius'

³⁷ Syme (1939) 313.

Apollo speaks with prescience about future affairs fits nicely with the god's prophetic role, but clearly it is Propertius and not Apollo supporting the dynastic agenda of Augustus. At the conclusion of the poem, Propertius is drinking the night away and waiting for Apollo to bring back the sun, *sic noctem patera, sic ducam carmine, donec/ iniciat radios in mea vina dies* (85-86). Augustus' power at the time extended to the very movements of celestial bodies.³⁸ The Augustan peace allowed Propertius like Tibullus the freedom to write his elegies and stand aloof from politics with few repercussions. Propertius 4.6 then stands as a true panegyric for Augustus and the secure age of peace his victory at Actium secured for all.

Propertius 4.9 gives an etiology for the Ara Maxima and the Forum Boarium through a narrative about Hercules's visit to Rome. According to the legend, after he slayed Geryon and took his cattle, Hercules stopped at Rome on his return to Greece. Vergil presents this in *Aeneid* 8 when Aeneas meets Evander at Pallanteum, a small Arcadian settlement on the site of future Rome (184-305). Upon his arrival the Arcadians are celebrating a festival to Hercules. Evander tells Aeneas how Hercules passed through Latium and decided to water his cattle and rest in Rome. He then comes in contact with the cattle thief and monster Cacus, who had troubled the Arcadians for some time. Hercules kills Cacus to the delight of the Arcadians and celebrates with a meal in Evander's home. For his service the Arcadians built him an altar and observe a festival. Propertius 4.9's *aetion* confirms archaeological evidence that the cult of Hercules was one of the oldest foreign cults in Rome and was concentrated in the area around the commercial center called the Forum Boarium.³⁹ Hercules, a foreigner, makes a stop in Rome and joins the Roman

³⁸ The statement recalls the quote of Cicero preserved in Plutarch that accused Caesar of seeking the unnatural power to control time, *Κικέρων γοῦν ὁ ῥήτωρ ὡς εἶκε, φήσαντός τινος αὐριον ἐπιτελεῖν Λύραν, "ναὶ" εἶπεν, "ἐκ διατάγματος", ὡς καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς ἀνάγκην τῶν ἀνθρώπων δεχομένων (Life of Caesar 59.6).*

³⁹ Cornell (1995) 68-73 suggests that the myths surrounding Evander came about to explain the similarity of the *Lupercalia* and the rites of the Arcadian god Zeus Lykaios. Likewise, while archaeological evidence says nothing about a hero like Hercules, it does confirm that from an early period Greek merchants brought their religious cults

pantheon. The story explains the syncretism of foreign cults brought by merchants at Rome. Like Tatius and even Romulus, the foreign Hercules played a critical role in the city's development. In this way Propertius' poem gives this etiological answer to a more complicated socio-economic occurrence, the integration of foreign businessmen into the Roman economy. If the asylum at Rome attributed to Romulus has any historical accuracy, it seems to be that Rome had a relatively open policy on immigration when compared with its neighbors.⁴⁰ Propertius' concentration on the Forum Boarium, historically associated with trade and foreign cults, emphasizes the immigrant contribution to Roman history just as he did in 4.1, 4.2, and 4.4 when he presented portraits of other foreigners who came to Rome like Evander, Aeneas, Horos, Vertumnus, Tatius, and even our Umbrian poet.

At the beginning of 4.9, the narrator places the audience in the Velabrum between the Forum Romanum and the Forum Boarium, *qua Velabra suo stagnabant flumine quaque/ nauta per urbanas velificabat aquas* (5-6). In his attempt at patriotic poetry, Tibullus also mentions the watery Velabrum as a navigable waterway in the early city, *At qua Velabri regio patet, ire solebat/ exiguus pulsa per vada linter aqua* (2.5.33-34). Both Propertius and Tibullus refer to this ancient waterway to contrast the swampy nature of this early Velabrum with the area's current status as one of the busiest areas in the city lying as it does between the Forum Romanum and the Tiber River. The Velabrum now connects the political center of the Roman world with

with them upon arriving at the port in the Forum Boarium. Another theory suggests that Hercules is an assimilation of the Phoenician god Melqart brought to Rome by Phoenician traders. Regardless, archaeological and literary evidence agree that the Forum Boarium was a cosmopolitan area from early on in Rome's history.

⁴⁰ Livy explains that the founders of cities often claimed later that the variegated rabble which had flocked to one's city during early periods of open immigration were actually chthonic people.

deinde ne uana urbis magnitudo esset, adiciendae multitudinis causa uetere consilio condentium urbes, qui obscuram atque humilem con ciendo ad se multitudinem natam e terra sibi prolem ementiebantur, locum qui nunc saeptus escendentibus inter duos lucos est asylum aperit.

1.8.5

the trading district. The reader may recall that the shrine to Vertumnus lies near the Velabrum (*Vicus Tuscus* 4.2.50).

Propertius gives a short account of the confrontation between Hercules and Cacus (7-16).⁴¹ I mentioned before talented story-tellers like the Homeric bards prided themselves on their ability to expand or compress a narrative.⁴² When Hercules arrives, Rome is the grassy, untouched area on the Palatine, *venit ad invictos pecorosa Palatia montes* (3). Although he presents a brief narrative, Propertius depicts Hercules as a cultural hero much like Vergil paints Evander and Aeneas. Hercules like these two heroes introduces Rome to a new and foreign culture. While Evander brought Arcadian rites and Greek religion and Aeneas introduced superior military tactics and his native Trojan religion, Hercules' visit inaugurates a new cult at Rome. These heroes bring a continuous stream of new ideas.

Like the heroes of Vergil's *Aeneid*, Propertius paints Hercules as an epic man of quick action who dispatches of Cacus in a mere three lines of learning the whereabouts of his stolen cattle.

*nec sine teste deo: furem sonuere iuveni,
furis et implacidas diruit ira fores.
Maenalio iacuit pulsus tria tempora ramo
Cacus, et Alcides sic ait: 'ite boves,
13-16*

This brief narrative contains course and violent language. Hercules kicks down (*diruit*) the rough (*implacidas*) doors of Cacus (*furis*) and pummels him to death with his club (*ramo*). Propertius' use of the word branch (*ramo*) reminds the audience of the early date of this event. The men of ancient Rome did not carry manufactured swords like their descendants in the Age of Augustus

⁴¹ Compare with Vergil (8.184-305) and Ovid (*Fasti* 1.543-586).

⁴² Lord (1960).

but rather employed modified tree branches as cudgels. Likewise, they did not adorn their homes with smooth, pre-cut doors but made use of whatever they could find. This narrative's language resembles that of an epic poem, yet Propertius has compressed the story into a few short lines in a playful, Callimachean manner.

Propertius' Hercules seems not merely a parody of Vergilian epic heroes but an amalgam of all the comedic traits of Hercules as presented throughout Greek literature (*Frogs*, *Alcestis*). Unlike Vergil's Hercules who says nothing, Propertius' Hercules speaks three times in this brief 74 line poem (16-20, 33-50, and 67-70) but with far less dignity than the reader would expect of an epic hero.⁴³

*Cacus, et Alcides sic ait: 'ite boves,
Herculis ite boves, nostrae labor ultime clavae,
bis mihi quaesiti, bis mea praeda, boves,
arvaeque mugitu sancite Bovaria longo:
nobile erit Romae pascua vestra Forum.'*
16-20

The verb (*sancite*) suggests that the cows are acting as priests consecrating the area as a new temple precinct.⁴⁴ Hercules' statement anticipates the busy activity of the Forum Boarium in the Age of Augustus (*nobile Romae Forum*). One cannot help but think that this etiology is a parody of the many etiologies presented so quickly in book 8 of Vergil's *Aeneid*. In book 8 Evander gives Aeneas a whirlwind tour of old Rome commenting on the ancient significance of places known for very different reasons in the Augustan age. Hercules further confirms his role as a comic character when he seeks out the hidden grove of the Bona Dea. While the narrator

⁴³ Richardson (1977) 4.9, Debroun (2003) 120 sees this speech by Hercules as comic exaggeration following the violent death of Cacus and sees bucolic overtones because of the repetition of *boves*. Tara Welch (2005) 122 believes that Hercules' words at the door of the sanctuary to the Bona Dea, *verba minora deo* (32), undermine the solemnity of Hercules' visit to Rome.

⁴⁴ Richardson (1977) 4.9.19.

suggests that his thirst is the cause, *dixerat, et sicco torquet sitis ora palato,/ terraque non ullas feta ministrat aquas* (21-22), Hercules' appetite for women was notorious in literature.⁴⁵ Clearly, the laughter of young women and not his need for water draws him to the grove, *sed procul inclusas audit ridere puellas* (23).⁴⁶

Propertius now continues his comic narrative as the hyper-masculine and epic Hercules breaks into the elegiac space of the *Bona Dea* sanctuary. Propertius indicates to his reader that we are entering an elegiac setting with his diction.

*sed procul inclusas audit ridere puellas,
lucus ubi umbroso fecerat orbe nemus,
femineae loca clausa deae fontesque piandos,
impune et nullis sacra resecta viris.
devia puniceae velabant limina vittae,
putris odorato luxerat igne casa,
populus et glaucis ornabat frondibus aedem,
multaque cantantis umbra tegebat aves.*
23-30

First we hear that girls are laughing, *inclusas audit ridere puellas*. Next, the narrator sets the location in a sacred grove (*lucus*) with fountains (*fontes*). The women live in a primitive hut (*putris casa*), and poplar trees (*populus*) shade the goddess' shrine (*aedem*). Naturally, birds flock to this serene location. This *locus amoenus* seems appropriate to an elegiac love scene. Unfortunately for Hercules, men may not enter the shrine or participate in these feminine rites, *impune et nullis sacra resecta viris*. Having set the scene, Propertius returns to his description of the rather boorish Hercules, *huc ruit in siccam congesta pulvere barbam,/ et iacit ante fores verba minora deo* (31-32). Hercules like heroes of old has a beard that at the moment is dry and

⁴⁵ Tara Welch (2005) 124ff sees the lust, slavery to an eastern women, and thirst of Hercules as Antonian qualities given Caesar's lieutenant's known debauchery, drunkenness, and his relationship with Cleopatra, a foreign woman.

⁴⁶ Richardson (1977) 4.9.22 points out that there was no dearth of water in the city since one could drink from the Tiber if necessary. Tara Welch (2005) 128-129 notes that Hercules enters the sanctuary deliberately despite knowing its restrictions against men.

stiff with dirt. His life of activity leaves him little time for proper grooming and makes interactions with women difficult at times despite his sexual appetite. The narrator freely admits that his speech that follows is not appropriate of an epic hero let alone a god. The verb *iacit* indicates a level of carelessness and misunderstanding that he is addressing the softer sex.

Upon addressing the women in the sanctuary, the epic hero Hercules using masculine boasts rather than charming, elegiac speech in his attempt to gain access to the Bona Dea sanctuary finds his female audience unwilling to compromise.

*audistisne aliquem, tergo qui sustulit orbem?
ille ego sum: Alciden terra recepta vocat.
quis facta Herculeae non audit fortia clavae
et numquam ad vastas irrita tela feras,
atque uni Stygias homini luxisse tenebras
<et gemere abstractum Dite vetante canem>?*
37-42

In the speech he brags that he is known the world over for his deeds amongst which he recounts supporting the earth for Atlas, killing huge wild beasts, and stealing Cerberus from Hades. His language, however, contains diction inappropriate for wooing women especially those who shun men. Such women have no use for epic language (*facta fortia, clavae, irrita tela*). Realizing his speech may be intimidating to these women, he switches to an elegiac topic, his service as a young serving girl to Omphale.

*sin aliquem vultusque meus saetaeque leonis
terrent et Libyco sole perusta coma,
idem ego Sidonia feci servilia palla
officia et Lydo pensa diurna colo,
mollis et hirsutum cepit mihi fascia pectus,
et manibus duris apta puella fui.'*
45-50

Again, the reader notices a change in tone as Hercules contrasts his harsh epic appearance (*saetae leonis, hirsutum pectus, manibus duris*) with the language of elegy (*palla, pensa, colo,*

mollis, puella). Just as he changed clothes and served as a female slave to Omphale, he has altered the language of his speech to persuade his female audience.

Unaccustomed to the subtleties of charm, our epic hero fails in his attempt at elegiac persuasion, and the priestess kindly reminds him no men may enter the sanctuary. Hercules now reverts to his true nature and uses epic force to bring down the door, *sic anus: ille umeris postis concussit opacos, / nec tulit iratam ianua clausa sitim* (61-62). His great force conquers the door while his overwhelming thirst will drain the whole river, (*exhausto flumine* 63). Propertius' Hercules chooses to commemorate this victory with a monument rather than his slaughter of Cacus. His four line speech gives the much awaited *aetion* for the Ara Maxima and explains why men alone participate in the cult's rites (67-70).

Propertius 4.10 explains the *aetion* for the Temple of Jupiter Feretrius and its three trophies, the *spolia opima*, *nunc Iovis incipiam causas aperire Feretri / armaque de ducibus trina recepta tribus* (1-2). Propertius' choice for his *aetion* is unusual as no Roman had won the *spolia opima* since Claudius Marcellus in 222 B.C. Marcus Licinius Crassus killed the enemy king of the Bastarnae Deldo in single combat in 29 B.C. but was denied the *spolia opima* because his commission was granted by Octavian. Propertius' elegy is a panegyric to the disciplined virtue of republican Rome that by 29 B.C. would no longer be rewarded with this greatest trophy. Richardson suggests that the poem "limps" to its conclusion with shorter narratives because the poet began to contemplate contemporary events at Rome.⁴⁷ I see 4.10 as a genuine panegyric to Roman discipline that recognizes that the rise of Augustus as *princeps* denies ambitious Romans the highest military honor of the old republic. Thus, the Augustan peace came at a huge price, the loss of the individual honors that motivated the Romans of old.

⁴⁷ Richardson (1977) 4.10.

While I would never use the term anti-Augustan to describe Propertius or any of the poets of the Augustan age given the contemporary conditions of patronage, I cannot help but think the subjects of 4.10 would undermine Augustus' authority in some way. Augustus, whose shadow stands over all the poetry of this period, never mastered the arts of a great commander. He not only fell ill at inopportune times but lacked the militaristic vision of his great uncle.⁴⁸ This celebration of old Roman virtue and the glorification of the winners of the *spolia opima* reveal the weakness of Rome's new *princeps*. While military men like Romulus, Cossus, and Marcellus governed and captured glory in old Rome, under Augustus military distinction is reserved for one man alone who never distinguished himself in any real way during his many years at war. 4.10 stands out as a panegyric to the lost system of individual rewards that invigorated but eventually destroyed the republic.

As Propertius approaches this national monument, he reminds himself that with these etiological elegies he is attempting something never done before in Latin outside of Tibullus 2.5; namely to give epic praise in elegiac couplets, *magnum iter ascendo*, (3). Of course, he is also playing with the topographical setting of the monument since he must ascend the great slope of the Capitoline to arrive at this temple. The chance to attain greater glory that comes with a difficult task motivates Propertius, *sed dat mihi gloria vires:/ non iuvat e facili lecta corona iugo*. The reader may recall that Propertius rejects Ennius' shaggy crown in 4.1 out of a preference for the ivy of Bacchus (61-62). Here he assures the reader he still remembers his programmatic project for the book. The narrator transitions seamlessly from discussions of his own prize (*corona*) to Romulus, the first man to capture the *spolia opima*, through the use of the

⁴⁸ Syme (1939) 204 Although Brutus took Octavian's camp on the first day of the Battle at Philippi, he did not capture Octavian, who was mysteriously moved before the battle. This episode remains a mystery and required apologies from later imperial supporters.

noun *palma* (5), a branch awarded to first place winners in poetic competitions. Just as Tibullus relates himself to the new priest (*sacerdos*, 2.5.1) and the seer (*vates*, 2.5.114), Propertius compares himself as poet to the recipient of the poet's praise. In this new genre, elegies give praise to poet and subject at once whether the subject is a man (Messalinus in Tibullus 2.5) or a monument (Apollo's temple 4.6, and the Temple of Jupiter 4.10). In his project Propertius hopes to glorify both his homelands Rome and Umbria. As his poetry rises, his poems honoring the city gain greater glory for Rome, the city of his new life, and his birthplace Assisi.

*ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Umbria libris,
 Umbria Romani patria Callimachi!
 scandentis quisquis cernit de vallibus arces,
 ingenio muros aestimet ille meo!*
 4.1.63-66

Propertius' description of Romulus, the first victor of the opimian spoils, introduces a dominant subject of 4.10 and an important theme to Roman identity, military discipline and its accompanying gore, *imbuis exemplum primae tu, Romule, palmae huius, et exuvio plenus ab hoste redis* (5-6). Propertius' use of *imbuis* gives Romulus' victory a watery tinge. Soon Romulus will bring back Acron's armor wet with its owner's blood, *non sanguine sicca suo* (12). Propertius' elegy here indulges the reader with themes Tibullus clearly shies away from in his panegyric to Messalinus. The distance from the battle of Actium and prosperity of the early Age of Augustus allows Propertius to give graphic details of violence without fear of alienating his audience. When Tibullus wrote 2.5 around 20 B.C., I suggest the poet found the civil wars too recent to give any images to the violence. Propertius in 16 B.C. after numerous *recusationes* composes not just an *aetion* for Jupiter's temple but a panegyric to an important aspect of Roman life, severe military discipline. The military discipline of the Romans seems to be the most

common trait attributed to them by foreigners.⁴⁹ Horace 3.2, published about 7 years earlier, celebrates the discipline of Rome's armies and promises a share of glory to these soldiers.

Propertius 4.10 follows Horace and Tibullus in offering praise for Rome's military achievements while seeking poetic glory for the poet like bards in the Homeric epics.⁵⁰

As I mentioned before, 4.10 is a panegyric to a way of life that has changed under the principate. Military men can no longer earn the *spolia opima* and will soon lose the right to obtain even triumphs for their victories.⁵¹ Propertius shows the distance between the time when Romulus won his *spolia opima* and his own age by comparing two Romes, *Acron Herculeus Caenina ductor ab arce,/ Roma, tuis quondam finibus horror erat* (9-10). So insignificant was Romulus' Rome that the little town Caenina threatened Roman security. Presumably, this Latin town was rather small and irrelevant in the Augustan age. He paints Romulus as a hardened military commander with tremendous endurance and success because he grew up in poverty and hardship, *Urbis virtutisque parens sic vincere suevit,/ qui tulit a parco frigida castra lare* (17-18).⁵² Propertius' use of *parens urbis* reminds the audience of the city's new father Augustus,

⁴⁹ Plutarch discusses the respect Pyrrus had for the Roman commitment to militaristic discipline.

καὶ κατιδὼν τάξιν τε καὶ φυλακὰς καὶ κόσμον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ σχῆμα τῆς στρατοπεδείας, ἐθαύμασε καὶ τῶν φίλων προσαγορεύσας τὸν ἐγγυτάτω “τάξις μὲν” εἶπεν “ὦ Μεγάκλεις αὐτῆ τῶν βαρβάρων οὐ βάρβαρος, τὸ δ' ἔργον εἰσόμεθα.”

16.7

⁵⁰ In the *Iliad* Achilles acting as a bard sings of the famous deeds of men on Etion's lyre as the Greek embassy approaches his tent, (9.189). Demodocus appears as a blind bard in the *Odyssey* and sings of the quarrel between Achilles and Odysseus (8.62ff).

⁵¹ The emperor Augustus granted triumphs to commanders as he saw fit. Cornelius Balbus was the last non imperial commander to receive a triumph in 19 B.C.

⁵² It is common to speak of a great commander's physical and mental endurance in Latin literature such as Sallust's portrait of Catiline, *corpus patiens inediae algoris vigiliae, supra quam quoiquam credibile est*, (*Bellum Catilinae* 5.4) or Livy's description of Hannibal, *nullo labore aut corpus fatigari aut animus uinci poterat. caloris ac frigoris patientia par; cibi potionisque desiderio naturali, non uoluptate modus finitus; uigiliarum somnique nec die nec nocte discriminata tempora. Ab Urbe Condita* 21.4.6

who would be named *pater patriae* in 2 B.C. and was accustomed to victory but not through a lifetime of military training.

In Propertius' descriptions of the battles, he employs graphic and violent imagery for each death. As I said before, he does not avoid exploring the violence and gore that accompany military glory. He portrays Romulus' victory over Acron as a sacrifice to Jupiter, '*Iuppiter, haec hodie tibi victima corruet Acron. / voverat, et spoliū corruit ille Iovi* (15-16). Sacrifice in the ancient world was a bloody affair, and the audience would rightly associate Acron's death with an excess of gore. Propertius gives a religious significance to the example and brings the reader back to the sight of these trophies and the true subject of the poem, the temple of Jupiter Feretrius. The sacrifices of the soldier in battle secure a literal sacrifice to their god as payment for the glorification and security of the hero.

Turning to the second example, Propertius will use the same graphic language to characterize battle but will again contrast the poverty of old Rome with its present splendor. The poet's second subject, Aulus Cornelius Cossus, killed the enemy Veintine commander Tolumnius around 426 B.C. Propertius stresses the poverty of early Rome when conquering Veii was a task, the farthest Roman outpost was Nomentum, and Rome's empire consisted of three *iugera* from Cora (24-26). Veii on the other hand contained the curule chair.⁵³ The chair denotes royalty in Etruria and suggests the opulence of Veii at this time in the fifth century B.C. In contrast, Veii in Propertius' lifetime was a small farming district whose people occasionally dug up vestiges of the city's past glory in their fields (29-30). In reporting the death of Tolumnius, the poet once more paints a bloody scene that he punctuates with religion, *di Latias iuvere manus, desecta Tolumni/ cervix Romanos sanguine lavit equos* (37-38). Propertius' Cossus is

⁵³ According to Livy Romans adopted the curule chair of the Etruscans for their magistrates. *me haud paenitet eorum sententiae esse quibus et apparitores hoc genus ab Etruscis finitimis, unde sella curulis, unde toga praetexta sumpta est* (1.8.3).

fated by the gods to win this contest, and the severing of Tolumnius' head bathes (*lavit*) the nearby horses with blood. Again Propertius indulges his reader's senses and describes the violence in detail. His panegyric will not obscure the reality of warfare.

In his final narrative, Propertius characterizes the Roman enemy as foreign. In his first two examples, Rome's enemies were neighboring Italian communities. In his third portrait, he must narrate Marcus Claudius Marcellus' victory over the Gallic chieftain Viridomarus who brought his troops across the Rhine and into northern Italy in 222 B.C. By the year 222 B.C., Rome had conquered much of the Italian peninsula and defeated Carthage in the First Punic War. While the city was about to enter a most dire struggle for survival against Hannibal, Rome was a major power in the western Mediterranean. Propertius characterizes this distant threat as foreign unlike the Sabine and Etruscan foes of his first two examples. While Propertius' Rome embraces immigrants, he cannot avoid glorifying Rome in a poem on the temple of Jupiter Feretrius. To early Rome the Sabines and Veientine were foreign, yet in Propertius' Rome these areas were so close as to render such thoughts primitive. The Gauls, on the other hand, were foreign in language and culture. Propertius spends much effort depicting the Gallic chieftain as foreign. He throws the Gallic spear (*gaesum*) from his chariot (*rotis*). The heavy spear of the Gaul and his use of chariot warfare seemed primitive to Romans, who used the lighter *pilum* and fought in a more disciplined style through the use of maniples.⁵⁴ Likewise, Viridomarus wears the Gallic necklace (*torquis*) and pants (*bracas*). The poet's Roman audience would recognize these as foreign especially the *bracae* since the Romans thought of their togas as an essential indication of their identity.

⁵⁴ Scullard (1959) 56 points out that amongst Marius' greatest innovations in warfare were the *pilum* or light throwing javelin and his use of manipular warfare.

By analyzing Tibullus 2.5 and Propertius 4 in the previous two chapters, I have sought to explain how each poet has fashioned his own legendary Rome while establishing the origins of genre-bending in Augustan poetry. I have then examined the consequences of these depictions for Roman identity in the Age of Augustus. The occasional nature of Tibullus 2.5, a panegyric celebrating the induction of his patron's son amongst the priests of Apollo, has different expectations than Propertius' etiological poems in book 4. Nevertheless, both poets create their own versions of early Rome and alter the dialogue on Roman identity.

CHAPTER 4
ELEGIAC LEADERSHIP IN THE FASTI: JANUS, HERCULES, AND THE FABII

This chapter illustrates Ovid's manipulation of the epic-centered form of Roman identity established chiefly by Vergil and Livy in the early years of the Augustan principate. Ovid's manipulation, I argue, results in the creation of a new model for Roman leadership that emphasizes elegiac characteristics such as patience, forethought, and cunning. This discussion requires that I mark certain passages as epic, elegiac, or a combination of the two to show the model's fluctuation within the poem. I evaluate each passage based on diction (epic or elegiac), the nature of the entry (a historical or mythological *aetion* for a monument or festival), and the political consequences of the narrative. In this way Ovid reveals to his audience and Germanicus in particular the advantages of his elegiac model of leadership built on elegiac virtues like patience, forethought, and cunning over epic qualities like strength and haste.

Janus

On his entry for January 1, Ovid interviews the god Janus, to whom Ovid dedicates the *Fasti*'s first month, in an attempt to shed light on the Romans' confusion as to the god's origin and duties.¹ As the first character in the poem, his role is vital to the success of the project, and Ovid, therefore, makes him a reflection of the whole binary nature of elegy and Ovid's elegiac Rome. His dual sided nature reflects the binary tension of the elegiac couplet itself, which contains one line of hexameter and one of pentameter.² Janus and the elegiac couplet are

¹ Green (2004) 89-288 discusses the different conceptions of Janus that ancients had. The god seems to have performed many tasks from the simple duty of a doorkeeper to having complete control of time and beginnings.

² Taylor and Holland (1952) 137-142 argue convincingly that Janus by the time of Augustus had become associated with the city's records, the consular lists, and the calendar itself. This proposal explains why Augustus may have displayed the *Fasti Capitolini* on his arch. They also note that the words *arcus* and *ianus* are often used interchangeably. Likewise, since the consuls enter their office on January 1, Janus' day, his close association to them appears more logical. Syme (1979) 192-193 sees Janus as the "custodian of peace" and notes that while Vergil in his *Aeneid* portrays *Bellum* in chains Horace and Ovid depict *Pax* as the god to be enclosed and protected. Newlands (1995) 6-7 agrees that Janus' dual nature reflects the duality of Ovid's poem since like Janus the poem is both serious and humorous, panegyric and subversive, characteristic of Ovid's earlier elegy yet evocative of his new

representations of Ovid's literary Rome, and Ovid gives the god a markedly elegiac nature showing him as a patient and clever leader for the city. Like the elegiac couplet, Rome has binary diversity as both a city of Mars and Venus, love and war, epic and elegy, gravity and levity, public and private. Ovid's *Fasti* will play with this dynamic as it applies elegy's essential binary scheme to Rome's whole history.³ Thus, Janus, as an elegiac leader, is the first in a long list of characters in the *Fasti* whose sagacity and patience will be shown to have served Rome better than the reckless, warlike, and epic demeanor of its other leaders.⁴

In his conversation with Janus, Ovid alters the temporal boundaries of the universe by linking the Roman Janus with the Greek god Chaos as the poet simultaneously seeks to replace epic leadership's old model with a new elegiac model. It is likely that Ovid's union of Greek and Roman time through the *Fasti* reflects ongoing efforts to justify Augustus' unconstitutional power by reconciling the differences between Greek and Roman conceptions of time. Ovid's mixing and matching of Greek and Roman elements, however, reveals cracks in the foundation of Augustan ideology and its attempts to present Augustan Rome as the logical consequence of

etiological project. Pasco-Pranger (2006) 21-22 suggests that Janus' two-sided nature marks a historical point when many were looking both back to the republican past and forward to the Augustan succession. The nature of an imperial successor forced the populace to recognize the stability of the new imperial system and the remoteness of the city's republican past. For Tacitus' discussion of the anxiety caused by the prospect of succession cf. *Annales* 1.4-1.5. Green (2004) 89-288 observes that Janus as teacher resembles the didactic stance of much of the *Fasti*. Likewise, he believes that Janus' dual nature "anticipates the polyphony of the poem." I would only add that Ovid expresses this polyphony through a series of contrasts. Ovid's binary approach is most appropriate to the elegiac couplet containing as it does one quick and versatile line of hexameter stopped only briefly by a *caesura* followed by a slower pentameter with its strongly expressed *diarsis*. Cf. Halporn (1963)

³ Just as the god Vertumnus in Propertius 4.2 stands as a metaphor for the poet's project in that the god shows the same flexibility and variation as the poet's elegiac verse, Janus the two-faced god represents the binary perspective that is pervasive in Ovid's *Fasti*. Although the *Fasti* follows in the tradition of Propertius 4, Ovid has narrowed Propertius' myriad of voices to a series of dichotomies.

⁴ I use the term character to refer to the gods and mythological, legendary, and historical figures that appear throughout the *Fasti*. While these characters represent markedly different periods and characteristics of Roman history, Ovid allows each to contribute to his discourse on Rome. It is through his multifaceted approach to Roman history and identity that Ovid offers his opposition to the Augustan ideology, which attempted to unify Roman and Greek history so as to present Augustus as the logical and perfect culmination of human history. Book 6 of Vergil's *Aeneid* and the temple of Mars Ultor illustrate the imperial propaganda as the syncretism of Greek and Roman culture.

the struggles for supremacy amongst all the major powers in the Mediterranean throughout history such as Troy, the Greek city-states, and Carthage.⁵

Ovid ponders the lack of a Greek parallel for Janus, *quem tamen esse deum te dicam, Iane biformis/ nam tibi par nullum Graecia numen habet* (89-90).⁶ Like the *Fasti* Janus has no Greek parallel.⁷ Ovid is following in Callimachus and Propertius' footsteps but also creating his own example of etiological elegy through its application to the Roman calendar. Ovid's reflection on Janus conjures up the god, who appears to the poet as he is composing. The conversation between Ovid and Janus recalls Callimachus' discussion with the Muses in the *Aitia*. The poet has couched his etiologies for January in the authoritative words of the oldest Latin deity, who immediately compares himself to the Greek god Chaos, the first deity mentioned temporally in the *Theogony* (116ff) and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (103-104).⁸ Through the comparison to Chaos, Ovid simultaneously links his new poem to the whole history of Greek literature and his own most recent work (*Metamorphoses*) while giving it a distinctly Roman flavor since Janus and the *Fasti* have no Greek parallels.

⁵ Feeney (2007) 160 observes that while Augustus sought to connect Rome's past and present through long stretches of time, Ovid often points out "gaps and fissures" between past and present.

⁶ King (2006) 66-67 suggests that the inconsistencies in Janus' answer to the question of who he is points to an antagonism between the appearance of universal order under the imperial system and the actual incoherence of much of Augustan policy. For a specific discussion of the incoherence of Augustan ideology, see my discussion of the entry on the *Ara Pacis*.

⁷ Bömer (1957) 90 notices that it is a typical posture of the Roman poets to ascribe Greek origins to many things and Ovid is no exception.

⁸ Syme (1978) 34 proposes that Ovid was writing the *Fasti* between 2 B.C. and A.D. 4 before taking a break to write the entirety of the *Metamorphoses* between A.D. 4 and 8. If his supposition is right, we ought to view the works as set pieces on time. Barchiesi (1991) 6-7 notices that *tempora* are important to both poems. Ovid's *Metamorphoses* will directly lead to his *Fasti* where he makes *tempora* the first word in his elegiac calendar. Feeney (2007) 169 follows up on this by noticing that linear and cyclical expressions of time are never completely separated. In my opinion, the epic *Metamorphoses* takes a diachronic approach to all of human history while the elegiac *Fasti* although diachronic in scope concentrates mostly on Roman affairs while incorporating several scenes from Greek mythology where they have influenced Roman time. Unlike Heinze (1919) I do not see any great difference in the narrative technique between his epic and elegiac poems and follow John Miller (2002) 188-189, who believes that Heinze has overstated the differences between the epic and elegiac narrator in Ovid. He purposes that Heinze's comments more properly befit a comparison of narrative in Vergil and Ovid.

Throughout the whole exchange, Ovid presents Janus as an elegiac leader with the demeanor characteristic of a kind and patient teacher. The god's friendly countenance assures the poet that he may ask whatever questions he wishes with no fear, *dixerat: et voltu, si plura requirere vellem/ difficilem mihi se non fore pactus erat* (145-146). Likewise, Ovid uses the language of didactic poetry when describing the knowledge Janus has shared with him, '*multa quidem didici* (229).⁹ In his interview the god recalls his reign over the Roman people, one even more remote than Saturn, as peaceful prior to Justice's flight from earth.¹⁰

*tunc ego regnabam, patiens cum terra deorum
esset, et humanis numina mixta locis.
nondum Iustitiam facinus mortale fugarat
(ultima de superis illa reliquit humum),
247-250*

The adjective *patiens* while applied by the narrator to the earth seems more appropriate to the god himself given his peaceful reign. The god's only weapon at that time was a key, an indication of the safety and peace of the early Romans, *nil mihi cum bello: pacem postesque tuebar/ et', clavem ostendens, 'haec' ait 'arma gero'* (253-254). Janus' description of his peaceful reign recalls for the audience the Greek *topos* of the golden race. During the Age of Augustus, Roman poets use the *topos* of the golden age as a point of departure for discussing the Augustan revolution.¹¹ Would this great cultural movement taking place around them restore

⁹ Miller (1980) 204-214 notices that Ovid incorporates many *personae* which are not entirely didactic into his didactic poem as he plays the role of the *vates* (poetic seer), Callimachean scholar, panegyrist, and witty narrator. For instance, Miller points out that Ovid often turns from the etiology of a ritual to directing the participants in the ritual. Green (2004) 229 sees Janus as a representation of the didactic poet, who is teaching his pupil Ovid.

¹⁰Green (2004) 249-250. Justice is traditionally listed as the last deity to abandon man, (*Eclogue* 4.6, *Georgics* 2.473-474, *Metamorphoses* 1.149-150) and her departure suggests a break in communication between men and the gods.

¹¹ One of the earliest references in Greek to a so called golden age occurs in Hesiod's *Works and Days* when the bard discusses the deterioration of the ages of men who degenerated from a golden race (Χρύσεον γένος) through five metallic stages before arriving at our own present iron age (109-200). Hesiod does identify the golden race with the reign of Kronos but makes it clear that Kronos was still holding sway in heaven and the Titanomachy had not yet occurred, οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ Κρόνου ἦσαν, ὅτ' οὐρανῷ ἐμβασίλευεν (111). The Augustan poets on the other hand associate

Italy to a lost form of idyllic peace or some golden age? While Ovid does not view the Augustan city as a return to some lost utopia, he does prefer the sophistication and progress of his own age to that of the past. He does, however, long for a leader imbued with his elegiac virtues believing such a man more capable of governing the city than the epic warrior.¹²

After answering several questions from Ovid, Janus begins to retell the story of Tarpeia and the Sabine assault on the citadel as an *aetion* for his temple in the forum. The temple commemorates his aid to the Romans when they held off Titus Tatius and the Sabines. By the time of the *Fasti*'s composition, both Livy (1.11.6ff) and Propertius (4.4) had offered their own accounts of Tarpeia's betrayal.¹³ Ovid chooses to treat the story again but from a different

this golden race with the reign of Saturn in Italy that occurred after Jupiter expelled his father from heaven. While Augustus fancied his restoration of Rome as a rebirth, he never explicitly used the term *saeculum aureum*. He did, however, celebrate secular games (*ludi saeculares*) in A.D. 17 and boasted of his impact on Rome's urban revival, *Vrbem neque pro maiestate imperii ornatam et inundationibus incendiisque obnoxiam excoluit adeo, ut iure sit gloriatus marmoream se relinquere, quam latericiam accepisset* (Suetonius 28.3). The Augustan poets in responding to the *princeps*' building program used a Greek literary topos (the golden age) to explain the changes occurring at Rome under the Augustan principate, (*Eclogue* 4, *Carmen Saeculare*, Tibullus 1.3.35-48, Tibullus 2.5.19-38, and *Metamorphoses* 1.89-112).

¹² Brenk (1980) 81-97 shows that Vergil alters the Hesiodic image of a golden race from his first reference to the *aurea gens* (9) in *Eclogue* 4. Vergil's *Aeneid* while focusing on Aeneas relates in fact the impact of the proscriptions and civil wars of the triumviral period on the Italian people. Galinsky (1981) 196-197 suggests that while Ovid sees the problem of avarice in his age, he recognizes that he is living at Rome's height and has no desire to return to the rustic period of Saturn, which itself was not immune to greed (1.193-194). Wallace-Hadrill (1982) 19-22 notices that Hesiod's Golden Age gives way to more and more degenerated states of nature. Vergil's treatment of the Golden Age follows the trials and tribulations of Octavian's rise. *Eclogue* 4 optimistically sees the return of Justice to earth and a revival of the reign of Saturn in 40 B.C. when Antony and Octavian avoided civil war through the pact of Brundisium. By the publication of his *Georgics* in 29 B.C., Octavian has won the civil war, but his death could once again ignite a war. Finally, the *Aeneid* shows Vergil's confidence that the Age of Augustus will indeed be an age of gold. Wallace-Hadrill (1982) 27 suggests that Ovid turns the theme on its head by agreeing that the Age of Augustus is an age of gold, except not for its purity but rather its obsession with greed (*Ars Amatoria* 2.277-278, *Fasti* 1.191ff). Papaioannou (2003) 686-687 sees no references to a golden age in Propertius 4 but suggests that both Tibullus and Propertius believe in a natural decay of civilization.

¹³ Livy's account (1.11.6ff) emphasizes Tarpeia's greed and treachery. His suggestion that the Sabines killed her because of their hatred of traitors reinforces the idea that treachery violates a community's trust in its citizens to such an extent that even the enemies of said state have no regard for traitors. Propertius (4.4) in some way mitigates Tarpeia's blame by attributing her treachery to the irrational force of love. Once Tarpeia falls for Titus Tatius, she willingly trades the safety of her community for a chance at romantic love. I give further treatment to Propertius and Livy's versions in Chapter 3 of this project. Fox (1996) 160-165 sees Propertius 4.3 and 4.4 as a pair to be considered together. Both poems revolve around the elegiac concept of *militia amoris*. In 4.3 Arethusa, the wife of a soldier on campaign, longs for her husband's return and wishes to show her fidelity by joining him at war. She feels she deserves to be reunited with her husband because of her faithfulness. In this way Propertius blends the elements

perspective. He will present the whole tale through the experience of Janus, who as an old Latin god can properly place the account in its historical frame. Livy gives several explanations for Tarpeia's treason while Propertius contends that she helped the Sabines because she was infatuated with their king Titus Tatius. In contrast, Ovid's Janus never names Tarpeia referring to her only as a fickle guard (*levis custos*). The adjective *levis* is common in elegy and recalls the elegiac lover Tarpeia from Propertius 4.4.¹⁴ Ovid will alter the story by putting the narrative in the mouth of Janus, who emphasizes not only his commitment to Rome in her time of danger but his elegiac craftiness. Janus says that Juno offered help to the Sabines by removing the locks from the gate to the citadel. This elegiac god uses his craftiness and forethought, *cum tanto veritus committere numine pugna/ ipse meae movi callidus artis opus* (267-286), to avoid a direct confrontation with Juno.¹⁵ By throwing sulphur in the river and creating fog, he helps the Romans protect their citadel. When confronting a superior deity, Janus has wisely pursued a well-crafted and less risky approach that turns out wholly successful. Ovid's narrative of the

of elegy (*militia amoris*) with the expectations of war (*arma*). In 4.4 Propertius' Tarpeia not only does not reject war in favor of love but wishes to use warfare to acquire her erotic object.

¹⁴ Forms of *levis*, *leve* are found throughout elegy, which is the elegiac complement to epic's *gravis*. The following are just a few of the appearances of the adjective in Roman elegy: Propertius 1.3.33, 1.3.43, 1.9.32, 1.10.18, and 2.1.49; Tibullus 1.1.73, 1.7.44, 2.5.89, 2.5.96; and several hundred instances of the adjective throughout the *corpus Ovidianum*.

¹⁵ While Juno's wrath gives birth to the *Aeneid* (1.1-5), Janus' elegiac tactics avoid dragging Ovid's elegiac poem into the world of full-fledged epic. In book 2 of the *Aeneid*, Venus informs Aeneas that Juno controls the gates of Troy (much like Janus' description of the Sabine attack) and he must leave the city, *hic Iuno Scaeas saeuissima portas/ prima tenet sociumque furens a nauibus agmen/ ferro accincta uocat* (2.612-614). Here in the *Fasti*, Ovid compares the Sabine attack on Rome to the fall of Troy, yet this time the diligence and craftiness of the elegiac god Janus protects Rome from the savage anger of Juno. Feeney (1984) 179-194 indicates that the reconciliation between Jupiter and Juno in the *Aeneid* (12.791-842) is not complete since Vergil wishes to leave the door open for Juno's further resistance to Rome during the Punic Wars, a major part of Ennius' *Annales*. Clearly, Ovid is showing her opposition to Rome in a period (the 8th century B.C.) prior to her complete reconciliation with the city after the Punic Wars. In other words, both Vergil and Ovid are mapping themselves onto the Ennian tradition by presenting the struggle against Carthage as an inevitable consequence of Rome's foundation.

Sabine war emphasizes the elegiac foresight and craftiness of the first elegiac leader to appear in the *Fasti*.

Hercules

In the blurred binary of the *Fasti*, Ovid presents several characters as both elegiac and epic. These characters are the literary representations of the poet's genre-bending poem, a project aimed at composing epic material in elegiac couplets. The cross-dressing Hercules in Ovid's entry for the *Lupercalia* falls into this category.¹⁶ During the entry for the *Carmentalia*, the Ovidian narrator tells the story of Hercules' visit to Rome and his conquest of the monster Cacus. In his second appearance, Hercules is the cross-dressing lover and slave of Omphale (2.305ff).¹⁷ Ovid's juxtaposition in books 1 and 2 of the two Hercules forces his reader to reconcile the grandiose monster slayer with this cross-dressing slave. The tale of Hercules' servitude to Omphale is a classical paradigm of gender reversals. According to the myth, Hercules was forced to serve as a slave to Omphale, the queen of Lydia, for one year as a

¹⁶ The cross-dressing Hercules appeared previously in Propertius 4.9. Therefore, it will be helpful to consider Propertius' treatment of this Hercules when examining how Ovid approaches the Greek hero on February 15. Spencer (2001) 259-260 suggests that Propertius' treatment of Hercules in 4.9 "destabilizes" for the Romans the bridge between past and present and could "undermine" their own current experiences of Augustan Rome. She feels that Propertius 4.9 creates a dissonance between "visual and verbal registers" that creates a literary space in which "definitions and demarcations" are fluid and transitory. DeBrohun (2003) 157-159 notices that characters can alter their identities in Propertius 4 by changing their wardrobes. Thus in Propertius 4.9, Hercules during his conversation with the old priestess transforming himself from epic hero to *exclusus amator* to female slave momentarily takes on the role of the poet himself, who given his *servitium amoris* feels inclined to redefine his own place in Roman society by creating a suitable identity. I believe that both Propertius and Ovid make use of the cross-dressing Hercules as an intersection between the epic and elegiac worlds. He is not only the most renowned Greek hero but has also suffered a form of *servitium* at the hands of a woman. Through the manipulation of this Hercules, both Propertius and Ovid illustrate the importance of both *arma* and *amor* to Roman identity while giving cover to themselves for the preference of elegy over epic.

¹⁷ Hercules, one of many contributors to early Rome, makes several appearances in the poem. In two entries Ovid retreats his victory over Cacus (1.543-586, 5.603-662). Ovid's Hercules famously cross-dresses in the present passage (2.305-364) but also shows up in the last entry for the poem in the temple of Hercules of the Muses (6.797-812). Galinsky (1972) 126-132 sees Hercules as an early founder figure that predates Aeneas. He sees a consistent effort on the part of Vergil's *Aeneid* to make Aeneas as integral to the development of Rome and Italy as Hercules was to Greece. For instance, Vergil consistently uses the term *labor*, a term synonymous with Hercules, to describe Aeneas' task in establishing the Italian race, cf. the programmatic statement at 1.10

punishment for killing a certain Iphitus.¹⁸ Thus, Hercules the most epic and masculine of heroes falls victim not only to love but real slavery. The details of this myth mimic the mask of the elegiac poet who often speaks of his *servitium amoris* to a *dura domina*.¹⁹ In this way Ovid's dual representation of Hercules corresponds to the binary nature of not just elegy but Rome itself, simultaneously a city of war and love.

When Ovid begins his entry for the *Lupercalia*, he seeks to explain the *aetion* for the celebration. He asserts that Evander brought it to Italy as a way to honor Lycaen Pan of Arcadia now the Roman god Faunus (2.269ff). He next considers why the spectacle involves nudity since naked runners strike women with a strap to promote fertility (303-304). He gives two reasons, the first Greek and the second Roman. In Ovid's first explanation, he tells the story of Faunus' attempted rape of Omphale. An historic assessment of this story may help place Ovid's narrative in the appropriate light. The most infamous historical occurrence of the *Lupercalia* took place in February of 44 B.C. just a month before the assassination of the *dictator perpetuus* Julius Caesar. During the ceremony Antony acted as one of the nude runners and later offered Caesar a diadem, which the dictator refused three times in accordance with the reaction of the crowd.²⁰ Given Antony's association with Hercules, it is not out of the question that many readers would connect this scene with Antony's famous performance at the *Lupercalia*. When one considers that Augustus had decided to abolish and later revive the *Lupercalia*, the political implications of this

¹⁸ Sophocles' *Trachiniae* 69ff, Propertius 3.11.17-20, and Propertius 4.9.45-50.

¹⁹ Debroun (2003) 159-160 suggests that Propertius uses the example of Hercules and Omphale to explain his *servitium amoris* to his mistress at 3.11.17-20. If a woman could enslave the greatest of all heroes, how could Propertius, a mere poet, overcome a similar temptation?

²⁰ In his second Philippic, Cicero narrates the transactions of that infamous *Lupercalia* in which he describes Antony as looking pale and nauseous, *apparet esse commotum; sudat, pallet. Quidlibet, modo ne nauseet, faciat quod in porticu Minucia fecit* (2.84.10). Later in the oration, he mentions Antony's presentation of the diadem (2.86.10-2.87.4).

festival come to light. It is possible that the association of the festival with Julius' dictatorship and eventual death persuaded Augustus to abandon it for a few years before retooling it as an imperial celebration.²¹

In Ovid's Greek cause for nudity at the festival, he gives an account of Faunus' attempted rape of Omphale. In this narrative Faunus spots Omphale as she walks with Hercules and desires her.²² Ovid uses elegiac diction (*incaluit*, *ardor*, *capillis*, and *sinu*) to indicate that the coming scene is one more appropriate to elegy than epic.

*vidit et incaluit, 'montana' que 'numina', dixit
'nil mihi vobiscum est: hic meus ardor erit.'
ibat odoratis umeros perfusa capillis
Maeonis, aurato conspicienda sinu:
307-310*

Just as soon as our narrator begins his elegiac tale, the epic *Herculeae manus* threaten to overwhelm the elegiac story. Connecting this comment with Ovid's treatment of Augustus on February 5, we can see how the self-conscious poet takes great pains to make overly epic characters look out of place in his elegiac poem. He must control these epic men so that they do not topple his meager elegiac couplets.²³ Ovid quickly ensnares the epic characteristics of his

²¹ Suetonius discusses the abolition and revival of certain republican festivals, *nonnulla etiam ex antiquis caerimonis paulatim abolita restituit, ut Salutis augurium, Diale flamonium, sacrum Lupercale, ludos Saeculares et Compitalicios. Lupercalibus uetuit currere inberbes*, (*Augustus* 31.4) A.W.J. Holleman (1973) 260-268 indicates the *princeps* may have altered the ceremony in an attempt to shame unfertile women. I agree with Holleman that Augustus' discomfort resulted from the association of the *Lupercalia* with 44 B.C. and Caesar's attempt to make himself a Hellenistic king. Augustus must have disbanded the festival until he could find a way to repackage it to fit his new imperial model.

²² King (2006) 201 notices that *utrum* and the ambiguity of *hic* versus *hic* causes confusion as to whether Faunus' erotic target is Omphale or Hercules. I would point out that the -i scans long suggesting *hic* rather than *hic*; however, Ovid is being intentionally ambiguous. The build up to the attempted rape of Hercules is meant to highlight the confusing nature of this *iocus antiquus* in which Hercules, the most epic of all heroes, becomes an object of male sexual desire. Faunus' confusion reflects the audience's uncertainty about Ovid's current genre-bending project. Will they step back in horror like Faunus when he thinks he is touching the sleeping Hercules (339-342), or will they embrace it and laugh like the characters who mock Faunus (355-366)?

²³ Galinsky (1972) 128-153 illustrates how Vergil modeled much of his characterization of Aeneas on Hercules as he constantly referred to Aeneas' struggles as *labores*. Galinsky sees the depictions of Hercules in Propertius 4.9 and *Fasti* (2.305ff) as anti-Augustan.

hero with an elegiac and effeminate parasol (*umbracula*), and gives a prelude to the complete elegization or emasculation of Hercules that will soon unfold.²⁴ Throughout the passage, the narrator will struggle to confine this massive epic hero in his small elegiac meter.

Ovid also gives an elegiac backdrop to the sleeping quarters for Hercules and Omphale, which are carved out of living tufa rock and contain a flowing stream, *antra subit tofis laqueata et pumice vivo/ garrulus in primo limine rivus erat* (315-316).²⁵ Ovid's description here is similar to his illustration of the setting for Rhea Silvia's rape in Book 3, but the Ovidian reader knowing that this story is lighthearted (*traditur antiqui fabula plena ioci*) recognizes that the tranquility of this *locus amoenus* will not be shattered by violence. The narrator has already informed the reader that the story has a humorous and not tragic ending. Faunus shall not be successful in his rape.

Upon arriving at their sleeping quarters, Omphale and Hercules participate in a reversal of gender roles. Ovid describes how the Lydian woman dresses the Greek hero in her feminine refinement mixing epic (*instruxit*) and elegiac language (*cultibus*).²⁶ The cross-dressing of Hercules and soon Omphale, who takes up Hercules' club, lion-skin, and quiver (325-326), and

²⁴ *Umbraculum* is found in three other Augustan poems (*Eclogue* 9.42, Tibullus 2.5.97, and *Ars Amatoria* 2.209). In the three elegiac instances, the word implies a "parasol" or "sunshade" carried by women. Vergil's *Eclogue* 9 uses it in the sense of a naturally shady place under a tree. Cicero (*De Legibus* 3.14.16, *Brutus* 38.1) and Varro (*De Re Rustica* 1.51.2) agree with the Vergilian connotation.

²⁵ Rothwell (1996) 829-854 suggests that Vergil, Tibullus, and Propertius make very different use of the site of primitive Rome. While Tibullus' early Rome (2.5) contains elegiac festivals and sights for lovers, Vergil's Rome in *Aeneid* 8 emphasizes the historical progress of the site from Hercules to Augustus. Rothwell (1996) 834 notes that Propertius has very little use for natural scenes in most of his poems. When he does mention natural sites in book 4, he often paints them as brutal and bleak. His depiction of the Capitoline hill in 4.4 makes Rome a barren place full of hardships that bring no progress. Likewise, the city offers no hope for Tarpeia's love for Tatius. In Ovid's *Fasti* the violence of rape often shatters the beauty of the natural surroundings that are its backdrop. Cf. Rape of Lotis (1.395ff), Rape of Callisto (2.153ff), Rape of Omphale (2.305ff), Rape of Lala (2.583ff.), and the Rape of Rhea Silvia (3.9ff.). Ovid does not set two of his rapes in a natural setting, namely the rape of Lucretia (2.779ff) and the Rape of the Sabines (3.179ff).

²⁶ The Homeric bard of the *Iliad* uses terms of female refinery to describe Hera's preparation for the *hieros gamos* when she seduces Zeus allowing Poseidon to lead the Greeks in a counter attack against the pressing Trojans and drive them back from the ships, (books 13-15). His description is a mock arming scene. cf. Armstrong (1958).

the blending of epic and elegiac diction in the passage mimic the blending of genre in the *Fasti* as the Ovidian narrator attempts to sing of epic topics in elegiac couplets. The Ovidian narrator's task of elegizing his epic material is reflected by Omphale's attempt to effeminize the huge Hercules. Like the narrator's project, Omphale is not wholly successful since the hero's Herculean size breaks through her dainty clothes (320-324).²⁷ In elegy poets often expend great efforts to describe the refinery of their lover, and the Ovidian narrator, like the elegiac speaker, gives a long list of the clothing Omphale puts on Hercules including a girdle (*zonam*), a tunic (*tunicarum*), bracelets (*armillas*), and shoes (*vincla*),²⁸

*dat tenues tunicas Gaetulo murice tinctas,
 dat teretem zonam, qua modo cincta fuit.
 ventre minor zona est; tunicarum vincla relaxat,
 ut posset magnas exseruisse manus.
 fregerat armillas non illa ad brachia factas,
 scindebant magni vincula parva pedes.*
 319-324

Each time Hercules' massive body does epic violence to the elegiac clothing as he loosens (*relaxat*) the clasps of her tunic, breaks (*fregerat*) her bracelets, and splits (*scindebant*) her shoes.

When Omphale and Hercules go to sleep, Faunus makes his approach. The narrator calls Faunus an adulterer (*adulter*) and refers to his boldness (*audet*), a characteristic of epic haste. Faunus seeks to violate the elegiac mistress but will instead confront the epic resistance of Hercules. Faunus' retreat from the seemingly masculine bed (339-340) mimics the behavior of

²⁷ Debrohun (2003) 163 describes the failure of Hercules' plea in Propertius 4.9.37-50 in which he attempts to gain entrance to the Bona Dea sanctuary. When the description of his epic labors fails to placate the priestess, he recalls his service to Omphale when he dressed as a Lydian slave. As Debrohun explains, Hercules fails because he is not a girl. Similarly, despite Ovid's attempt to elegize Hercules, he resists the restraint of the elegiac couplet in the same manner in which his epic body overwhelms the elegiac refinery.

²⁸ Propertius 1.2, *Amores* 1.14, the *Medicamina Faciei Femineae*, and the *Ars Amatoria* 3.133ff all spend numerous lines describing women's refinement. It is not uncommon for the elegist to compare his slender verse to the luxurious refinement of his mistress. Propertius defends his choice of elegy over epic to Maecenas by explaining that his girl and not Calliope or Apollo inspires his poems. He even suggests his whole book could be made of Coan silk, a popular fabric for the elegiac mistress (2.1.1-6).

Ovid's reader, who may dismiss the narrator's attempt to elegize epic material. As Faunus approaches, he comes armed with an epic-sized erection, *et tumidum cornu durius inguen erat* (346) but takes an epic-sized fall from the bed (*alto lecto*) when Hercules resists his force. The laughter directed at Faunus reflects his misplacement since he brought epic violence to an elegiac tale. The environment of the narration is so confusing that Faunus has mistaken the epic hero Hercules for the elegiac mistress Omphale. How better for a narrator to illustrate the confusion of genre in his own verses than to present sexual ambiguity in the poem's characters?

This whole confused tale has implications for Ovid's own life as an elegiac poet. In the binary world of Ovid's time, men inhabited an epic world and the sophisticated female lived in the elegiac landscape of refinement. Throughout Ovid's life his poetry confronts this cultural expectation that views the acquisition of honor through battle and political office as the only redeeming path for an appropriate Roman male. Ovid long ago rejected that convention in favor of the Heliconian Muses. He chose *tuta otia* (*Tristia* 4.10.39-40) over the *fortia arma* of the forum, (4.10.17-18). This decision to cultivate secure peace rather than seek honor and office pervades the whole Ovidian corpus from the first lines of the *Amores* to book 1 of the *Fasti*, since he often feels the need to defend his choice of lifestyle by comparing it to a preference of genre.²⁹

Ovid's *antiquus iocus* will not only elegize the epic hero Hercules but threaten to bugger him as the narrator takes the reader right up to the point of making Hercules a catamite before finally relenting. His choice reflects an interest in controlling epic characters through elegiac diction and in this way illustrating the value of an elegiac perspective. As the reader of the *Fasti*

²⁹ If we accept the opinion of Syme (1978) 24 that verses (1.284-285) refer to Germanicus' triumph, (May 26, A.D. 17) book 1 of the *Fasti* contains the last extant verses of Ovid's life. Therefore, his entire corpus from the *Amores* to the *Fasti* sought to defend his choice of lifestyle and by extension his preference of genre.

knows, Hercules is serving as a slave to a foreign woman. In the ancient world, the free born man saw slavery as a complete loss of dignity and humanity. Obviously, Hercules has lost a great deal of dignity, but he has not endured the ultimate humiliation: the role of catamite. While free born males in Ovid's time did participate in homosexual acts, the citizen was expected culturally to play the part of the active partner. In Athens a citizen could in theory lose his citizenship for playing the passive role. Ovid's *antiquus iocus* will take the reader right up to the line without crossing it. Ovid labels Faunus an adulterer, a much maligned moniker in Augustan morality, and depicts him attempting to dishonor a venerated hero. Ovid, however, will pull back at the last moment before Faunus buggers the most hyper masculine and epic hero of mythology and a son of Jupiter. In the end Ovid does not allow elegy to do sexual violence to its fellow genre, epic.

The Fabii

Ovid's entry for February 13 illustrates the advantage of elegiac leadership by contrasting the destructive epic speed of the Fabii with the successful patience and forethought of their descendant Fabius Maximus Cunctator.³⁰ In composing his entry for February 13, Ovid makes the first of two specific references to the *gens Fabia*, one of the most ancient and noble families in Roman history. On this day in 479 B.C., 306 members of the *gens Fabia* fell during an ambush by the Veintines near the Cremera River. During the high period of the *gens Fabia* (485-479 B.C.), the family held seven consecutive consulships. In his description of the 5th

³⁰ Harries (1991) 153-157 suggests that Ovid's epic treatment is meant to show the recklessness of the epic Fabii. Newlands (1995) 90-91 rightly contributes that, "by adopting an epic theme and style so early in the poem, Ovid flagrantly advertises his intention ... to transgress generic horizons." These transgressions will occur throughout much of the poem. I, too, believe Ovid shows his commitment to expand generic boundaries throughout the poem and especially in book 2 where he treats the conferment of *pater patriae* on Augustus, the fall of the Fabii, the cross-dressing of Hercules, and the rape of Lucretia. Ovid's addition of Fabius Cunctator at the end of this entry emphasizes his preference for the patience and cunningness of this elegiac leader, who is so different from his epic ancestors.

century Fabii, Ovid indicates that this one family controlled the resources and bore the burden of the entire city, *una domus vires et onus suscepit urbis* (2.197). Ovid's contemporary reader would find the Julian family as a convenient allegory for the Fabii since the Julio-Claudian emperors often passed down imperial power as if it were an inheritance.³¹ He asserts, likewise, that any of the Fabii had the capacity to serve as military commander (*dux*), *e quis dux fieri quilibet aptus erat* (2.200).³² Ovid returns to the issue of imperial haste near the conclusion of the poem when he advises Caesar (presumably Augustus) to be mindful of the disaster at Lake Trasimene and to avoid committing rashly to battle if the auspices forbid it (6.763ff).

While Ovid includes ancestors of his friend Quintus Paullus Fabius Maximus in the *Fasti*, the story relates a negative example intended to show the dire consequences of rash, epic behavior when confronted with elegiac forethought and strategy.³³ Ovid emphasizes haste throughout the narrative. The Fabii quickly arrive (*celeri passu*) at the swift flowing Cremera River, *Cremeram rapacem* (2.205). In the first engagement against the Veientes, the virtue and speed of the Fabii overwhelm the enemy (207-212).³⁴ They build a camp and attack the enemy with great force (*valido Marte*). Ovid adds a Homeric simile about Libyan lions to solidify the epic portrait of the family's leadership (209-210). The Veientes find it beneficial to use treachery (*insidias*), a tactic that requires forethought (*parat*) like the actions of the cunning

³¹ Compare what Galba says to his future heir Piso in Tacitus' *Historiae, sub Tiberio et Gaio et Claudio unius familiae quasi hereditas fuimus* (1.16.5).

³² The discussion about the military prowess of each Fabius may remind a contemporary reader of Tiberius' famous *recusatio imperii* (*Annales* 1.13.5) which we have already seen occurred prior to Ovid's composition of the *Carmentalia* (1.531-536). Syme (1978) 28-29.

³³ Ovid addresses two of his *Epistulae ex Ponto* (1.2, 3.3) to a certain Quintus Paullus Fabius Maximus, the suffect consul of 45 B.C. known later as a patron of literature, (Juvenal 7.95). Syme (1978) 135-155 is an entire chapter dedicated to examining the evidence for Quintus Paullus Fabius Maximus. Cf. Harries (1991) 156-162 for Ovid's connection to the Fabii.

³⁴ Harries (1991) 154-157 discusses the epic style and diction of this passage and notes that the speed of the Cremera River matches the swiftness of the Fabian attack.

Janus in book 1 (2.214). On the other side, the Fabii continue with their epic strategy as they fill the valley with their adherents like a flooding river and cut down whatever they see without fear (219-224). The narrator has compared the battle between the clever Veintines and the quick and courageous Fabii to the war of elegy and epic taking place in his verses. At this point the Ovidian narrator feels compelled to directly address the Fabii in epic style.³⁵ He asks why despite their good birth (*generosa, nobilitas*) they are proceeding so rashly, *quo ruitis, generosa domus? male creditis hosti/ simplex nobilitas, perfida tela cave* (225-226).³⁶ The couplet seems to offer a hint; the Fabii while courageous and quick are not particularly sophisticated or clever (*simplicitas*). Even if the actions of the Veintines seem devious (*fraude*) and the tactics of the Fabii fitting of manly courage (*virtus*), the deception of the enemy proves fatal to the epic Fabii. The narrator describes the last stand of the Fabii with a Homeric simile about a dying boar that injures the dogs chasing him (231-232), which illustrates the futility of epic courage in the face of treachery and foresight. The epic Fabii, fittingly described as descendants of Hercules (237-238), left one young Fabius at home from whom descended Fabius Maximus Cunctator, a man revered at

³⁵ Often at emotional junctures epic narrators will address their subject in the second person (apostrophe) turning from objective to subjective narration. Edwards (1987) 37-38 defines apostrophe as a direct address by the singer to one of his characters. He points out that the singer's choice to use apostrophe shows his sympathy for the characters chosen. The bard makes use of apostrophe most often at points of tension involving sympathetic characters. With a few exceptions, only three characters in both Homeric poems receive apostrophes; Patroclus (*Iliad* 16.692-693, 16.787, 16.812-813, and 16.843), Menelaus (*Iliad* 4.127ff, 4.146, 7.104, 13.603, 17.679ff, and 23.600), and Eumaeus (8 times in the *Odyssey* when the bard calls on Eumaeus when reporting the swineherd's direct quotes). The string of apostrophes in *Iliad* 16 builds up to the emotional death of Patroclus that concludes the book. Given the epic nature of this passage, I see no reason to expect Ovid to use apostrophe in a way inconsistent with the Homeric bards. For a further discussion of apostrophe in epic cf. Block (1982) and Bergren (1982).

³⁶ Variations of the phrase *quo ruis* appear throughout Latin literature. There are occurrences in the following works: *Aeneid* 2.520, 4.449, 12.313; Propertius 4.1.71; *Heroides* 13.131, 16.123; *Metamorphoses* 9.429; and the *Thebaid* 8.338. Perhaps the most famous appearance is in book 2 of the *Aeneid* when Hecuba advises Priam not to attempt a foolish attack on Neoptolemus, *ut uidit, 'quae mens tam dira, miserrime coniunx./ impulit his cingi telis? aut quo ruis?' inquit*, (519-520). Farney (2007) 16-17 explains that long enobled families like the Fabii (*generosa*) could expect high commands and public office as a right of birth during the republic. By naming the Fabii, an old and noble *gens*, Ovid has brought to the surface a major issue for the nobility under the principate; namely that the *princeps* now controlled all access to political and military honor. While Augustus did reward members of ancient noble families with consulships and commands, he reserved many of the highest distinctions such as triumphs and the right of tribunician power for his family. cf. Syme (1939) 490-491.

Rome for his cautious and effective strategy against Hannibal. Although his policy of refusing battle and slowly exhausting the Punic supply lines proved effective, his tactics angered many of his contemporary Romans. Just as the elegiac poet must constantly defend his choice of genre and lifestyle, masculine pride and cultural expectations forced Cunctator to justify his seemingly undignified strategy to his political opponents. Thus, Cunctator becomes the historical embodiment of the clever and patient elegist by defeating his more capable epic opponent with strategy. In this chapter I have sought to analyze how in *Fasti* 1 and 2 Ovid manipulates his accounts of Tarpeia's betrayal, Hercules' cross-dressing, and the epic haste of the Fabii in order to show the value of elegiac characteristics like patience, cunning, and forethought have better served Rome's historical development than epic rashness or force.

CHAPTER 5 FROM MORTAL TO GOD: ROMULUS

Given Ovid's programmatic promise in the *Fasti* to sing about the division of times throughout the Latin calendar (1.1-2), his audience would expect multiple appearances by Rome's founder and first king.¹ In this chapter I intend to show Ovid's transformation of Romulus into an elegiac leader although the poet's initial characterization shows Rome's founder struggling as a young man to demonstrate *pietas*. My discussion will examine the precedents for the character of Romulus. Ovid like his republican predecessors gives a complicated presentation of Rome's first king, who stands in for the various leaders who have assumed the task of ruling Rome over the years. Ovid will show Romulus' transition from the hasty, epic warrior of books 1-3 (preface to Book 1, *Lupercalia*, *Quirinalia*,) conspicuous for his *virtus*, into the pious king and loyal brother of the slain Remus in books 4 and 5 (*Parilia* and *Lemuria*). *Pietas*, once a quality associated with epic heroes, will become in Ovid's *Fasti* one of the hallmarks of the elegiac leader.

Romans often used Romulus as a foil for contemporary leaders during the republic.² Ovid and his Roman predecessors reveal a complicated character. Sometimes writers present him as a great warrior king and largely positive figure who earned divinity through his actions on earth.³

¹ While Romulus appears often in Ennius' fragments and the prosaic writings of Cicero and Livy, Ovid mentions him more often in his *Fasti* (19 times) than in any other Augustan Age poem. For this reason Ovid's *Fasti* gives invaluable details about how his audience viewed not only the character of Romulus but the nature of successful leadership at Rome.

² In Sallust's *Historiae* Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, one of the incoming consuls for 78 B.C., calls Sulla a *scaevos Romulus* and his reign a *tyrannidem* (1.55.6-27). The adjective *scaevos* can mean anything from left-handed to ill-omened. In this context Aemilius means something closer to sinister, from *sinister* the other Latin adjective for left. Republican orators then could conjure negative and positive Romuli to fit the necessities of their current situation since his legacy was quite ambiguous. In this instance Romulus represents the just Roman leader and the foil to the cruel and illegitimate Sulla, whom Sallust's Lepidus has painted as a foreigner by using the noun *tyrannidem* to describe his reign rather than *dominatio* which appears several lines later.

³ Ennius (*Annales* 71-91), Cicero (*De Legibus* 1.3 and *De Republica* 2.6-12), and Livy (1.7 and 1.16) emphasize that Romulus' spectacular deeds merited his apotheosis.

Yet in other accounts authors present him as a fratricide and tyrant whom the senators may have torn apart when they could no longer tolerate his autocratic nature.⁴ The initial strife between Romulus and Remus culminating in the death of the latter fits very well into the Roman understanding of the city in the first century B.C. when civil wars took place on and off for 60 years until the battle of Actium. Thus, in the age of Augustus the Roman audience would immediately associate Romulus with their current prince, Augustus. So once again we must keep Augustus in the forefront of our mind as we evaluate the writings of Augustan age writers (Livy, Vergil, Horace, Propertius, and Ovid). I will begin with an analysis of Romulus' characterization prior to Ovid's *Fasti*, particularly in the works of Ennius (*Annales* 1.71-91), Cicero (*De Legibus* 1.3 and *De Republica* 2.6-12), Livy (1.7 and 1.16), Horace (*Ode* 1.12 and *Epistle* 2.1.5), Vergil (*Aeneid* 8.342), and finally Ovid himself (*Metamorphoses* 14.805-828).⁵ I will concentrate on the narratives that concern Rome's founding and Remus' death, and Romulus' apotheosis (events covered in the *Fasti*) in order to evaluate Ovid's treatment of Romulus in five different parts of the *Fasti*: the preface to book 1 (1.27-42), the *Lupercalia* (2.359-474), his apotheosis during the *Quirinalia* (2.475-532), the *Parilia* (4.721-862), and the *Lemuria* (5.419-493). Romulus' varied characterization allows different authors to use him as a foil for any Roman leader at any time. Therefore, a contemporary of Ovid would no doubt think of Rome's current ruler, Augustus, during the Romulean narratives. Ovid's discussion of Romulus' apotheosis makes more sense in the context of Augustus' pending deification.

⁴ Livy (1.16.4) briefly mentions the version in which the senate tears Romulus apart and even suggests a possible reason for it by referencing his 300 bodyguards (*Celeres*) and the tension that existed between the senate and the king (1.15.6). Ovid also mentions this rumor of Romulus' murder (2.497-498) but quickly moves away from it to the speech of Proculus Iulius. Thus, the details of this alternate account must have remained well into Ovid's lifetime.

⁵For my comments on Romulus in Propertius see chapter 1.

Ennius' account of Rome's founding (1.72-91) is the oldest extant treatment of Romulus and the founding of Rome.⁶

*Curantes magna cum cura tum cupientes
Regni dant operam simul auspicio augurioque.
In monte Remus auspicio sedet atque secundam
Solum auem seruat. at Romulus pulcher in alto
Quaerit Auentino, seruat genus altiulantum.
Certabant urbem Romam Remoramne uocarent.
Omnibus cura uiris uter esset induperator.
Expectant ueluti consul quom mittere signum
Vult, omnes auidi spectant ad carceris oras
Quam mox emittat pictos e faucibus currus:
Sic expectabat populus atque ore timebat
Rebus utri magni uictoria sit data regni.
Interea sol albus recessit in infera noctis.
Exin candida se radiis dedit icta foras lux
Et simul ex alto longe pulcerrima praepes
Laeua uolauit auis. simul aureus exoritur sol
Cedunt de caelo ter quattuor corpora sancta
Auium, praepetibus sese pulcrisque locis dant.
Conspicit inde sibi data Romulus esse propritim
Auspicio regni stabilita scamna solumque.*

Ennius' version differs in several key ways from the later literature about Romulus. Ennius places Romulus on the Aventine hill (76) during the augury contest. Likewise, he puts Remus, whom we usually find on the Aventine in Augustan age accounts of the augury, on an unnamed hill (*monte*).⁷ Thus, Ennius' contest does not present the same tension found in later writers, who

⁶ The area around the Aventine was the sight of the secession of the plebs in the fifth century B.C. that ignited a hundred or more year struggle for plebian rights in the city. Wiseman (1995) 107-113 believes the early myth placed Romulus on the Aventine while Remus was on a small mount across from the Aventine, the *Mons Murcius*, named after the goddess Murcia, who had a shrine below in the Circus Maximus where it was necessary to slow down to round the corner. He associates Remus' name with the *remores* or slow birds of augury. Wiseman sees the development of the myth of the twins as a dramatic creation of the fourth century B.C. to explain the conflict between the plebeians and patricians. In support of Wiseman, I see Ennius' reference to the starting gates (*ad carceris oras*) and a chariot (*currus*) as a clear indication that he is placing the two precisely where Wiseman sees them as Romulus occupies the Aventine and Remus an unnamed *mons*.

⁷ Since Ennius' account is the oldest extant account, we cannot accuse him of moving the crime if his successor Livy places Romulus on the Palatine and Remus on the Aventine instead of an unnamed hill that Wiseman (1995) 107ff identifies as the *Mons Murcius* (Livy 1.7.1). We know that during the age of Augustus, the emperor maintained two huts of Romulus, one on the Palatine and one on the Capitoline (Vitruvius 2.1.5). Scholars have explained the presence of the two hills in different ways. Balland (1984) 74 sees the placement of a hut on the Capitoline as an

describe a future king who cheated during the augury contest (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.86.3-4, Plutarch *Rom.* 9.5). While he does mention the anxiety of the observers (*omnibus cura viris, ore timebat*) he downplays its significance by comparing it to the nervousness of the audience before a chariot race (*ad carceris oras*). Their apprehension resembles more closely the excitement of anticipation than real fear. On the appointed day, only Romulus receives the augury and the divine right to rule. Ennius' account does not show a violent struggle between the twins or any disagreement as to whom the augury was revealed. Romulus rightfully won the kingdom because he alone received an augury on the Aventine Hill.

For Cicero the apotheosis of Romulus and his deification are the keys to understanding Romulus as an epic hero, and Ovid will treat the apotheosis in a similar fashion. Cicero, in his *De Legibus* (composed between 54 and 51 B.C.) mentions the apotheosis of Romulus during a hypothetical dialogue between Cicero's friend Atticus, his brother Quintus, and the orator himself. The three discuss the veracity of certain legendary tales about the Roman kings.

{MARCVS} *respondebo tibi equidem, sed non ante quam mihi tu ipse responderis, Attice, certen <non> longe a tuis aedibus inambulans post excessum suum Romulus Proculo Iulio dixerit se deum esse et Quirinum uocari templumque sibi dedicari in eo loco iusserit,*
1.3.5-10

attempt by Augustus to downplay the loss of significance the Capitoline hill underwent because of his building projects (temple of Apollo Palatinus) and renewed emphasis on the Palatine. Edwards (1996) 37 concurs suggesting that the hut on the Capitoline smoothed over the loss of religious functions on the Capitoline. Rea (2007a) 100-105 believes that the Capitoline retained much of its religious significance in the age of Augustus and sees the emperor's decision to place a hut near the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (guarantor of the republican empire) as an attempt to connect Romulus with the political and religious significance of the Capitoline since this hill preserved the memory of Rome's rise from a small town to a world capital. I think that Augustus simultaneously sought to associate himself with Romulus and Jupiter Optimus Maximus through the placement of two huts while at the same time diminishing the significance of both Romulus and Jupiter by putting increased emphasis on Aeneas and Apollo.

While Cicero may not recognize these events as actual facts, he does affirm many details about Romulus' apotheosis later cited by Augustan writers.⁸ He reports that Romulus appeared to Proculus Iulius and told him to establish a cult to Quirinus, the name of the now deified Romulus. Given the fragmentary nature of Ennius' *Annales*, we do not know how he described Romulus' apotheosis. We can conclude, however, that by the later Republic the story of Proculus Iulius and Romulus' deification had become a primary account of the event. Ovid has chosen to concentrate on the same events (founding of Rome/death of Remus and Romulus' apotheosis) that the earlier accounts emphasized, even including similar details such as the reference to Proculus Iulius.

The nature of Romulus' character and how he came to power is also an important concern for Roman prose writers and Romulus appears as a wise ruler, who was elected by a forward-thinking and thoughtful populace, in Cicero's dialectic treatise on the commonwealth (*De Republica*). In this work Cicero, through the mouths of Laelius, Scipio Aemilius Africanus, and many others, discusses the development of the Roman constitution. At the start of book 2, Scipio gives a short history of Rome beginning with its kings and Romulus' founding of the city. In this account Scipio credits Romulus with much sophistication and foresight regarding his plan for the city. In particular Scipio gives Romulus credit for choosing a site near but not on the sea since maritime cities experience an adulteration of culture and are prone to revolution (2.6-7). Therefore, Rome's location on a river that empties into the sea offers a better opportunity for building a city. Likewise, he attributes the creation of the senate to Romulus as well when after the death of Titus Tatius he once more ruled without a colleague. Scipio is definitive in asserting Romulus ruled by the consent and authority of the senate and earned his deification from a

⁸ Fox (1996) 7 Cicero and the other participants do not draw a strong distinction between true and false accounts in the *De Legibus* since the dialogue is not properly an historical work.

sophisticated people in a literate culture, as opposed to a band of primitive fools (2.17).⁹ He likewise confirms the story that the deified Romulus appeared to Proculus Iulius and demanded a temple at Rome and the new title Quirinus (2.20). This is an important point since it proves that the detail about Proculus Iulius, a Julian ancestor, affirming Romulus' divinity appeared in the narrative tradition long before the rise of Augustus and his renewed interest in Rome's Trojan origin.

Cicero's positive presentations of Romulus in the *De Legibus* and *De Republica* are meant to assure his audience that Romulus rightly earned his deification through illustrious deeds and service to the early state. Yet several years later Cicero would find the elevation of the dead dictator Julius Caesar to the status of god incompatible with his understanding of human mortality and Roman religion (*Philippics* 1.13). Here the reader notices that while a Roman noble of the 1st century B.C. may tolerate the idea of a legendary king of Rome's deification he would not endure such sacrilege in his own lifetime. This exception makes it all the more clear that Cicero accepted Romulus' divinity. Cicero argues for the veracity of Romulus' apotheosis on the grounds that the early Romans were not primitive people subject to wild superstition (2.17-18). Therefore, Cicero will not accept the divinity of Caesar on the grounds that his earthly deeds have not earned him such a distinction and not because he doubts the possibility of mortal deification. Such was the portrait of Romulus during the republic. While certain accounts of his death at the hands of the senate existed, we find in the works of Ennius and Cicero the same basic narrative that Livy and his successors use.

⁹ Scipio seems to be thinking of his contemporaries (in the 2nd century B.C.) or of Cicero the author in the 50's B.C. Cicero seems to give a completely different version of the Romans here than his successors in the Augustan age, who often contrast the primitive world of their ancestors to the splendor of Augustan Rome (*Aeneid* 8, Propertius 4.1, *Fasti* 1.85-284).

The transition from Republic to Empire caused Roman writers to consider once more what it meant to be a Roman and how this small city on the Tiber had come to rule the whole of the Mediterranean world. Naturally, this dialogue would include discussions of Rome's foundation. Thus, although Livy begins his *Ab Urbe Condita* with Aeneas' arrival in Italy, chapter 4, which covers the early affairs of Romulus and Remus demonstrates how Romans generally considered Romulus' foundation the true origin of the city.¹⁰

While Livy's accounts of Romulus' life contain much greater detail than the extant republican examples, the historian moves at rapid speed through the regal period taking a mere book to cover what Varro reckons to be around 244 years. Livy professes a desire to reach more recent events that he knows his audience will better enjoy while admitting that trying to trace the history of city over seven hundred years presents a unique challenge.

res est praeterea et immensi operis, ut quae supra septingentesimum annum repetatur et quae ab exiguis profecta initiis eo creuerit ut iam magnitudine laboret sua; et legentium plerisque haud dubito quin primae origines proximaque originibus minus praebitura uoluptatis sint, festinantibus ad haec noua quibus iam pridem praeualentis populi uires se ipsae conficiunt: ego contra hoc quoque laboris praemium petam, ut me a conspectu malorum quae nostra tot per annos uidit aetas, tantisper certe dum prisca [tota] illa mente repeto, auertam, omnis expers curae quae scribentis animum, etsi non flectere a uero, sollicitum tamen efficere posset.

1.pr. 4-5

For this reason book 1 moves at great speed and as a consequence the kings and Rome's early inhabitants appear as heroes with epic and rash tendencies. Despite this Livy paints Romulus and the remaining kings besides Tarquinius Superbus in a mostly positive light. For Livy the precarious nature of the early state requires the hasty, primitive, and even brutal tactics of these men in order to achieve security and the future prosperity of Rome. In other words, Livy sees

¹⁰ It is true that the Greek Evander had a settlement on the site prior to this time, but his city known as Pallanteum has no true connection to the city of Rome named for its founder from Alba Longa.

these primitive characteristics as the marking of *virtus*, the most important Roman virtue for empire building.

While Livy dedicates 13 chapters to Romulus, I wish to narrow the focus to those events later retold by Ovid in his *Fasti*, namely Rome's foundation and the death of Remus (1.7) and Romulus' apotheosis (1.15.6-16). Livy is known in his histories to cite more than one account of certain narratives, and he makes no exception in the story of Rome's foundation and Remus' death. In the first account, Livy explains that the two brothers determine who will be king through an augury of birds. His version of the story offers some ambiguity as to whether Romulus justly attained the Roman kingship or not. Six vultures come to Remus first, but Romulus sees twelve, *priori Remo augurium venisse fertur, sex vultures; iamque nuntiatio augurio cum duplex numerus Romulo se ostendisset, utrumque regem sua multitudo consalutauerat* (Livy 1.7.1). The ambiguous augury leads to a dispute between the two factions as one group claims to have won because Remus saw his birds first while the other faction contends that the greater number that appeared to Romulus should ensure his kingship. The disagreement leads to a struggle in which *someone* kills Remus, *tempore illi praecepto, at hi numero avium regnum trahebant. Inde cum altercatione congressi certamine irarum ad caedem vertuntur; ibi in turba ictus Remus cecidit* (1.7.2-3). Livy does not blame anyone for Remus' death and least of all Romulus. The struggle leads to violence, and Remus dies. Nevertheless, this account creates the possibility that Romulus never rightly earned the crown since Remus saw the birds first. Livy takes no sides when reporting the event and leaves the question in doubt. Here we see the ambiguity of Romulus' story. Although Romulus' character is generally

represented positively in the works of Ennius and Cicero, Rome's legendary founder had a darker side which an orator might make use of in decrying a current "tyrant."¹¹

Livy's second conclusion to the tale features Romulus killing his own brother in anger for violating his law. Here Romulus exhibits rash behavior and appears to be more concerned with *virtus* than *pietas*. He becomes so angry about Remus' jumping of the walls that he kills him immediately, *volgatior fama est ludibrio fratris Remum novos transiluisse muros; inde ab irato Romulo, cum verbis quoque increpitans adiecisset, "Sic deinde, quicumque alius transiliet moenia mea," interfectum* (1.7.4). In this second account, Romulus not only kills the playfully harmless Remus (*ludibrio*), he swears to give the same fate to anyone who tries to breach his walls like an epic hero in the *Aeneid* or the *Iliad* boasting over a dead enemy.¹²

Livy's second account emphasizes Romulus' integrity as he would rather protect his people and keep his word than allow his own brother to live without punishment. For Livy Romulus represents the early Romans' austerity and the value of *virtus* over all other virtues including familial *pietas*. These men made no exceptions in cases of morality, and their honor meant more to them than their own relatives. This account reminds the reader of another early Roman in the *Ab Urbe Condita*, Manlius, who chose to kill his own son rather than make an exception when he disobeyed a military order and won the battle (8.7). Livy and Ovid depict

¹¹ Livy and Ovid reference this alternate account without giving it full treatment. Livy points out that Romulus was much more popular with the soldiers and the commoners than with the senatorial class (1.15.8). In the same passage, Livy says that Romulus kept a bodyguard of 300 men called *Celeres* by his side at all times. While he does not blame one of these men for Remus' death, Ovid will make that case in the *Fasti* (4.836ff and 5.469-474). There is little doubt that Octavian shied away from taking the name Romulus because of the existence of alternative versions where Romulus kills his brother and drives the Senate to assassinate him when that body can no longer tolerate his military dictatorship.

¹² In Homeric poetry heroes often boast over the dying body of their enemies such as Hector when he kills Patroclus (*Iliad* 16.830ff) and Achilles upon fatally wounding Hector (*Iliad* 22.331ff). In the *Aeneid* Pyrrhus gives a similar boast before he dispatches Priam (2.547-550).

these ancient heroes as confronting the same dangers; however, Livy would likely deem the behavior of epic characters in the *Fasti* appropriate for early Romans, who had to contend with so many dangers. Livy's narrative lauds Romulus as a hero for the same reasons Ovid indicts him in the *Fasti*; they glorify *virtus* at the expense of patience, piety, forethought, and cunningness.

I now turn to Livy's depiction of Romulus' apotheosis (1.15.6-1.16). After narrating the chief accomplishments of Rome's first king (1.4-1.15), Livy must confront the various accounts of his death. He precedes the death of Romulus with a brief reflection on the king's life.

haec ferme Romulo regnante domi militiaeque gesta, quorum nihil absonum fidei diuinæ originis diuinitatisque post mortem creditæ fuit, non animus in regno auito recipiendo, non condendæ urbis consilium, non bello ac pace firmandæ. ab illo enim profecto uiribus datis tantum ualuit ut in quadraginta deinde annos tutam pacem haberet. multitudini tamen gratior fuit quam patribus, longe ante alios acceptissimus militum animis; trecentosque armatos ad custodiam corporis quos Celeres appellauit non in bello solum sed etiam in pace habuit.

1.15.6ff

Like Cicero Livy expresses the opinion that his contemporary Romans should not be incredulous about Romulus' divinity since his legacy surely merited this honor given the strength and security he brought to the new city. Livy, however, includes one small detail that may undermine this portrait of Romulus, namely that he enjoyed much greater favor with the military and the commons than the senatorial class. He even mentions Romulus surrounded himself at all times with 300 bodyguards known as the *Celeres*. Perhaps, it was this added trait of a tyrant that brought the senators in conflict with Romulus.¹³ The Senate, however, did not have the same affection for Romulus that the people did. The reader must retain this detail when he confronts the possibility in the next chapter (16) that Romulus was murdered. Livy lauds Romulus for his

¹³ The use of personal bodyguards is often the first step taken by one seeking to turn an oligarchy into a tyranny. Aristotle in his *Athenian Constitution* says that Peisistratus, described as an extreme democrat (a leader popular with the people and not the nobles much like Romulus), faked an attempt on his life in order to persuade the assembly to allow him to maintain a large group of bodyguards. With this force Peisistratus took the acropolis and named himself tyrant of Athens (14.1-2).

achievements while admitting that his popularity did not spread to all Romans and particularly to the most powerful of them, the senators.

In chapter 16 Livy discusses two accounts surrounding the apotheosis of Romulus.

According to the common version, Romulus disappeared while reviewing the army in a portion of the Campus Martius called the Palus Caprae.

his immortalibus editis operibus cum ad exercitum recensendum contionem in campo ad Caprae paludem haberet, subito coorta tempestas cum magno fragore tonitribusque tam denso regem operuit nimbo ut conspectum eius contioni abstulerit; nec deinde in terris Romulus fuit.

1.16.1

Throughout his account Livy insists Romulus ascended into the sky and merited the title of god.

While Livy presents the idea that most people in Romulus's time believed in this apotheosis, he admits a story circulated at the time that the senate in anger had torn the king apart.

fuisse credo tum quoque aliquos qui discerptum regem patrum manibus taciti arguerent; manavit enim haec quoque sed perobscura fama; illam alteram admirationi uiri et pauor praesens nobilitavit. et consilio etiam unius hominis addita rei dicitur fides.

1.16.4

Livy argues that this account did not take hold because by and large the Romans greatly admired Romulus and wanted to believe he had become a god. He suggests in this way that the veracity of Romulus' deification may have been further questioned if the people had not so loved Romulus and Proculus Iulius had not devised a scheme (*consilio*) that lent credibility to the story (1.16.5ff). In other words Augustus' ancestor Proculus Iulius had a significant impact on the legacy and ultimately the apotheosis of Romulus. During this encounter the deified Romulus ordered Proculus to inform the Romans that so long as they remembered their warlike nature, Rome would grow to be the capital of the world. Without Proculus Iulius' story, Romulus' legacy may not have maintained a mostly positive nature during the Republic.

The poetic portraits of Romulus prior to the *Fasti*, as composed by Horace, Vergil and Ovid, stress Romulus' origins and apotheosis, but do not give full treatment of Romulus'

ascendency to the kingship.¹⁴ In his entire corpus, Horace mentions Rome's first king by the name Romulus six times (*Ode* 1.12.33, 2.15.10, 4.5.1, 4.8.24, *Carmen Saeculare* 47, and *Epistula* 2.1.5).¹⁵ In 1.12 Horace gives a panegyric to Augustus by comparing him to heroes and republican figures from the past. Romulus appears only once and with no real distinction from the others named.¹⁶ Horace is using this list of great men to build to his crescendo, Augustus. Although he does not elevate Augustus above these other men as Ovid does with his panegyrics in the *Fasti*, Horace makes it clear that Augustus is greater by ending his list with the current prince and calling on the gods to grant him a peaceful and successful reign on earth. The poet is not comfortable yet describing Augustus as a god in the 20's B.C. By the end of Augustus' life, Ovid will do just that in his panegyrics.

Horace's second reference to Romulus occurs in a letter to Augustus (2.1.5). In the letter Horace discusses the poet's ability to grant *encomia* to great men and assures Augustus that Romulus, Hercules, Dionysus, and Castor and Pollux never found satisfactory poets to hymn them justly for their deeds (5-10). They had to wait for death to receive appropriate honors. Of course all five of these mythological characters were mortals who earned divine honors. Clearly, Horace is consoling Augustus and giving his own *recusatio* as to why he is not the right poet to compose for Augustus the *encomium* he deserves. In this way Horace leaves the door open for a future poet to properly eulogize and praise the emperor.

¹⁴ While Horace will make several references to Romulus in connection with Augustus, he does not feel comfortable referring to the emperor as a god. The uncertain nature of the Roman state during the early years of Augustus' reign prevented even the most loyal of poets (Horace and Vergil) from knowing whether he would successfully develop a stable imperial model that could preserve the new era of peace. Horace mentions the battle of Actium once (*Epistulae* 1.18.61) while Vergil mentions Actium three times (*Aeneid* 3.280, 8.675, and 8.704).

¹⁵ The deified Romulus, Quirinus, is mentioned twice as well (*Ode* 3.3.15, *Satire* 1.10.32).

¹⁶ He is grouped with Numa his usual counterpart, the Tarquinius, and Cato the younger (33-36). The group does not show any real consistency since Cato was not a king like the others.

Romulus takes on a similar role in the *Aeneid*, appearing only four times (1.276, 1.292-293, 6.778, and 8.342). Vergil downplays Romulus' role in Rome's foundation – the focus is on Aeneas. Romulus first appears in Jupiter's prophecy for Rome which he narrates to Venus (1.257-296). The prophecy portends greatness for the city and gives a few details about the city's future including references to Ascanius, the Alban kings, and Romulus. Vergil's Jupiter also names Remus as a fellow lawgiver to his brother Romulus, *cana Fides et Vesta Remo cum fratre Quirinus/ iura dabunt* (292-293). Clearly, Vergil means to show the *princeps* as the final and logical development of Italian politics by placing him at the culmination of the list. Like the imagery in the temple of Mars Ultor, Jupiter's prophecy concludes with Rome's greatest leader, Augustus. Thus, like other Augustan writers, Vergil makes Romulus out as a less sophisticated foil to the great Augustus.

In book 6 Anchises gives a prophecy of Rome to his son Aeneas in the underworld. He shows him many future and great Romans including Romulus, *quin et auo comitem sese Mauortius addet/ Romulus, Assaraci quem sanguinis Ilia mater/ educet* (777-779). In these lines Vergil merely names Romulus as a son of Mars, founder of Rome, and lists several of his achievements (777-784). In this passage Vergil again ties the whole history of Rome together through the Trojan ancestry of Augustus. Rome's line of kings begins here with Aeneas and runs through the Alban kings and ultimately to Rome's true founder Romulus. Vergil's presentation of Romulus illustrates the secondary place the city's first king comes to occupy under Augustus. As the importance of Aeneas and Evander to Rome's foundation increases, Romulus slowly loses some of his legacy as the city's founder and namesake.¹⁷ In the *Aeneid* the *pietas* of Aeneas surpasses the *virtus* of Romulus.

¹⁷ Papaioannou (2003) 680-701 notices that Vergil makes Evander the original founder of Rome and a duplicate of Aeneas since both are cultural heroes and models of leadership. She illustrates how Evander's acceptance of Aeneas

Vergil's last reference to Romulus occurs in book 8 when Evander gives Aeneas a tour of his settlement known as Pallanteum (306-369). One of these places is the Lupercal on the Palatine, *hinc lucum ingentem, quem Romulus acer asylum/ rettulit, et gelida monstrat sub rupe Lupercal/ Parrhasio dictum Panos de more Lycaei* (342-343). The Vergilian narrator gives credit to Romulus for the Lupercal, but does not relate any further details of Romulus' role in Rome's foundations.¹⁸ Just as Mars and Apollo gain prominence during Augustus' reign at the expense of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the increased interest in Aeneas and the tragic memories of so many civil wars rendered Romulus less useful to the Augustan regime's propaganda.¹⁹ Ovid, however, will challenge this perception of Romulus' role and function in the new imperial age.

Like his Augustan predecessor Livy, Ovid treats Romulus' deification in the *Metamorphoses* (14.805-828) changing only a few minor details.²⁰ Firstly, Mars, Romulus' father, approaches Jupiter and requests that he honor his old promise to deify either Romulus or Remus since Romulus has made the Roman state sufficiently strong to survive (14.805-815).²¹ After Jupiter agrees, Mars flies down to earth on his war chariot and carries off Romulus, who is

begins the process of reconciliation between the Greeks and Trojans and that the customs and *mores* of ancient Pallanteum in the *Aeneid* coincide nicely with traditional Roman ideology and morality which emphasized *frugalitas*, *pietas*, and *labor*.

¹⁸ I have already mentioned that Augustus set up two different huts of Romulus, one on the Palatine and the other on the Capitoline. Romulus clearly proves to be an important part of Augustus' renewal of the city, but the emperor had to find ways to make use of the warrior king without conjuring up fratricide.

¹⁹ Fears (1981) 56 explains how the young triumvir Octavian eliminated many "outmoded or distasteful themes" including many of the institutions surrounding Jupiter and Romulus.

²⁰ While Ovid mostly follows the traditional version of Romulus' apotheosis, his choice to follow up this passage with an account of the deification of Romulus' wife Hersilia may have irritated the emperor. Both Syme (1939) 414 and Holleman (1973) 260 see the Augustan moral program as an attempt "to keep women in their place." If this is accurate, knowing that the Roman people would associate Hersilia with Livia Augustus may have conceived of Ovid's suggestion as an affront to his moral program.

²¹ Dumézil (1970) 246ff Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus formed the original archaic triad.

dispensing justice to the people on the Palatine Hill (14.818-824). The reader notices two things about this account. First, Ovid makes no mention of either Romulus' death at the hands of the Senate or this mysterious Proculus Iulius. Instead, Mars, much like Venus in the *Aeneid*, approaches Jupiter and requests a divine favor for his son. In other words the narrator of the *Metamorphoses* indicates that the Olympians themselves made Romulus a god and not a group of primitive Romans confused by his disappearance and then persuaded by the patrician Proculus Iulius. His narrative suggests that only the gods can deify a man at the end of his life. This notion of divinity sharply contrasts with the concept in Augustan Rome, where Augustus made his adopted father a god and established priests and *flamines* for the cultivation of his own image.²²

While it may seem insignificant, Ovid's decision to move the apotheosis from the *Palus Capreae* in the *Campus Martius* to the Palatine Hill (14.822-823) reflects the renewed interest in the Palatine hill during the reign of Augustus.²³ While the Capitoline had traditionally represented Jupiter's promise of imperial power to the Roman republic, Ovid's reference to the Palatine reflects a development during the reign of Augustus when the *princeps* had turned the Palatine hill, Romulus' settlement, into his own palatial dwelling decorated with a temple to his

²² For Augustus' efforts to deify Caesar cf. *Metamorphoses* 15.760-761, for Augustus' approval of priests and *flamines* in his lifetime cf. *Annales* 1.10.25-26.

²³ Augustus in fact maintained two huts to Romulus as he constructed a second on the Capitoline Hill (Vitruvius 2.1.5). Balland (1984) 75 believes that Augustus placed another hut on the Capitoline so his reappropriation of Romulus and the Palatine Hill did not appear too strong. He also believes Livy, Horace, and Vergil wished to avoid associating Augustus too closely to Romulus and thus never mentioned the Romulean hut near the *princeps*' home on the Palatine. Favro (1996) 100 suggests that in the early 20's B.C. Octavian sought to connect himself with Romulus by renovating the *Lupercal* and buying a house next to the hut of Romulus on the Palatine. Although he considered adopting the name Romulus, he settled on Augustus when he saw the negative consequences of bearing the royal name of a fratricide, (Suetonius *Life of Augustus* 7.2). Edwards (1996) 37 thinks that the omission of references to the Palatine huts shows an unwillingness to "upstage" the true symbol of imperial power, the Capitoline Hill. Rea (2007a) 100-105 believes that the Capitoline retained much of its religious significance in the age of Augustus and sees the emperor's decision to place a hut near the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (guarantor of the republican empire) as an attempt to connect Romulus with the political and religious significance of the Capitoline since this hill preserved the memory of Rome's rise from a small town to a world capital. I think Augustus wished to have it both ways, encouraging the people to associate Romulus with his house on the Palatine and yet connect his martial legacy to the Capitoline Hill.

personal patron, Apollo Palatinus.²⁴ Ovid's shift of sites proves the success of Augustus' attempts to associate the power of the Capitoline with his house on the Palatine without seeming to disturb Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the guarantor of the very empire over which Augustus saw.²⁵ While he may have rejected his name, Augustus saw the advantage of incorporating Romulus' warlike spirit and empire into his own new imperial system. Augustus, however, knew that he could not associate himself too closely with a royal fratricide that may have died at the hands of an angry senate. This version of the story sounds much too close to the events of 44 B.C. when an incensed senate assassinated Octavian's great uncle Julius and set off a series of civil wars culminating at Actium with Augustus' complete victory. Thus, Augustus sought to appropriate the glory of Romulus' epic deeds without accepting the homicidal tendencies of epic men like Rome's first king. Ovid's solution requires that Augustus seek the more elegiac model of leadership depicted by Romulus in books 4 and 5 of the *Fasti*, which balances *virtus* with *pietas*.

Romulus in the *Fasti*

While Romulus as founder of the city will make multiple appearances in the *Fasti*, Ovid offers a dual perspective on Rome's first king, who will undergo a transformation in character from the epic personification of *virtus* early in the poem (1.29-44, 2.363-378, and 2.475ff) to the picture of elegiac piety in the later narratives (4.845-848 and 5.419-493). In this way Ovid will not only re-appropriate the piety of Vergil's Aeneas for the normally warlike Romulus but

²⁴ For the role of Jupiter Optimus Maximus as the patron of Rome's empire during the republic cf. Fears (1980) 101ff.

²⁵ The presence of two Romulean huts in the age of Augustus, one on the Capitoline and the other on the Palatine, shows the confusion contemporary Romans had about the origins of their city. Recall that when Evander gives Aeneas a tour of Rome in the *Aeneid* Vergil pays close attention to both the Palatine and Capitoline. The narrator tells the audience that Romulus will restore the Palatine as a shrine to Lycaen Pan (8.342-343) while Evander describes the Capitoline as a holy site to Jupiter himself (8.347-354).

transform the epic *pietas* of the *Aeneid* into an elegiac virtue. The reader's first impression of Romulus follows the traditional Roman memory of the city's first king and makes him the personification of *virtus*, one of the two virtues (the other being *pietas*) from which Romans believed the city's success stemmed. It was customary for the Roman people to personify these virtues in the first two kings of Rome, Romulus (*virtus*) and Numa (*pietas*). For Ovid's literary project, Romulus will stand as a dual character himself (epic and elegiac), for while he will show elegiac piety in books 4 and 5 he will also play the epic foil to the elegiac Numa in the early books. These multiple dualities parallel the binary nature of the elegiac couplet and the typical depiction of Rome as the city of Mars and Venus.

Augustus sought through the imagery of the *Ara Pacis* to associate himself with both kings and their complementary virtues.²⁶ In the *Fasti* Ovid is not so subtly hinting that he values the piety of his leaders over their prowess in war (*virtus*) just as he prefers the *amor* of his elegies to the *arma* of epic.²⁷ Ovid's *Fasti* privileges piety over manliness at every turn and sometimes to the detriment of Romulus, yet in Ovid's entries for the *Parilia* and *Lemuria* Romulus is conspicuous more for his piety than his epic courage. Thus, Ovid gives a complicated presentation of Rome's first king, who as in republican literature stands in for the different types of leaders Rome has experienced over the years, some more concerned with *virtus* and others with *pietas*. If Ovid wishes to make Romulus this kind of two-fold leader of a binary city, he must simultaneously embody *virtus* and *pietas*, the chief virtues of Rome.

²⁶ Later in this chapter, I will address Ovid's celebration of the *Ara Pacis* (1.709-724).

²⁷ Green (2004) 27-44 points out that this opposition between Romulus and Numa mirrors the tension between *arma* and *arae* in the poem since Romulus made his name through warfare while Numa gained fame for his piety. I would add that the audience should not find the poem's early treatment of Romulus surprising since our poet has just promised a work on religion (*arae*) and not war (*arma*), *Caesaris arma canant alii: nos Caesaris aras/ et quoscumque sacris addidit ille dies* (13-14). Cf. Hinds (1992) 112-124, Barchiesi (1997) 111, 175-176, Gee (2000) 41-47, Littlewood (2002), and Pasco-Pranger (2002).

During his preface to book 1, Ovid gives some introductory details about the calendar in the fashion of a didactic teacher.²⁸ His discussion leads to an analysis of the calendar's origins, which the poet ascribes to Romulus and Numa. Here our Ovidian narrator will make Numa out as the more competent and pious of the two. Ovid declares that Romulus established a ten month calendar for the city (27-28) but immediately undermines the king's efforts by accusing him of ignorance. As Ovid states, Romulus made his name for acts of war and not his administrative accomplishments, *scilicet arma magis quam sidera, Romule, noras/ curaque finitimos vincere maior erat* (29-30).²⁹ Ovid then offers several explanations to Germanicus as possible excuses for Romulus' error; women carry children for ten months and widows mourn their deceased husbands for as many months (33-36).³⁰ According to the Ovidian narrator, Romulus named the first two months of his calendar after Mars and Venus since the former is the father of the king himself and the latter the mother of the whole race.³¹ The king then named the third month (May)

²⁸ Ovid had taken on the role of didactic poet in several of his previous poems including the *Ars Armatoria*, the *Medicamina Faciei Femineae*, and the *Remedia Amoris*. Miller (1992) 11-12 suggests that we should not consider the *Fasti* a didactic work because Ovid does not make consistent use of this technique picking up and dropping off the persona of the didactic teacher throughout the poem. Newlands (1995) 52-57 calls the poem didactic but notices that as Ovid recognizes the uncertainty of the knowledge he hopes to present he appears more as the skeptical student than the confident teacher. I agree with Green (2004) 27-62 that while Ovid's preface suggests a didactic poem his cursory treatment of these didactic details indicate his desire to move quickly beyond the basic functions of the calendar to his own presentation of Roman time.

²⁹ Green (2004) 29 Ovid sets up a dichotomy between *sidera* and *arma*. Julius Caesar and Augustus will ultimately fix the calendar through the use of astronomy (*sidera*) in the first century B.C. Ovid's reference here to *sidera* recall his two programmatic statements (1-2, 13-14) where he proposes to sing of the movement of stars (*signa*) and the altars of Caesar (*arae*) but not his conquests in war, (*arma*). Cf. Hinds (1992) 115-116, 120ff, and Gee (2000) 21-65. I see his references to *sidera*, *arma*, and *arae* as a sophisticated debate on genre. While *arma* belong to war epics, stars pertain to didactic epics like the *Works and Days* and Aratus' *Phaenomena*. Ovid is declaring up front that his *Fasti* will attempt to blend not just war epic and love elegy but many elements from subgenres within both epic and elegy.

³⁰ Green (2004) 32 sees Ovid's uses of *error* as a reference to the poet's own mistake, which brought about his relegation to Tomis, (*Tristia* 2.207) and suggests that Ovid is seeking sympathy from his audience by attributing some rational to the mistake of Romulus.

³¹ Green (2004) 39 The more common etymology for April was from (*aperto*) since Romans considered this month the opening of spring. I think Ovid's insistence that April derives from Aphrodite (4.61ff) reflects his own desire throughout the *Fasti* to present Rome as a city of binaries, most commonly as a city of love and war. His interest in

after the older men (*maiores*) and the fourth month (June) after their younger counterparts (*iuvenes*) but gave numbers alone to the remaining six (41-42).³² Finally, Ovid closes his comments on the early development of Rome's calendar with a single couplet reference to Numa, who adds two months to the beginning of the calendar, *at Numa nec Ianum nec avitas praeterit umbras/ mensibus antiquis praeposuitque duos* (43-44). Ovid's portrait here of Numa is consistent with the Roman view of the city's second king, who gained great fame for his religious piety. This reference to Numa is the first in a series of entries of the *Fasti* in which Ovid praises the piety and foresight of Rome's second king.³³ Romulus' character has not yet assumed the role of pious leader.

Lupercalia

Romulus makes his second appearance in the poem during the entry on the *Lupercalia*. While Romulus will continue to dominate the rest of the entry for February 15 as Ovid moves from a single legendary occurrence of the *Lupercalia* to the *aition* for the actual site of the *Lupercal*, I will restrict my comments here to the narrative about the cattle raid, (2.359-380) and the *aition* for flagellation at the *Lupercalia* (2.432-442).³⁴

Upon giving a Greek *aition* for nudity at the *Lupercalia* (2.303-358), Ovid adds Roman reasons (*causas*) to his Greek *aition* (2.359-360). Although he will give Roman *aitia*, the

Venus stems from his long-standing relationship with her as a love poet. If Ovid fails to make Venus as important to Rome as Mars, he will fail in his effort to raise elegy to the status of epic.

³² Green (2004) 42 Ovid does not mention that Augustus by this time had renamed *mensis quinctilius* and *mensis sextilis* July and August respectively. Hinds (1987) 137 n. 23 and Feeney (1992) 15-19 see a constant effort on Ovid's part to postpone celebrations of these imperial months until he comes to them accordingly.

³³ Green (2004) 43-44 notes that Ovid ascribes Numa's reform to religious piety rather than astronomy. Julius Caesar and Augustus used astronomy to establish their more accurate calendar reforms of the first century B.C.

³⁴ I do not think the *aition* for the *Lupercal* offers anything to a discussion of how Ovid depicts Romulus as a leader.

Callimachean couplet that begins this passage (359-360) and Ovid's addition of Greek athletics to the story of the cattle raid create confusion about the festival's true origin, present the Greek *aitia* as equally valid contributions to the understanding of the Roman festival, and thus undermine the *Lupercalia*'s purely Italic associations.³⁵ Ovid's invocation of the Muses and Callimachean language suggest that despite his Roman topic he is still thinking of Greek antecedents.³⁶ He makes another programmatic statement and asks the Muses to add Roman causes to the foreign (Greek) *aition* he has just given.³⁷ He follows with a statement on Callimachean aesthetics, *inque suo noster pulvere currat equus* (2.360).³⁸ Ovid's horse imagery recalls Apollo's programmatic advice to Callimachus that the poet stake out his own course on paths and roads never before explored:

Ἀ[πό]λλων εἶπεν ὃ μοι Λύκιος·
 αἰοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὄττι πάχιστον
 θρέψαι, τῆ]ν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην·
 πρὸς δέ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἄμαξαι
 τὰ στεῖβε]ιν, ἐτέρων ἵχνια μὴ καθ' ὀμά
 δίφρον ἐλ]ῶν μηδ' οἴμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους

³⁵ Fox (1996) 198 Ovid's juxtaposition of vastly different sources in his treatment of *aitia* throughout the *Fasti* gives the impression that each of them function as equally valid sources of knowledge for the calendar.

³⁶ While it is true that Roman poets often invoke the Muses, their association with Greek poetry and especially epic gives a Greek coloring to this Roman story. Ovid is straying from his promise (1.1-2) to sing of Latin time and creating a Roman history in which people of many cultures elevated Rome from a stopping place on the *Via Salaria* to the longest lasting empire in the classical world.

³⁷ Fox (1996) 197 believes this programmatic statement marks a transition from mythological to historical narrative since in this Roman story Romulus and Remus are carrying out the sacrifices to Faunus which the narrator mentioned earlier in the entry. I suggest that the reader cannot help but treat both accounts as historical because Ovid's narrative style in the *Fasti*, which relies on the mixing and matching of different *aitia* in many entries, creates confusion and makes little distinction between mythological and historical stories. Gowing (2005) 9-10 explains that Romans viewed history as a refashioning of the past in an attempt to give it meaning to the present. By this definition, Augustan age readers would regard all these narratives in the works of Vergil, Horace, Livy, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid as historical.

³⁸ Propertius had used an equine metaphor in his programmatic statement when announcing a new style of poetry blending epic and elegy, *sacra deosque canam et cognomina prisca locorum:/ has meus ad metas sudet oportet equus* (4.1.69-70). Fox (1996) 197-198 argues that the reference to horse imagery introduces a more epic tale requiring a greater "vigor" of narration. Ovid's choice to emphasize this transition from lesser to greater topics shows his versatility as an elegist turning smoothly from one style of narrative (Greek to Roman or epic to elegiac) to another.

ἀτρίπτο]υς, εἰ καὶ στε[ι]γοτέρην ἐλάσεις.’
Fr. 1.26-32

Lycian Apollo said to me, “poet, nourish as fat a sacrifice as possible, but, my good man, keep your Muse delicate. And I give you this command; tread where the wagons do not go and do not drive your chariot where there are the same footprints of others nor the broad road but rather on the unworn paths, even if you ride along a narrower course.”

Apollo describes the Callimachean aesthetic through the metaphor of a wagon (ἄμαξαι) and chariot (δίφρον) while Ovid has altered his to that of a horse (*equus*) mark out his own new path in the dust (*suo pulvere*). Thus, as Ovid prepares to add Roman causes to his Greek *aitia*, through this Callimachean reference the poet reminds his audience that the *Fasti* is a Callimachean project that intends to take Latin elegy to places it has never before approached. While Ovid will give Roman causes throughout the rest of this entry, the informed reader will look to see how he blends these Greek and Roman elements.

Throughout the actual narrative of the cattle raid, Ovid emphasizes the epic speed of the event as the whole story lasts a mere fourteen lines:³⁹

*Romulus et frater pastoralisque iuventus
solibus et campo corpora nuda dabant.
vectibus et iaculis et misso pondere saxi
bracchia per lusus experienda dabant:
pastor ab excelso 'per devia rura iuencos,
Romule, praedones, et Reme', dixit 'agunt.'
longum erat armari: diversis exit uterque
partibus, occursu praeda recepta Remi.
ut rediit, veribus stridentia detrahit exta
atque ait 'haec certe non nisi victor edet.'
dicta facit, Fabiique simul. venit inritus illuc
Romulus et mensas ossaque nuda videt.
risit, et indoluit Fabios potuisse Remumque
vincere, Quintilios non potuisse suos.*
365-378

³⁹ Ovid's emphasis on speed may be a joke at the expense of Livy 1, another source for the deeds of Romulus. In book 1 Livy covers the whole history of Rome from Aeneas to the expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus in one book and therefore must maintain a vigorous narrative pace. Robinson (2011) 359-380 sees Ovid's simple narrative style as a parallel to the simplicity of the twins' lives in primitive Rome.

He, nevertheless, portrays Romulus not as some epic brute but a competitive young man, whose care for his community causes him to stop his private exercise routine and help his fellow herdsmen as soon as the threat to the city emerges. Ovid places the cattle raid on the day of the *Lupercalia* when the Romans were making their customary offerings to Faunus (361-362). No sooner has our narrator given his audience a Roman context than he interjects a reference to Hellenistic athletics by depicting Romulus and Remus engaged in nude exercises characteristic of a Greek *gymnasium* (365-368).⁴⁰ The shout of a shepherd interrupts their exercise, and Romulus and Remus learn thieves are carrying off some of their cattle (369-370). The adjective *devia* seems here to mean “unfrequented” or “out of the way” which recalls for the audience Ovid’s Callimachean program, an attempt to blend many subgenres of epic and elegy including didactic, amatory, and etiological into a beautiful tapestry of Roman history. Ovid’s efforts require him to leave behind the paths created by Livy, Vergil, and Propertius in order create his own lasting celebration of Roman identity represented in his mind by the same series of binaries that hold together his beloved elegiac couplet.

As soon as the twins learn of the theft, they set out unarmed because the process of arming themselves would give the thieves a head start, *longum erat armari* (371). Each youth takes a group of followers and goes his own way, Romulus with the Quintilii and Remus with the Fabii (371-372). The narrator having just begun the story reveals the outcome immediately and wraps

⁴⁰ Notice that the twins and their friend are employing contemporary implements of exercise found throughout the Greco-Roman world; either levers (*vectibus*) as in manuscript ζ or boxing gloves (*caestibus*) as in manuscript ς, javelins (*iaculis*), and discuses (*saxi*). For discussions of Roman anxiety over the Hellenization of Rome cf. Polybius 31.25.2-5, Cicero *Tusculan Disputations* 4.70, and Catherine Edwards (1993) 22-24, 80, 92-97, 102-103, and 203-204. According to King (2006) 200-201, Romans saw the activities of the *gymnasium* as a sign of the Greeks’ predilection for extravagance and luxury and feared objectifying the men by exposing the nude Roman man to male or female audiences. I see Roman anxiety over the influence of Greek customs as a natural consequence of the Roman feeling of inferiority in the presence of Greek culture.

the whole account up in a mere six more lines (373-378).⁴¹ Remus and the Fabii retrieve the cattle and take the meat from the sacrifice as their spoils. As Remus takes his portion of meat, he gives a laconic statement similar to Hercules in Propertius 4.9 when he inaugurates the *Forum Boarium* (16-20) declaring that only the victor deserves to eat the meat, *atque ait 'haec certe non nisi victor edet'* (374).⁴² Upon returning Romulus finds out that Remus and his men have prevailed and consumed all the meat. While Ovid paints Romulus as disappointed (*indoluit*), his laughter (*risit*) could suggest that he is not a sore loser if Ovid does not mean to foreshadow the rift between Romulus and Remus that will culminate with the latter's death in the entry for the *Parilia* (4.721ff).⁴³

At the end of his entry on the *Lupercalia*, Ovid gives an *aition* for the Lupercalian rite of fertility in which runners strike women with leather straps (429-452). Here our narrator presents us with the king Romulus, rather than the young man illustrated earlier in the entry (365-380), and for the first time in the poem he depicts Romulus as a man in crisis, the true test of any politician's character. Ovid's representation of him reveals a weak Romulus incapable of protecting his people without divine aid, much like Aeneas in the early books of the *Aeneid*. In the end the Roman people find the help they need from Juno Lucina, who tells them to whip their women with goat-leather straps to promote conception (435-442).

⁴¹ Hexameter 371 is completely spondaic except for the fifth foot drawing out the discussion of their preparation. Hexameters 373 and 375 are completely dactylic save for the last foot giving great speed to the first half of the couplets. Ovid's account of the cattle raid has the same epic speed in the hexameter line that Livy displays throughout his first book.

⁴² Remus' laconic statement also parallels Romulus' imperial boast over the dead Remus in Livy (1.7.3).

⁴³ Robinson (2011) 377 gives an exhaustive treatment of line 377. For those who see Romulus' actions as those of a good loser cf. Heinz (1919) 29, Duval (1972) 208, Fantham (1983), 190; Schilling (1960) 114 and Barchiesi (1997) 158 see Romulus' smile as deceptive and think he is secretly hiding his anger. I admit that Schilling and Barchiesi' interpretations would make more sense given what the audience knows of Remus' impending murder. The only question is whether Ovid intends the reader to see Romulus here as deceptive or as a good sport. Recall that in Homeric epic, people laugh at the failures or shortcomings of others. In epics characters laugh at one another's expense and never laugh with them.

Upon learning that the community's women cannot conceive, Romulus launches into a short speech, full of self-pity:

*'quid mihi' clamabat 'prodest rapuisse Sabinas'
Romulus (hoc illo sceptrum tenente fuit),
'si mea non vires, sed bellum iniuria fecit?
utilius fuerat non habuisse nurus.'*
431-435

He complains that the rape of the Sabines was useless if it brought war (*bellum*) but no long term security (*vires*). His self-pity reminds the reader immediately of Aeneas' actions in book 1 of the *Aeneid* when upon encountering a storm at sea Aeneas loses control of limbs (*soluuntur membra*), groans (*ingemit*), and gives a long speech in which he bemoans his own fate and longs to have died at Troy with the other great heroes (92-101).⁴⁴ Aeneas' recklessly epic behavior imperils the whole mission since it could cause his crew to lose confidence in not just their leader but their task. Romulus like Aeneas has resigned himself to failure at the first sign of opposition. While crises naturally cause emotional responses, the elegiac leader must restrain his passion and think of his subjects. The choice of Aeneas and Romulus to voice publicly their fears could bring about a grave crisis of confidence in their subjects, who like their ruler may now find resistance futile.

Romulus' poor leadership does not bring about the solution, but instead the piety of the Roman people accomplishes an end to the suffering as they call upon Juno Lucina,

*monte sub Esquilio multis incaeduis annis
Iunonis magnae nomine lucus erat.
huc ubi venerunt, pariter nuptaeque virique
suppliciter posito procubuere genu:
cum subito motae tremuere cacumina silvae,
et dea per lucos mira locuta suos.*

⁴⁴ For the appropriate elegiac response to a crisis, compare Anna Perenna's response to a storm at sea where she silently wishes for her own death yet hides her tears from the crew (3.595-598) or Romulus' pious but restrained response to the death of Remus at the hands of Celer (4.845ff).

'Italidas matres' inquit 'sacer hircus inito.'
obstipuit dubio territa turba sono.
436-442

The Ovidian narrator uses third person plural verbs to describe the people's approach to the grove (*venerunt* and *procubuere*) emphasizing the public nature of this solution. The people, not Romulus, consult the goddess for a solution. We may compare this to the depictions of the pious Numa who twice in the *Fasti* consults the gods on behalf of himself and in an attempt to aid his suffering people (3.275-398, 4.629-676). In this passage the people and not their king are the pious ones genuflecting in the sacred grove near the Esquiline Hill to await the response of Juno. Thus, this rite of the *Lupercalia* belongs to the foresight and piety of the Roman people and not the acts of one man, whether he is Romulus or more appropriately Augustus, who briefly outlawed the festival.⁴⁵ Here Ovid privileges the people's contribution to the Roman ritual and illustrates the popular aspect of the festival.⁴⁶

Quirinalia

Ovid's treatment of Romulus' apotheosis has significant consequences for the new *pater patriae* Augustus, whom Ovid casts as the most epic character in the *Fasti* and whose deification seemed all but assured to Ovid and his contemporaries once the emperor obtained this title in 2 B.C. The comparison between Romulus and Augustus makes the emperor once more aware that Romulus' reign is the closest parallel to his emerging principate and forces him to decide how

⁴⁵ Suetonius discusses the abolition and revival of certain republican festivals, *nonnulla etiam ex antiquis caerimonis paulatim abolita restituit, ut Salutis augurium, Diale flamonium, sacrum Lupercale, ludos Saeculares et Compitalicios. Lupercalibus uetuit currere inberbes*, (*Augustus* 31.4) A.W.J. Holleman (1973) indicates the *princeps* may have altered the ceremony in an attempt to shame unfertile women. I agree with Holleman that Augustus' discomfort resulted from the association of the *Lupercalia* with 44 B.C. and Caesar's attempt to make himself a Hellenistic king. Augustus must have disbanded the festival until he could find a way to repackage it to fit his new imperial model.

⁴⁶ The elegists Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid often privilege the private over the public and the individual over the state by revealing that the achievements of the city came about as a result of the people's efforts and not the senate or any individual man. Throughout the poem Ovid will seek to orient his narratives back toward the popular festival and avoid some of the more heavy aspects of the imperial rites.

closely he wishes to model himself on Rome's first king. On February 17 Ovid treats the *Quirinalia*, a festival for the deified Romulus.⁴⁷ While Ovid's entry for February 17 makes no mention of the *princeps*, his shadow lurks over the section as it does in so many portions of this poem. It is the coming deification of Augustus that would be most in the minds of Ovid's contemporary readers. The reader may recall that Ovid has used Romulus as a foil to the emperor Augustus in his panegyric to the *princeps* for receiving the *pater patriae* on February 5. In that passage Augustus, the most epic of characters in the *Fasti*, bests the ancient *pater patriae* in every possible way.⁴⁸

While Ovid's entry for the *Quirinalia* on February 17 blends details of Livy's account (1.16ff) and his own previous attempt (*Metamorphoses* 14.805-828) to create an integrated version of the tale, the narrator's confusion as to the origin of the name Quirinus, his failure to mention the Quirinal hill, the site of the festival, and his choice once more to treat the apotheosis of Romulus forces the reader again to consider their own contemporary Romulus, Augustus, a man already deified by the language of Ovid's poetry.⁴⁹ The audience must think of Augustus' coming deification throughout this passage since Ovid has in this poem already shown Romulus, now the deified Quirinus, to be inferior to Augustus in every way (2.119-148). If Augustus' mortal deeds so dwarf those of the deified *pater patriae*, the reader can expect the *princeps* to receive soon his share of divinity. After all the senate had deified his great uncle after his murder

⁴⁷ Robinson (2011) 475-512 points out that Romulus' deification according to legend actually took place in July. Thus, Ovid has moved the date of the apotheosis. Likewise, Robinson points out that some Romans thought Romulus was buried in the Forum Romanum near the *lapis niger* (Horace *Epode* 16.11-14 and Porphyrio at *Epode* 16.13). In this tradition Romulus neither reached heaven as a god nor died at the hands of the senate.

⁴⁸ Although Romans granted Marcus Furius Camillus this same honor for saving Rome from the Gauls, Ovid makes no mention of Camillus' distinction as *Pater Patriae*. Two other important accounts of Romulus' deification occur in Augustan age literature, namely in Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* (1.16.1ff) and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (14.805-828). These two versions contain many but not all of the same details as Ovid's entry for February 17.

⁴⁹ Ovid refers to Augustus as a god while still living several times in his poetry (*Ars Amatoria* 1.203-204, *Metamorphoses* 15.760-761, and *Tristia* 1.1.20, 1.2.3-4, and 1.3.37).

in 44 B.C., and Augustus' forty-five year reign as sole ruler of the Roman world grossly surpassed the three year efforts of the *dictator perpetuus*.

The confusion of our narrator as to the origin of the name Quirinus continues a trend in the *Fasti* of offering multiple *causae* for each Roman festival or monument; a technique that makes Ovid's Rome variegated, complicated, yet versatile and in no way the possession of one family, let alone one man.⁵⁰ Playing the role of the antiquarian, our Ovidian narrator begins the entry with a discussion of the etymology of Quirinus, the deified Romulus, and offers three possible reasons for his name (477-480).⁵¹ Perhaps, Romulus acquired the name because he had won his fame with a spear or *cures* in Sabine. Or was it that the Romans, known by ward as Quirites, gave their first king this name? Of course it could be because Romulus brought the Sabine town of *Cures* into the Roman community. At this point our narrator has made it clear he has little interest in the true origin of the name. In fact he will never mention anywhere that the festival took place on the Quirinal. Ovid's account has moved the ritual from its original cult site on the Quirinal, said by Varro (*De Lingua Latina* 5.158) and Martial (5.22.4) to have been sacred to an

⁵⁰ Robinson (2003) 609 says the Ovidian narrator of the *Metamorphoses* skillfully weaves together the many narratives in the epic poem in a way that showcases his strength and keeps the audience guessing where he will turn next in his narration. In contrast, the narrator of the *Fasti* often complains that the content of the calendar restrains his narrative skill. While I believe the content and structure of the calendar are a limiting force, Ovid's complaints of his own ability whether intentional or not undermine the potential authoritative voices in the poem (Janus, Mars, Venus, the narrator himself) and allow the reader to build his own Rome from the multiple *causae* offered up by the Ovidian narrator. The result is that Rome appears a rich matrix of many elements and is many things to many people. Robinson (2011) 475-512 suggests that cynical readers may see Ovid's reference to the feast of Fools during the entry for February 17 as a way of mocking any Romans who might believe this story of the deification of the mortal Romulus. He does admit, however, that the *Quirinalia* and *Festa Stultorum* fall on the same day and thus rightly belong together in Ovid's narrative for February 17.

⁵¹ Edwards (1996) 37 sees the omission of references to the Palatine hut of Romulus as an effort by writers friendly to Augustus (Livy, Horace, and Vergil) from becoming entangled in the many different versions of early Rome. By contrast Ovid relishes the chance to blur these distinctions and create his own Rome, a city built on *virtus* but preserved through the *pietas* and foresight of her rulers.

old form of Jupiter. Not much is known of the real Quirinus.⁵² He formed one third of the early Capitoline triad (Livy 8.9.6), received the third offering of the *spolia opima* mounted by Claudius Marcellus (*Aeneid* 6.859), and functioned as a sort of peacetime Mars, *Quirinus autem est Mars, qui praeest paci et intra civitatem colitur: nam belli Mars extra civitatem templum habuit* (Servius at *Aeneid* 6.859). Our narrator's account shows how dim the origins of ancient Italic gods like Quirinus had become by this point of the Augustan revolution.

As Ovid turns to the actual tale, he alters some of the details of his previous account.⁵³ While Mars' speeches are relatively short in both poems (*Metamorphoses* 14.808-815, *Fasti* 2.483-488), the account in the *Fasti* unlike its parallel in the *Metamorphoses* not only explicitly references the death of Remus as a motive for deifying the remaining brother but makes the bold claim that Romulus means so much to Mars that he makes up for the loss of Remus, *redde patri natum: quamvis intercidit alter/ pro se proque Remo qui mihi restat erit* (485-486). If Romans typically associated the death of Remus with their own civil wars, the Roman reader would take this as a reference to the devastation of the recent civil wars. By taking this point a step further, the reader comes to the unnerving conclusion that Romulus (Augustus) has eliminated all political competition and established a Rome in his image alone. In other words Ovid's Mars concedes the losses of the civil war as a necessary sacrifice for the greatness of Romulus and by extension the city itself.⁵⁴ How else could a contemporary reader take Mars' speech but as an apology for the impending deification of Octavian, a man responsible for countless atrocities not

⁵² Dumézil (1970) 261ff sees Quirinus as a sort of peacetime Mars who had many of his attributes re-appropriated by other deities and became associated simply with the deified Romulus much like the ancient Greek god Enyalios, whose name eventually became nothing more than a personification of Ares.

⁵³ He now sets the apotheosis near the *Palus Capreae* as Livy has it. Nevertheless, as in the previous version, Mars approaches Jupiter and requests that the king of gods receive Romulus into the Olympian canon.

⁵⁴ For a further discussion of the blood sacrifice that brought about the *pax Augustana* see my comments below on the *Ara Pacis*.

just in his youth but again towards the end of his life? The reader can almost see Mars' war chariot coming for the new *pater patriae*, the first man to build a temple to the war god inside what was always considered his city.⁵⁵ Augustus, the most epic of all leaders in Ovid's *Fasti*, successively pushed the complicated image of the epic Romulus to the periphery and established Apollo and Mars as the new protectors of his imperial model without showing disrespect to Jupiter's temple on the Capitoline. This policy allowed him to pursue his epic model of leadership without being associated with a possible fratricide like Romulus or undermining too publicly the cult of Jupiter, the original guarantor of the Roman Empire.

Ovid's narrative will force Augustus to consider once more how closely he wishes to embrace the legacy of king Romulus.⁵⁶ Throughout the poem Ovid has depicted a series of epic leaders (Jupiter, Mars, Romulus, and Augustus) with which to contrast his elegiac counterparts (Janus, Numa, Fabius Maximus Cunctator, and Romulus again) and thereby offer evidence of what constitutes successful leadership. Since the nature of his power over the city has no parallel in republican Rome, the emperor must accept that his principate resembles most the reign of Romulus, who like the *princeps* exerted a monarchic hold over the city and for his efforts received the title of *pater patriae* and divine honors.

While Ovid does follow a traditional version of this story by including the patrician Proculus Iulius, this man's association with the Julian *gens* cannot help but remind the reader of the current Julian monarch, who hoping to leave a stable government knows he must yoke the

⁵⁵ Dumézil (1970) 206 explains that early temples to Mars remained outside the city. Quirinus took up the civic functions of Mars. Augustus then was the first to build Mars a sanctuary inside the god's own city.

⁵⁶ Book 2 contains by far the strongest emphasis on leadership of any book in the *Fasti*. The Ovidian narrator encourages his audience to reconsider many of Rome's early leaders besides Romulus and Augustus, such as the Fabii, the Tarquini, and Brutus.

Roman people to his own family through religious worship in the vein of a Hellenistic king.⁵⁷ As a Hellenistic king, he could expect deification during his own lifetime and a lasting legacy. Following the actual apotheosis of Romulus, Ovid like Livy (1.16ff) and unlike his previous attempt (*Metamorphoses* 14.805ff) presents his readers with the rumor that senators had murdered Romulus, *luctus erat, falsaeque patres in crimine caedis/ haesissetque animis forsitan illa fides* (497-498). The narrator quickly disposes of that notion by presenting the case of Proculus Iulius, a man who claims he met the deified Romulus on the road back from Alba Longa (499-512).⁵⁸ It is as if the Julian *gens* knowing the necessity of deification to their future success have sought to procure the honor for another man centuries ahead of time.⁵⁹ The inclusion of Proculus Iulius, nevertheless, assures us that Ovid still cannot avoid Augustus in the month of February. Our Ovidian narrator finally acknowledges the ritual's significance to the Quirinal hill stating that Proculus Iulius' speech persuaded the people to build a temple to Quirinus on the hill and establish yearly honors to him (511-512). Again, the narrator has had no intention of discussing the *Quirinalia* and its relationship to an ancient cult site on the Quirinal. To our Augustan narrator, Quirinus as the deified Romulus has important consequences for their own leader and new *pater patriae* but little to do with an ancient Sabine god of the Quirinal.

⁵⁷ Robinson (2011) 498 suggests like Cicero (*De Republica* 2.20) that the senate put forth Proculus Iulius to cover up their murder of Romulus.

⁵⁸ In a twist of irony, a Julian is insisting that a tyrant was not murdered. Octavian had used the "murder" of his adoptive father as a justification for his entire revolution.

⁵⁹ Dumézil (1970) 248-249 suggests the association of Romulus' apotheosis with this Proculus Iulius is a late addition by the Julian *gens* occurring around the beginning of 1st century B.C. at the earliest. In this way a Julian receives the honor of being chosen by the god as the first witness to Romulus' divinity.

Parilia

It is during the entry for the *Parilia* that Ovid shows the first signs of Romulus' maturity and development from epic to elegiac leader.⁶⁰ This change in character will continue to develop in book 5 when Romulus will piously establish the *Lemuria* to honor the death of his brother. If Ovid can succeed in elegizing the most epic of Rome's early leaders, he may successfully alter the model of Roman leadership from epic to elegiac and simultaneously put elegy on equal footing with epic. I will concern myself with the story of Rome's founding alone since it is the only part of the entry that provides an example of Romulus' leadership (4.807-862).⁶¹ Likewise, Ovid is not the first to treat the *Parilia* as the founding of Rome; Livy had given two accounts of the tale in his *Ab Urbe Condita* some twenty or more years previously (1.7.1-3).⁶² Livy's narrative lauds Romulus for the same flaws Ovid's *Fasti* often indicts its epic heroes; they are hasty and violent men with no time for thoughtful reflection.

Ovid's account of Rome's founding (807-856) follows his previous section on fire-leaping and recognizes April 21 as Rome's birthday (806). Our clever narrator pretends that mere

⁶⁰ In his entry for April 21, Ovid must sing of the *Parilia*, an ancient and pre-Romulean feast of purification for sheep and shepherds in honor of the pastoral goddess Pales. This day, however, had become associated with Romulus' founding of the city, an event which supposedly took place on the *Parilia* of 753 B.C. Dumézil (1970) 380-381 insists that Pales is a goddess and that confusion over her gender comes from the confusion of the Roman goddess with an Etruscan god named Pales, an agent of Jupiter. Fantham (1998) 721-862 points out that Propertius mentions the *Parilia* twice in book 4; once in reference to the city's founding (4.1.19-20) and again when describing the occurrence of the festival during Rome's war with Titus Tatius (4.4.73-75). By this point in the Augustan age, his Roman audience would expect Ovid to connect the *Parilia* with the more important event of that calendar day, Romulus' famed augury and the founding of his city. Cf. Beard (1987) for a discussion of the *Parilia* and Romulus.

⁶¹ Fantham (1998) 721-862 believes Ovid divides the narrative into four parts: the purification of sheep and shepherds (4.721-782), the *aition* for fire-leaping at the celebration (783-806), the founding of Rome and death of Remus (807-856), and a patriotic prayer for Roman supremacy (857-862). I will refer to the last two sections only since the first two sections do not pertain to Roman leadership.

⁶² Ennius gives an account of the auguries sought by Romulus and Remus upon the founding of the city (*Annales* 77-96). In Livy's account of the same augury (1.7.1ff) Remus sees his birds first while Romulus receives an augury twice as large. In the aftermath the gangs of both men hail their leader as king, and a fight breaks out. During this altercation Remus dies. Livy also gives the alternative story that Romulus killed his brother Remus because he had mocked the size of the lowly walls of his new city.

happenstance has offered him an opportunity to sing of Rome's founding and in hymnic fashion calls on the deified Romulus to aid his presentation of the city's founding, *ipse locum casus vati facit: Urbis origo/ venit; ades factis, magne Quirine, tuis* (807-808). Ovid acts as if he has no control over the information he disseminates in his calendar, as if the sheer number of details and *causae* have overwhelmed our narrator and made him unreliable. His comments remind the reader of his earlier trepidation when embarking on a panegyric to Augustus the *pater patriae* (2.119ff), yet no Callimachean poet as accomplished as Ovid ever allows himself to flow aimlessly from one topic to another. Notice his use of *vates*, a word for a soothsayer that carried an ancient religious significance that Vergil and his fellow Augustan poets revived as a term of sophistication for their style of poetry.⁶³ While fitting all the details of such an important day into this entry is a difficult task, the narrator is purposefully creating confusion here so that the reader can see Rome for what it is; a city that over a 700 year period rose from a meager salt town to the capital of the empire, a feat brought about by the efforts of countless men and women. Ovid's narrative celebrates these nameless and lesser known contributors so as to reveal that the greatness of Augustan Rome does not belong to one man or even one family.⁶⁴ It is for this reason he focuses much of the entry on the festival itself (721-806) and not the controversial story of Rome's founding (807-856).

Ovid's account of the tale -- unlike his other narratives that seem hostile to Romulus (1.27ff, 2.119ff) -- removes much of the blame from Romulus for his brother's death by stating that Remus recognized his brother as the victor of the augury and rightful king of Rome. He also

⁶³ Cf. Newman (1968) for the use of *vates* in Augustan poetry.

⁶⁴ Miller (1991) 108-139 notices that Ovid's one poem on a religious festival in his early career (*Amores* 3.13) depicts a poet more concerned with a festival containing glitz or "golden [pageantry]" than the simpler rustic rites of the countryside. The narrator in the *Fasti* on the other hand shows a greater interest and appreciation for these simple rustic rites much like Tibullus.

removes Romulus from blame by naming another man, Celer, as the actual killer and calling Remus rash for his actions. In his version the two brothers agree to settle the contest with an augury just as in Livy's accounts, *'nil opus est' dixit 'certamine' Romulus 'ullo/ magna fides avium est: experiamur aves'* (4.813-814). Unlike Livy's first account of this story, Ovid emphasizes that Remus accepted Romulus as the rightful winner and founder of Rome, *sex Remus, hic volucres bis sex videt ordine; pacto/statur, et arbitrium Romulus urbis habet* (4.817-818). Ovid's story replaces Livy's unnamed assassin with a character named Celer, whom Romulus places in charge of the walls and tells to kill anyone who dares (*audentem*) to cross the walls:

*hoc Celer urget opus, quem Romulus ipse vocarat,
'sint' que, 'Celer, curae' dixerat 'ista tuae,
neve quis aut muros aut factam vomere fossam
transeat; audentem talia dede neci.'*
4.837-840

Ovid makes it clear that anyone who dares to jump the walls (*audentem*) must die. Romulus gave this as an early law to the city. Unfortunately, Remus chooses to not only mock his brother's walls but breaks the law by jumping over the wall,

*quod Remus ignorans humiles contemnere muros
coepit, et 'his populus' dicere 'tutus erit?'
nec mora, transiluit: rutro Celer occupat ausum;
ille premit duram sanguinolentus humum.*
4.841-844

Here Ovid transfers the blame from Romulus to two different impulsive characters, Celer and Remus. If Remus had not dared to jump the fence (*ausum*), Celer would not have killed him. On the other hand, Celer's name has the connotation of quick or even hasty, a fact that transfers

some of the blame to the impulsive guard.⁶⁵ Celer is the negative epic hero in this account, but Remus receives blame for his own rashness and lack of concern for the law. After all he chooses to jump the walls and provoke Celer, who simply follows Romulus' instructions to the letter and makes no exceptions for the king's brother.

At this point in the story, Ovid reveals the new character of Romulus. Ovid's Romulus weeps when he learns of his brother's death but hides his grief from the people and sticks to his word regarding enemies.

*haec ubi rex didicit, lacrimas introrsus obortas
devorat et clausum pectore volnus habet.
flere palam non volt exempla que fortia servat,
'sic' que 'meos muros transeat hostis' ait.*
4.845-848

Romulus, like Aeneas in Vergil's *Aeneid*, develops into a good leader during the *Fasti*. The early actions of both call into question their capability as kings (*Aeneid* 1.92ff and *Fasti* 1.29-44 and 2.475ff), but both in the end emerge as model leaders in their respective poems. Romulus does not want to alarm his people and show weakness by weeping in public, a fact that reveals he has matured and no longer resembles the man who cried upon learning that the Roman women could not conceive (475ff).⁶⁶ Here he keeps his word and honors his brother with the appropriate funeral honors, *at tamen exsequias; nec iam suspendere fletum/sustinet, et pietas dissimulata patet* (4.849-850). His efforts to hide his grief fail though, and his piety shines through. Ovid has not treated Romulus in this passage as the reader might expect given the description of other epic heroes and Romulus himself in the *Fasti*. Instead, he has emphasized the king's respect for the law, his concern for the people, and his piety. The reader feels empathy for the king, who must

⁶⁵ Cf. Dionysius Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities* 1.87.4 for another version that mentions a Celer.

⁶⁶ Ovid does not necessarily depict Romulus' transformation chronologically since the incident with infertility surely must have occurred well after Remus' death. Ovid does, however, show an improved transformation over the course of the poem.

put aside his own private wishes to care for the common safety of all. He makes no distinctions about his people based on class or kinship. Thus, Ovid humanizes Romulus by depicting the true sadness that overtakes him when he learns of Remus' death. The king reveals his piety through his fraternal devotion in granting Remus burial honors despite his virtual treason. In this way Romulus in Ovid's account of Rome's founding appears for the first time in the poem a stable and pious ruler.

Lemuria

For his entry on the *Lemuria* in May (5.419-493), Ovid returns to the story of Remus' death in order to explain the origin of the festival's name. He makes this narrative, covering the funeral and the days after Remus' death, consistent with his version in book 4. Upon approaching his parents Acca and Faustulus, Remus delivers a heartfelt speech in support of his cause and requests that they beseech Romulus to honor Remus' sacrifice in subsequent years on that very day.⁶⁷ Ovid's depiction of Remus and Romulus once more indicates his wish to exculpate Romulus at the expense of Remus and the real killer Celer.

In this story Ovid uses epic language to color Remus and Celer as hasty and cruel epic heroes respectively. On the other hand, the description of the dutiful Romulus paints him as an elegiac leader endowed with piety, much as Aeneas appears in the festival of the *Vinalia* (4.863-900). Ovid's description of Remus as swift (*veloci*), however, suggests that the young man himself is partly to blame for his untimely death, *Romulus ut tumulo fraternas condidit umbra/et male veloci iusta soluta Remo* (5.451-452). Just as he has described Remus as "bold" in book 4 (*audentem* 840), he characterizes Remus as "hasty" or "swift" in this account to remove guilt from the benevolent king Romulus. The adjective reminds the reader of Celer, the real assassin,

⁶⁷ Notice that Remus appears before his parents as they sleep much like the ghost of Hector in the *Aeneid* (2.268ff) and the ghost of Dido in the *Fasti* (3.639ff).

and thus puts the blame on these two “rash” characters for the tragedy that is Remus’ young death.

In his first words, Remus reminds his parents that he is one of their two sons, *'en ego dimidium vestri parsque altera voti,/ cernite sim qualis, qui modo qualis eram* (5.459-460).

Remus in this account once more admits that Romulus rightly won the augury contest, a detail omitted in both of Livy’s accounts, *qui modo, si volucres habuissem regna iubentes,/ in populo potui maximus esse meo* (5.461-462). Ovid makes it clear to his readers that Romulus has won the distinction as king fairly and in a contest authorized by both brothers.

Later in the speech, Ovid uses Remus’ words to further indict Celer as the true villain when Remus says,

*quem lupa servavit, manus hunc **temeraria** civis
perdidit. o quanto **mitior** illa fuit!
saeve Celer, **crudelem** animam per volnera reddas,
utque ego, sub terras sanguinolentus eas.
noluit hoc frater, **pietas** aequalis in illo est:
quod potuit, **lacrimas** in mea fata dedit.*
5.467-472

Remus’ diction characterizes Celer as a rash, epic character calling him *temeraria* and *crudelem*. Remus even mentions that the wolf, the wild beast that suckled the twins, had a softer touch (*mitior*) than this cruel man. The term *mitior* has an elegiac ring to it and is often found in elegiac poetry’s amorous descriptions.⁶⁸ In contrast Remus’ speech redeems his brother Romulus as a pious and thoughtful king. After all, Remus says his brother possesses equal piety (*pietas*) to himself and shed tears for his dead brother as a dutiful kinsman. Acca and Faustulus obey their son’s request and bring the matter to the king Romulus. Ovid gives the reader one final

⁶⁸ Conte (1994) 322-323 discusses how elegy with its emphasis on *nequitia* and *servitium amoris* to a *domina* at its heart develops in opposition to the life of the epic men who follow the *mos maiorum*. Thus, words like *mitis* and *mollis* uncommon in epic abound in the elegiac world which glorifies in a life of self-indulgence and leisure that allow time to pursue love interests.

indication of Romulus' piety as the king willing accepts to honor his brother's sacrifice with the festival of the Remuria, later changed to the Lemuria, *Romulus obsequitur, lucemque Remuria dicit/ illam, qua positus iusta feruntur avis* (479-480).

In this chapter I have examined Ovid's depiction of Romulus in the *Fasti* and suggested that the poet reveals Romulus' transformation from a rash and hasty warrior in book 1 to an elegiac, pious, and foresighted king by books 4 and 5. Likewise, Romulus acts as a foil to the most epic character in the whole poem Augustus, whom Ovid declares as more epic than Romulus in every way (2.119ff). Ovid's predecessors including Ennius, Cicero, and Livy all emphasize that Romulus rightly earned the kingdom in the augury contest and merited divine honors for his great deeds. Of the three only Livy mentions the alternative version of Romulus' death in which the senate no longer able to tolerate his autocracy tears him apart during a meeting, yet Livy is sure to say the people disregarded this version out of admiration for the great Romulus wishing to believe that he had become a god. Through Romulus' change in the *Fasti* from epic warrior to elegiac king, the poet stresses that the elegiac Romulus and all elegiac leaders marked as they are by piety, foresight, and patience have served as much better models for leadership than the primitive and epic leaders depicted in the works of Ennius, Cicero, Livy, and Vergil. By creating his own elegiac hero and re-appropriating Aeneas' piety for Romulus, Ovid raises the genre of elegy and puts himself on equal footing with Vergil as Rome's most influential poet.

CHAPTER 6 FROM MORTAL TO GOD: AUGUSTUS

This chapter both evaluates the relationship between Ovid and the *princeps* and examines how Augustan imperial policy relates to Ovid's program for the *Fasti*.¹ Ovid paints Augustus as the most epic of all characters in the *Fasti*. His very presence threatens to topple Ovid's insignificant elegiac couplets (2.119ff) and requires the voice of the great Homeric bard that Ovid protests he cannot properly channel. While one may be tempted to start an examination of the relationship between Ovid and Augustus in the *princeps*' latter years that led up to the poet's relegation in A.D. 8, the origin of the strife began much earlier in the 20's B.C. when Ovid was a young man training for the law courts and Augustus was trying to consolidate his power. Ovid's rejection of the emperor's political invitation to join the senate marked him out for an elegiac life of leisure like his friend Propertius and encouraged him to stand aloof from politics. In this way a reader may view Propertius and Ovid's *corpora* as not only defenses of their choice of lifestyle but also endorsements of the merit of elegiac virtues. The works of both poets offer competing

¹ Evaluating the relationship between Rome's grandest emperor and the city's greatest living poet is not an easy task. While many agree that distinctions like anti and pro Augustan are much too simplistic, so too are our comparisons of Augustus to modern totalitarians like Hitler or Stalin. Any discussion of Augustan politics says as much about us in the modern world as it does the Romans. Ahl (1984) 192-208 advises that modern critics abandon the groundless notion that a writer could never safely criticize the emperor. Ahl points out that Quintilian states that the critical work need not even elude the emperor. The writer must, however, account for two things. First, he must avoid the emperor's punishment should he offend Caesar. Secondly, he must make his audience sympathetic to his views. Therefore, the approach and "figured speech" determine whether the writer can protect himself should he anger the emperor. Regarding Augustan propaganda Wallace-Hadrill (1987) 221ff explains that the most successful propaganda is "that which coalesces unnoticed with the existing values of the society." Kennedy (1992) 26-27 explains that the Romans had no term for the complex system we call "politics." For Kennedy, "the politics of Augustan poetry is inextricably linked with the politics of talking about it." Thus, as the poets interact with Augustan ideology, they are also actively shaping and changing the ideology of the emerging principate. Thomas (2001) 75-80 points out that Ovid and later Lucan often allude to ambiguous and problematic passages from Vergil's *Aeneid* in an attempt to challenge the Augustan reception of the poem. Thomas notices that while neither Turnus nor Dido speak during the little *Aeneid* of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* the narrator gives voice to their concerns articulating Dido's feeling of betrayal and Turnus' belief that he was justified in his claim to his fiancée Lavinia. Augustus' revolution was a huge success, and despite the ruthless proscriptions of his youth he so thoroughly incorporated his own family into the religious, social, and political fabric that out of a five hundred year old oligarchy he fashioned a monarchy that would survive for five centuries in Western Europe.

images of Rome and her history to those propagated by the emperor's administration. In other words Ovid like Propertius contributed to the dialogue on imperial power and Roman identity through his writings rather than the interworkings of the senate.

When Ovid was a young man, he received rhetorical training, the typical course of action before entering the senate. While he had an elegant and smooth style, his disregard for the order of events in his narratives hurt his ability as an orator.² Nevertheless, there is no hint that he could not have overcome such flaws and joined his peers in politics when Augustus offered him a chance to enter the Senate, but Ovid chose instead to retain his knight's ring and pursue a life of *quies*.³ His decision to remain aloof from politics likely irritated the emperor, who was eager to enfranchise noble men from provincial Italy as a sign of their faith and complicity in his political revolution. Following his departure from politics, Ovid like his fellow elegist Propertius made *recusationes* explaining his preference for the elegiac genre. In reality, these *recusationes* formed a defense of the poet's career. While one scholar sees Ovid's choice of career as a sign of his essentially apolitical nature, I propose that he was in reality using his passion for love poetry to justify a fundamental distaste for the political transformations of the Augustan age and their effects on Roman identity.⁴

² Seneca the Elder, who although ten years older than Ovid outlived him by over twenty years, records in his *Controversiae* a portrait of the young declaimer Ovid, whose elegant speeches though mostly prosaic renderings of verse often impressed his fellow students (*Controversiae* 2.2.8). It appears, however, that during his rhetorical training Ovid had little interest in giving forensic speeches (*controversiae*) since he did not enjoy offering proofs (*Controversiae* 2.2.12). Fränkel (1945) 5-8 sees in Ovid's poetry the same approach noticed by Seneca in his declamations; namely that despite his wit and charm he often neglects the sequence of events in his narratives.

³ In the *Tristia*, Ovid tells us that he and his brother, who was older by a year, came to Rome to study law. After his brother's death around 24 B.C., Ovid chose to narrow the stripe on his toga (*clavus*) and forgo entry into the Senate believing he did not have the appropriate physical constitution for a political life (4.10.29-38). Cf. Syme (1939) 363.

⁴ Cf. McKeown (1984) for a discussion of Ovid's apolitical demeanor.

Throughout the *Fasti* Ovid treats the *princeps* as not just an epic man but the most epic hero of all time. Descriptions of Augustus will go beyond the traditional panegyrics to mortals and reveal that the weighty presence of the emperor, now *pater patriae*, threatens to overwhelm even a poet's attempt to praise him. Of course, epic best fits the task of praise poetry, but Tibullus 2.5 and Propertius 4 showed Ovid a way to incorporate panegyric in an elegiac poem, a necessary element for a work on the Roman calendar.

Since the ancient historians' record of the period covered in Ovid's *Fasti* lacks significant details about the last years of Augustus' reign, the poem stands as an important historical source for the period when the *princeps* sought to obtain an adequate successor and preserve his new imperial state.⁵ As Ovid composes his poem on the *Fasti*, he cannot, even if he were in the words of one scholar "a fundamentally apolitical poet," avoid Augustus, who has left his stamp on every aspect of Roman life and especially the organization of time.⁶ If Augustus really is, as

⁵ Despite the misinformed notion of historical hindsight that Octavian successfully transformed into Augustus and neatly turned the republic into a principate, the princeps actually faced a fair deal of opposition throughout his whole career. Kathryn Welch (2012) persuasively argues that Syme's assumption that the "republic died after the battle of Philippi" reflects triumviral propaganda that sought to depict the remaining republican opposition as illegitimate although it existed even after Actium when Octavian appealed to a republican constituency to support his new program and prevent future civil wars. Syme (1974) 4-5 refers to the departure of Tiberius into exile as "the crisis of 2 B.C." Syme suggests that Tiberius went into exile upon realizing that Augustus now sought to install his grandsons as his heir leaving Tiberius to handle important matters with no possibility for advancement much like Marcus Agrippa in the past. Bowersock (1984) 169-185 explains that the problem of Augustan succession was tied to the problems of governing the eastern empire which once had ties to Augustus' old enemy Marc Antony. In an effort to assure future stability in that region, Augustus sent his heir apparents on tours of the east to showcase them. Tiberius first went to Parthia in 20 B.C. to negotiate the return of Crassus' lost standards. Around 2 B.C. Tiberius left for Rhodes as Gaius, the new heir apparent, was preparing for a campaign in Parthia. Southern (1998) 160ff explains that while Augustus may have felt very secure around 12 B.C. the death of Agrippa in that same year and the subsequent deaths of his grandsons Lucius (A.D.2) and Gaius (A.D. 4) formed a series of disappointments that plagued Augustus' plan for imperial succession. Following the death of the second grandson Gaius in A.D. 4, Augustus adopted Tiberius as his son, offered him *potestas tribunicia* for three years, forced him to accept his grandnephew as his subsequent heir, and granted Tiberius powers equal to the *princeps* when dealing with the imperial provinces (Suetonius *Tiberius* 15, 21). The question as to who would rule Rome had been answered. Now the Roman people had to prepare themselves for their new monarch.

⁶ McKeown (1984) sees Ovid as an apolitical poet since he makes use of political activity less often in his personal elegies than his predecessors Propertius and Tibullus. While McKeown (1984) 174 acknowledges that Ovid's earlier erotic verses would have irritated the emperor since the *princeps* had hoped to reestablish a rigorous moral code, he does not see Ovid as a poet bent on Augustan opposition. Otherwise, McKeown suggests that Ovid would have included more political passages in his earlier poetry. Newlands (2002) 215 sees the incomplete nature of the *Fasti*

Wallace-Hadrill thinks “too demanding to allow anyone’s world to remain insulated from politics,” Ovid’s treatment of the *Fasti* in verse could never escape the emperor’s presence.⁷ Indeed, the poet intended to make Augustus the dedicatee of his original plan. Augustus’ death prior to the poem’s publication caused Ovid to write a new preface for the emperor’s nephew and Tiberius’ predetermined successor Germanicus while moving the preface for Augustus to book 2.⁸

Ovid duly includes Augustus in 6 important entries for the *Fasti*.⁹ He gives four *aetia* for the *princeps*’ titles including Augustus on January 13 commemorating the first settlement in 27 B.C. (1.587-616), one for *pater patriae* on February 5 in 2 B.C. (2.119-148), another for his assumption of the chief priesthood (*pontifex maximus*) on March 6, 12 B.C. (3.415-428), and one celebrating the conferment of *imperator* on April 16, 43 B.C. (4.673-676). He also gives *aitia* in two entries for important Augustan monuments, the *Ara Pacis* on January 30, 13 B.C. (1.709-

as beneficial to the poem’s goal of offering multiple perspectives and promoting a type of Roman identity forged out of “cultural pluralism.” King (2006) 144 says that Julius Caesar’s reform of the calendar took the power over time away from the elites in the pontifical colleges and gave it to an “automatic solar-astronomical mechanism, established by Caesar’s one-man rule and monitored by bureaucratic often foreign, professionals.” Augustus’ imperial calendar augmented his totalitarian regime. I believe Ovid avoided politics in his earlier poetry for two reasons. First, he does appear by his own admission less interested in the politics of the Augustan age than others (*Tristia* 4.10.1-40). Secondly, public themes like the imperial policy of the emperor are fundamentally incompatible with the personal nature of elegy proper. Once Propertius with his fourth book and Ovid with this *Fasti* found a way to construct etiological elegy and capitalize on the great fame these political topics could grant their elegiac verse, they put aside their *recusationes* and began their innovative experiments to expand the potential of the elegiac couplet.

⁷ Wallace Hadrill (1987) 223 explains that Augustus’ overwhelming remaking of the Roman state would never allow any poet, important as these men were to the spread of imperial propaganda, to remain completely apolitical.

⁸ I follow Herbert Brown (1994) 32, Syme (1978) 23, and Miller (2009) 326-327 who believe the dedication to Germanicus in book 1 replaced the original dedication to Augustus, which Ovid subsequently moved to the preface of book 2. Given the numerous post exilic additions to book 1 (Syme 1978 28 ff), I find no reason to suggest he did not move the dedication from book 1 to book 2. Fantham (1985) 257-258 believes Ovid had always intended for his dedication to Augustus to appear in the preface to book 2. King (2006) 41 says that Ovid’s publication of the *Fasti* seeks civil inclusion for its author, and he sees the dedication to Germanicus as analogous to a man naming his imperial patron on *praescriptiones*.

⁹ Ovid also includes an entry on March 6 lauding Augustus for receiving the title *pontifex maximus* in 12 B.C. (3.415-428) and one on April 16 commemorating the conferment of the title *imperator* on Octavian in 43 B.C. for his relief of Mutina. I have excluded these two entries because of the accounts’ brevity.

724) and the temple of Mars Ultor on May 12 in 2 B.C. (5.545-598). It now seems beneficial to examine Ovid's commemoration of these dates in Augustan history.

Some scholars see the *Fasti* as failed panegyric whether it is because Ovid's erotic and playful style was not suitable for adaptation to Augustan ideology or since Ovid never had any intention of glorifying imperial policy.¹⁰ It is inevitable that a discussion of Ovid's *Fasti*, a poetic attempt to present his own perspective on Roman history through the calendar, will lead to an analysis of how this poem affects Augustus, the agent behind new *fasti* and every other phase of a revolution that began the very year of Ovid's birth (*Tristia* 4.10. 5-6). I wish to steer the argument away from discussions of sincerity and back towards an assessment of Augustus' role in Ovidian poetry.

I now wish to evaluate Ovid's epic panegyric at the end of the *Metamorphoses*.¹¹ This panegyric (15.843-870), published while he was still composing the *Fasti*, offers a unique

¹⁰ Herbert-Brown (1994) 63 believes these passages are not only sincere but even effective panegyrics. Wallace-Hadrill (1987) 228-229, and Hinds (1992) see the *Fasti* as a failure at Augustan panegyric. Holleman (1973) 266ff sees intentional opposition to Augustan policy in Ovid's *Fasti*. He suggests Ovid's irreverent treatment of Faunus in the entry on the *Lupercalia* is just one example of poetic opposition in the poem. I would agree that Ovid does not share with Vergil and Horace any deep reverence for early Roman gods like Faunus, whom he presents as a Roman Priapus in his Greek *aition* for activities at the *Lupercalia*. Barchiesi (1997) 78 states that Ovid's *Fasti* shows deference first and foremost to Alexandrian aesthetics and not Augustan ideology. Regarding Augustus' presence in the poem, he believes that it is difficult to separate the formal requirements of writing a calendar from the tensions present in Augustan ideology and discourse.

¹¹ During the defense of his poetry to Augustus in the *Tristia*, Ovid contends that other Augustan poets like Vergil (*Aeneid* 4) had written material as salacious as his *Ars Amatoria* and yet escaped punishment.

*et tamen ille tuae felix Aeneidos auctor
contulit in Tyrios arma virumque toros,
nec legitur pars ulla magis de corpore toto,
quam non legitimo foedere iunctus amor.*
(2.1.533-536)

This description of the epic as *tuae Aeneidos* indicates that although Vergil had composed the poem its association with imperial policy had virtually transferred literary authority from the poet to the *princeps*. While Vergil's *Aeneid* had clear imperial connections from the start, Ovid must have recognized that any attempt to treat topics of Roman identity would inevitably draw comparisons to the undergoing efforts by Augustus to create a new state. Armed with this self-awareness, Ovid recognized that while he could not avoid Augustus in his *Fasti*, he had to prevent the emperor from overshadowing his poetic authority. If we begin our discussion of the *Fasti* with Augustus, we deny Ovid poetic authority in his own poem, a necessary prerogative for even the lowliest of poets. If Ovid failed to control the presence of Augustus, like Vergil he risked losing control of his own poetic legacy. One must wonder how *felix* Vergil might have been if he had lived to see his immensely complicated and sophisticated poem arising as

opportunity to compare Ovid's use of panegyric in both works to see how the poet claims his own poetic immortality and re-appropriates the greatness of Augustus for his present project.¹² While Ovid offers a comparison of Augustus to Jupiter as he does in the entry for January 13 (*Metamorphoses* 15.859-860), the poet's final comments best articulate how he regards his relationship with the *princeps*. Augustus has elevated Rome beyond all previous attempts and rules over the earth just as Jupiter reigns in the sky (859-860). At such a time, any overt criticism of the emperor would put Ovid at odds with a popular regime and more importantly the whole future of power at Rome. Instead of offering direct opposition, the poet seeks to reclaim some of the *princeps*' success for his own poem. Jupiter and by comparison Augustus have no power over Ovid in his own poem, for neither can destroy the everlasting fame his *Metamorphoses* will acquire for its poet (871-874). Ovid assures us that his readership and fame will spread with the imperial state (875ff). The poet, like the emperor, will leave a lasting legacy on Roman culture that will expand as quickly as the imperial regime. Ever confident in his poetic legacy, he brags elsewhere that elegy owes as much to him as epic does to Vergil, *tantum se nobis elegi debere fatentur/ quantum Vergilio nobile debet epos* (*Remedia Amoris* 395-396). Thus, in this epic

it did from the most traumatic period of Roman history reduced to a mere piece of propaganda. I have no doubt of Vergil's commitment to Augustus and his attempts to restore peace. The deep sadness expressed in the Vergilian corpus shows an artist crying out for the peace and prosperity necessary for the great literary projects produced in the age of Augustus. I do, however, question whether any poet especially one as talented as Vergil would have any interest in continuing to compose poetry if the common perception would be that he was not in fact the driving force behind his own poetry. Griffin (1984) believes that Augustus' ability to coerce poets into writing clear panegyric for his family and him was not very successful during the early principate. Horace and Propertius both give *recusationes* for writing any sort of grand epic. While Vergil eventually takes up the task, he does so on his own terms and places his protagonist in the deep past. Griffin suggests that the rise and fall of Ovid, "the only great poet to have grown up in Augustus' reign," reveals an emperor that is much more capable of demanding increasing amounts of adulation and flattery from the poets. Book 4 of Horace's *Odes*, written upon the request of the emperor, contains much more panegyric than the first three books as Horace attempts to praise Augustus and his step-sons, Tiberius and Drusus.

¹² Miller (2009) 324-331 suggests that on at least two occasions (*Ars Amatoria* 2.493-510 and *Fasti* 1.1-26) Ovid re-appropriates for his own elegiac projects the imperial Apollo. Galinsky (1975) 30 refers to this Ovidian tactic as *reductio ad amorem*.

panegyric, Ovid not only controls the powerful figure of Augustus but co-opts much of his imperial success for his own poetic legacy.

I turn now to the elegiac panegyrics in the *Fasti*. Ovid's entry for January 13 while appearing to honor Augustus' reign will reveal it as extra-constitutional and grossly unnatural when juxtaposed with the city's republican tradition. In his entry for January 13, Ovid celebrates the first settlement of 27 B.C. by which Octavian acquired the title Augustus and more importantly retained *imperium proconsulare* without leaving the city of Rome. Through *imperium proconsulare* Augustus could retain his armies and control of the major provinces (Spain, Gaul, and Syria) while still acting as a civil magistrate at Rome since he did not lose his *imperium* upon entering the *pomerium*.¹³ Pompey had functioned in similar fashion during the later years of the First Triumvirate when he commanded the Spanish provinces from Rome and offered an important model for the *princeps*. *Imperium proconsulare* constitutes one of the two sources on which the newly emerging principate rested. The second imperial prerogative *potestas tribunicia*, granted during the second settlement of 23 B.C., allowed the *princeps* to veto any legislation in the senate.¹⁴ It was from these two sources Augustus and his successors derived the power to govern the empire. Thus, January 13 has important relevance to imperial ideology.

While Ovid's panegyric for January 13 offers great praise to Augustus, he seems greatly out of place in his own panegyric. Ovid's choice to include a long list of republican heroes culminating with Fabius Maximus Cunctator, an ancestor of Ovid's friend Paullus Fabius

¹³ Syme (1939) 313-315 explains that the first settlement granted *imperium proconsulare* to Augustus, which made him simultaneously an *imperator* in charge of the most important provinces and a civil magistrate. Syme (1978) 22 suggests that Octavian did not receive the title of Augustus until January 16, and thus Ovid has conflated the two dates in his *Fasti*.

¹⁴ Syme (1939) 336 In the second settlement of 23 B.C., Augustus received both *potestas tribunicia* and *imperium proconsulare* over the whole empire, a concession that made the other proconsuls throughout the Roman world mere legates to the *princeps*.

Maximus and the example par excellence of the patient and elegiac leader, ensures tension within the narrative when Ovid finally arrives at Augustus' accomplishments. For how can Augustus, who was never a great military leader, surpass not one but all the men on this list? Fabius Maximus, Ovid's elegiac foil to Augustus given his final placement in the list, had the foresight and patience during the Second Punic War to execute a strategy of not committing to battle with Hannibal in order to starve the Carthaginians into abandoning Italy. Despite the protests of his peers in the Senate and accusations of cowardice, Fabius' decision proved effective and prevented Rome from more humiliating and exhausting defeats while the Scipiones in Spain developed a strategy for combatting Hannibal's tactics.

As Ovid approaches this entry, he invokes religious language, *Idibus in magni castus Iovis aede sacerdos/ semimaris flammis viscera libat ovis* (587-588) much like Tibullus (2.5.1-2) and Propertius (4.6.1-2) in their panegyrics. Ovid turns immediately to the source of the celebration, Augustus' "restoration of the provinces" and the Senate's conferment of the honorific title Augustus on Octavian Caesar (589-590).¹⁵ Ovid says that no man in Roman history had ever received a title as great as Augustus, *nulli nomina tanta viro* (592), nor conquered as many people (599-600). His comment on Augustus' great power, however, rather confirms the unusual nature of his reign than lauds him as a great leader.¹⁶ At this point the narrator goes through a long list of republican heroes and the *aetia* for their mortal cognomina (593-606). Unlike

¹⁵ Green (2004) 593-616 notes the difficulty in determining who the *dux* of line 613 and the *heres* of 615 are. Since we have seen later additions in book 1, I am inclined to agree with Green that the *dux* is Tiberius and the *heres* Germanicus. Therefore, Ovid revised this section after his exile. With that said, the confusion as to who is the emperor at this time, supports my contention that Ovid's panegyrics for the principate seek to laud the imperial program while re-appropriating some of its greatness for the poet's own project regardless of who may occupy the principate.

¹⁶ Boyle (2003) 31 believes that Ovid's entry for January 13 calls into question the restoration of the republic and the civic virtues promoted by Augustus, whom Ovid paints as no traditional Roman leader. Boyle (2003) 216 suggests that cognomen Augustus far from being traditional attempts to associate Octavian with a god.

Octavian Ovid chooses to honor the republican system.¹⁷ Amongst this list Ovid includes the more famous figures Scipio Africanus, the Metelli, Drusus, Pompey, Julius Caesar, and Fabius Maximus. His choice to culminate the list with Fabius Maximus Cunctator indicates his close connection to the Fabii and his preference for the patient and elegiac leadership of Cunctator, who never let his pride overwhelm his own judgment and guided Rome through its greatest disaster. The reader implicitly compares Augustus to all these heroes and while acknowledging his power finds him out of place amongst the hardy and diligent men of republican Rome. While Ovid's narrative gives the basics of the entry and its origins, by lingering on the lengthy list of republican predecessors he once more reorients the focus of the celebration away from one man and back to the glory of Roman history as a whole.¹⁸ The emphasis on republican history leaves the reader nostalgic for a time when Rome had many great leaders and contributors rather than one.¹⁹ Much like Propertius 4.10, this panegyric to Augustus indirectly reminds the reader that despite his titles Augustus was never a great military commander like his uncle and the other republican leaders mentioned. Likewise, the power given to him surpasses all things mortal and seemingly brings him into potentially sacrilegious territory, *sed tamen humanis celebrantur*

¹⁷ Tacitus mentions that after the consuls Hirtius and Pansa had died during the siege of Mutina Octavian marched on Rome with their consular legions and forced an unwilling Senate to name him consul (*Annales* 1.10.10-11).

¹⁸ Ovid here employs an elegiac tactic found also in Propertius 4 and the *Metamorphoses* in which the poet takes an inclusive approach to his history and allows a myriad of voices to contribute to the poetic project. This elegiac technique allows the poet to offer his own resistance to the new emerging state, whose preservation required the *princeps* to re-appropriate the collective virtues of the republic for his own person. Cf. Fears (1980) 98-109. In Propertius 4 foreigners, astrologers, gods, soldiers, and women all offer different contributions to the whole that is 1st century B.C. Rome. Throughout his *Metamorphoses* Ovid takes up familiar stories from new perspectives. For instance, while the poem contains a little *Aeneid* in books 13 and 14, Ovid gives little attention to Aeneas himself and particularly avoids any scenes treated in Vergil's *Aeneid*. His treatment of the cycle shatters the coherence of Aeneas' activities as Ovid continually injects other mythological stories into books 13 and 14. Through this broken narrative style, Ovid presents Aeneas for what he is; one of a long series of important mythological and historical characters responsible for the eventual successes of the Augustan age.

¹⁹ Republican Rome took great pride that many men had contributed to the city's success. The historian Livy suggests that Rome could have resisted Alexander the Great and his Macedonian army better than the cities of Greece and the east since the city had so many great men with which to confront one superior general (*Ab Urbe Condita* 9.17-19).

honoribus omnes/ hic socium summo cum Iove nomen habet (607-608).²⁰ Thus, Ovid's entry for January 13 while appearing to honor Augustus portrays his reign as inconsistent with the history of government at Rome under the republic. Elegy, like the diverse city of Rome, stands as the multifaceted genre by comparison to the exclusive atmosphere in epic.²¹

While Ovid's panegyric to Augustus for January 13 simultaneously praises the *princeps* while revealing the extra constitutionality of his position, his entry for February 5 (2.119-148) celebrating the conferment of the title *Pater patriae* on February 5, 2 B.C. depicts Augustus as the most epic of all subjects surpassing even the brutal Romulus.²² In order to properly

²⁰ Fears (1980) 101ff explains that in the late republic dynasts like Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, and finally Octavian slowly attached to their own persons republican virtues like *victoria* and *libertas* traditionally bestowed by Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the state as whole. This process, however, took many years. During the Antonine age, the transformation reached its fullest form. Therefore, at the time of this panegyric's composition, Augustus was only beginning an imperial appropriation that would take several centuries. Many of Augustus' contemporaries, particularly those of noble republican families, would have found some of his actions completely sacrilegious. Tacitus reports that some people thought Augustus had usurped honors properly due the gods alone by requiring that *flamines* and priests maintain images of him along the other gods in the temples, *nihil deorum honoribus relictum cum se templis et effigie numinum per flamines et sacerdotes coli vellet* (*Annales* 1.10.25-26).

²¹ The heroic driven model of epic while attempting to create pan ethnic literature must focus on the deeds of the aristocratic heroes. Nonconformist characters like the iambic Thersites in the *Iliad* are treated as outcasts in the epic world (*Iliad* 2.211-277). Thersites' ugly form reminds the audience of the misshapen characters of Greek iambic like the bow-legged general preferred by Archilochus,

*Ὀὐ φίλεω μέγαν στρατηγὸν οὐδὲ διαπεπλεγμένον
οὐδὲ βοστρύχοισι γαῦρον οὐδ' ὑπεξυρημένον·
ἀλλὰ μοι μικρὸς τις εἶη καὶ περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν
ῥοϊκός, ἀσφαλεὺς βεβηκὼς ποσσὶ, καρδίης πλέως.*

Fr. 60

Nagy (1990) 17 suggests that the confrontation between Odysseus and Thersites (*Iliad* 2.211-277) illustrates the ancient tension between poetry of blame (iambic) and praise (epic). Thersites' tendency to mock his leaders associates him with the two great iambic poets Archilochus and Hipponax. Marks (2005) believes that despite his mistreatment Thersites belongs to the elite class. He explains that the Homeric poems do allow for some development of class conflict but only in an "implicit way." In the Homeric poems the bards through so called "tis-speeches" present only collective opinions of the *plethos* or common people. Thus, epic while it is pan ethnic endorses the individual perspectives of the aristocrats alone.

²² Although late republican Romans viewed both Romulus and Camillus as *patres patriae*, Ovid's choice to pass over Camillus drives home the point that Augustus while much greater than Rome's first king has nothing in common with republican leaders like Camillus, who legally obtained and preserved their *imperia* at the discretion of the Senate.

appreciate Ovid's panegyric of the epic Augustus, we must examine how the poet usually characterizes epic and elegy in his poems.

In his corpus Ovid often marks epic as a heavy (*gravis*) meter while he sees the elegiac couplet as light (*levis*) and elegant (*decora*).²³ As Ovid begins this present panegyric, he calls this title the greatest honor recorded in the *Fasti*, *maximus hic fastis accumulatur honor* (122), which by extension would make it the greatest honor ever obtained in Roman history. Instead of offering votive prayers, our narrator turns to Homer for inspiration, since if the poet wishes to properly laud his epic emperor, he will need the same strength and inspiration required to hymn Achilles, the greatest of all epic heroes (119-120).²⁴ Ovid like Propertius at 4.1.57-60 fears he lacks the talent to sing so epic a song, *deficit ingenium, maioraque viribus urgent* (123). The reader will notice that his modesty clashes with the bold pronouncements about his own poetic immortality that follow the panegyric to Augustus in the *Metamorphoses* (15.871ff).

While in the panegyric that closes the *Metamorphoses* Ovid attempts to re-appropriate some of Augustus' success for his own epic poem, here the poet grounds his fears of failure in a statement about genre declaring that his meter cannot sustain the weight of his subject and that Augustus requires hexameters for an adequate treatment, *quid volui demens elegis imponere tantum/ ponderis heroi res erat ista pedis* (125-126). The narrator's reservations about his project reopen the problem of the elegiac *recusatio* that Ovid appeared to have reconciled in book 1 (13-14). Here the epic weight (*ponderis*) of Augustus threatens to topple Ovid's puny elegiac couplets. The elegiac couplet can scarcely contain the epic Augustus and offers poor prospects as

²³ In *Amores* 1.1 Ovid calls epic the heavy meter (*gravi numero*) and in *Amores* 3.1 a personified image of Elegy, described as elegant at 10 (*decoris*), depicts her opponent Tragedy as composed of weighty words capable of crushing her, '*Quid gravibus verbis, animosa Tragoedia, dixit, / me premis? an numquam non gravis esse potes* (35-36).

²⁴ I follow the oral theory of composition for the Homeric poems (Lord 1960, Nagy 1979). Therefore, although I do not regard "Homer" as an individual poet, I will refer here to a certain "Homer" since Ovid conceives of him as a single poet.

a meter for this kind of panegyric.²⁵ The overstatement of Augustus' greatness parallels the weight discrepancy in the elegiac couplet caused by the alteration of the heavy but quick hexameter with the lighter and slower pentameter.²⁶

Before the narrator begins his twelve line comparison between Romulus and Augustus (133-144), he makes a quick generalization about Augustus' power saying that just as Jupiter rules the heavens as *pater deorum* the emperor reigns over the whole earth as *pater hominum* (131-132). While the comparison seems relatively innocuous, upon reflection it creates an epic controversy. The great epic leader Augustus has risen to such ranks that he now threatens the titles of Jupiter, who throughout Greek and Roman epic receives the title *pater deorum hominumque*.²⁷ Our narrator turns quickly from these comments to his comparison of Romulus the first *pater patriae* and Augustus the most powerful ruler in the world. The uneven treatment in Ovid's comparison parallels the discrepancy between the poet's hexameters and pentameters

²⁵ Cf. Wallace-Hadrill (1987) 228-229 and Hinds (1992). Some may wonder why Ovid would create panegyrics to Augustus in the *Fasti* if his meter was not up to the task. I suggest that Ovid's hope to create a genre-bending poem on Roman history required him to cover many Augustan achievements. It is not so much that elegiac couplets are particularly inappropriate for panegyrics but rather that they are unable to sustain the sort of long narratives necessary to properly treat Roman history.

²⁶ Halporn (1963) 10-12 The hexameter line of the elegiac couplet tends to seem quicker than the pentameter since the hexameter line contains clean breaks within one *metron* (*caesurae*) while the pentameter must slow down to account for breaks between two *metra*, (*diaereses*).

²⁷ Cf. Fears (1980) 101ff for a great discussion of how the dynasts of the first century B.C. dealt with the image of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the protector of the Roman republic and her empire. We know that during the age of Augustus, the emperor maintained two huts of Romulus, one on the Palatine and one on the Capitoline (Vitruvius 2.1.5). Scholars have explained the presence of the two hills in different ways. Balland (1984) 74 sees the placement of a hut on the Capitoline as an attempt by Augustus to downplay the loss of significance the Capitoline hill underwent because of his building projects (temple of Apollo Palatinus) and renewed emphasis on the Palatine. Edwards (1996) 37 concurs suggesting that the hut on the Capitoline smoothed over the loss of religious functions on the Capitoline. Rea (2007a) 100-105 believes that the Capitoline retained much of its religious significance in the age of Augustus and sees the emperor's decision to place a hut near the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (guarantor of the republican empire) as an attempt to connect Romulus with the political and religious significance of the Capitoline since this hill preserved the memory of Rome's rise from a small town to a world capital. I think that Augustus simultaneously sought to associate himself with Romulus and Jupiter Optimus Maximus through the placement of two huts while at the same time diminishing the significance of both Romulus and Jupiter by putting increased emphasis on Aeneas and Apollo.

as the narrator makes Augustus the greater and more active of the two at every point. In an Ovidian twist, the narrator records Romulus' deeds in the hexameter while singing of Augustus' accomplishments in the successive line of pentameter. This setup causes the narrator to elegeize Augustus in order to constrain this most epic of subjects in the light and narrow pentameter, much like the poet's approach to Hercules during the *Lupercalia*.²⁸ By placing Augustus in the pentameter line, he slows down the narrative to emphasize the strengths of the new *pater patriae* picking up speed in the next hexameter when he once more returns to the deeds of Romulus.

Augustus bests the epic king Romulus at every point even while languishing in the slower pentameter. The narrator lists Romulus' accomplishments at lightning speed in the hexameter but gives a slower treatment to Augustus to show that a true refashioning of Rome like that of Augustus requires more time. While Romulus ruled over a small region in Latium, Augustus controls the whole world (135-136). Augustus has as much control over earth as Jupiter does in heaven (137). The sentiment like line 132 borders on sacrilege as Augustus is encroaching on the power of the chief god under whose protection the Roman republic grew. Romulus captured women for his city while Augustus forces them to pursue chastity (139-140).²⁹ Ovid continues to paint Augustus as sacrilegious when he notes that while Romulus' father Mars obtained for him deification Augustus deified his own father Caesar (144).³⁰ Ovid presents Augustus as more

²⁸ By placing Augustus and his deeds in the lines of pentameter, the elegiac Ovid has once more attempted to re-appropriate some of this Augustan greatness for his own poem. If he succeeds in his elegiac project, he will have presented an elegiac model of Roman identity to rival the epic centered paradigm of Vergil's *Aeneid*.

²⁹ Ovid may be suggesting this point ironically since Augustus took Livia from her husband Tiberius Claudius while she was pregnant, *abducta Neroni uxor et consulti per ludibrium pontifices an concepto necdum edito partu rite nuberet* (*Annales* 1.10.20-22).

³⁰ Augustus probably did not appreciate Ovid pointing out that he owed everything to his name and specifically his adoption by the dictator Caesar. This was not even the first time the poet had dared to do so, *ne foret hic igitur mortali semine cretus, / ille deus faciendus erat*, (*Metamorphoses* 760-761). Zanker (1988) 36 points out that Octavian made good use of the title *divi filius* and even minted a coin in 40 B.C. bearing both his likeness and the expression *divi f.*

powerful and epic than even the first king of Rome and reminds the audience that Rome has evolved a long way from not just the early monarchy but even the more recent republic.

I now turn from Ovid's panegyrics for Augustus to his *aetia* for two very important Augustan monuments, the *Ara Pacis* and the temple of Mars Ultor. Like his treatments of the emperor himself, Ovid's approach to Augustan monuments will have consequences for understanding how the *princeps* fits into Ovid's program for the *Fasti*. While Ovid's etiological song on the *Ara Pacis* emphasizes the peace of the Augustan age, the warlike details he adds mark this peace as not only novel but incongruent with Augustus' presentation of his reign as a return to the golden age. Once more Ovid makes use of the elegiac tendency to exploit the dissonance between ideology and reality under the Augustan regime by depicting the *pax Augustana* in a novel way and avoiding idyllic scenes of peace presented in Greek poetry.³¹

In his entry for January 30, Ovid commemorates the dedication of the *Ara Pacis* on this day in 9 B.C. The structure stands as the most visible symbol of the *pax Augustana* and consists of an altar surrounded by a wall enclosed in a set of larger walls. The inner walls contain images of sacrificed cow skulls called *bucrania* while the outer walls contain a number of reliefs showing processions of the senate and imperial family, Aeneas, Romulus, Remus, and the so called *Italia* or *Tellus* relief that depicts a scene of golden age ideality. Ovid gives the origin of this altar to peace at the outset of the entry, the victory over Antony at Actium, by presenting it in hymnic form and personifying the deity Peace, *frondibus Actiacis comptos redimita capillos,/ Pax, ades et toto mitis in orbe mane* (1.711-712). His sixteen line passage never once mentions Augustus, the victor of Actium and dedicator of the altar. Like Tibullus 2.5 Ovid here praises

³¹ Green (2004) 234-236 suggests that Ovid alters traditional Greek motifs of an idealized peace by recalling the implements of war needed to preserve peace. It seems to me that Ovid is intent on pointing out the hardships required to preserve this new *pax Augustana*.

Augustan peace without reference to the man himself.³² Besides the comment on Actium, the closest he comes to naming the imperial family is a vague reference to the descendants of Aeneas (*Aeneadae*) that seems to indicate the Romans at large and not just the Julian family.³³

After announcing the *aition* for Augustan peace (1.709-712), the narrator turns to a description of peace under Augustus. At this point Ovid mentions the many imperial policies necessary for preserving the *princeps*' peace including constantly maintaining the implements of war and creating fear amongst your enemies (715-718). This sort of activity while not constituting war properly is characteristic of the epic soldier, whose active life contrasts strongly with the sluggishness of the elegist.³⁴ Likewise, Ovid's suggestion that Augustan peace requires arms mimics the incongruent images on the monument itself.³⁵ Multiple scenes around the altar depict cows; one resting comfortably in the *Italia* relief, another heading towards the sacrifice, and finally the *bucrania* decorate the inner precinct walls. The scenes seem to suggest that in order to produce peace for the cow, the cow itself must die. Upon considering the great loss of life that occurred during the civil war, the viewer may come to the unnerving conclusion that the *Ara Pacis* represents the blood sacrifice required to bring about the *pax Augustana*. In other

³² I follow Gosling (1987) 336-337 who suggests that Tibullus' omission of Augustus' name does not suggest any premeditated malice but rather stems from Tibullus' own natural detachment from politics and his desire in this poem to praise his patron Messalla and his son Messalinus, whose induction into the *quindecimviri* offers the opportunity for this rare public elegy. Tibullus' choice to praise another prominent family of the period would not anger Augustus since the emperor hoped that men of the leading families would adopt his own virtues.

³³ One may recall that Lucretius calls Venus, *Aeneadum genetrix*, (*De Rerum Natura* 1.1). By extension, Romans from the city of Venus may be regarded as *Aeneadae*. Boyle (2003) 263 sees *ducibus* (714) as a reference to the whole imperial household and sees irony in Ovid's association of peace with the emperor's family, which was experiencing great discord at this time as rivals struggled to gain the Augustus' favor and receive the title of successor. For Boyle, Ovid is pointing out the incoherence of the image of peace presented by the altar and the actual realities of the day at Rome.

³⁴ Tibullus suggests he has no interest in the constant vigilance and preparation necessary for warfare and uses it as point of departure for explaining his preference for elegy (1.1.3-4). At *Amores* 3.1.16, Tragedy calls Ovid the elegist a sluggish poet (*lente poeta*).

³⁵ Green (2004) 709-722.

words Augustan peace does not entail any return to a golden age but rather a step towards increased security that can only result from a strong imperial system.³⁶

While Ovid gives an artful epitaph to this Augustan monument, his concentration on the implements of war and vigilance needed to preserve the Augustan peace contrasts sharply with his elegiac model of leadership depicted throughout the poem, which values cunningness, patience, and forethought more highly than brute force. The career choices of Ovid and his fellow elegists, who preferred to pursue private, love poetry, clash profoundly with the imperial vigilance celebrated by Ovid in his entry for the *Ara Pacis* suggesting that while Augustus may rule the world his model of leadership is not as effective as the one endorsed by Ovid in the *Fasti*.³⁷

Like the *Ara Pacis*, the temple of Mars Ultor had important purposes for Augustan ideology. Therefore, by looking at Ovid's treatment of the temple, I hope to show again how the poet will make use of imperial imagery. On May 12 Ovid gives an *aetion* for the temple of Mars Ultor (5.545-598).³⁸ The entry seems to violate Ovid's commitment to sing of Caesar's altars but not his arms, but the narrator cannot explain the origin of the *Forum Augusti* without explaining

³⁶ Elsner (1991) 58ff has pointed out that the juxtaposition of the happy cow in the *Italia* relief and the images of dead cow skulls reveal holes in Augustan ideology since the sacrifice of the cow prevents it from participating in the new system that the animal's ritualistic sacrifice has brought to fruition. Green (2008) discusses the changes in the Roman view toward animal sacrifice during the late republic especially among Pythagorean cults. One can see opposition to human and animal sacrifice in Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* 1.62-78 and 5.1161-1203. He points out that the Augustan regime on the other hand presented animal sacrifice as traditional and a sign of the great fertility of the Augustan age.

³⁷ Cf. Tibullus (1.1.3-4) and (*Fasti* 2.9-10) where both poets reject *servitium militiae* in favor of *servitium amoris* and *servitium laudis* respectively.

³⁸ Suetonius specifically names three monuments when discussing the building program of Augustus, the *Forum Augusti*, the temple of Apollo Palatinus, and the temple of Jupiter Tonans, *publica opera plurima extruxit, e quibus uel praecipua: forum cum aede Martis Vltoris, templum Apollinis in Palatio, aedem Tonantis Iouis in Capitolio*, (Augustus 29.1).

how it was vowed.³⁹ At the time of the *Fasti's* composition, the temple had become associated with two military actions. Before the battle of Philippi in October of 42 B.C., Octavian supposedly promised a temple to Mars the Avenger if the god allowed him to defeat the armies of Brutus and Cassius. Besides the battle of Philippi, the temple had a connection to the return of Crassus' standards from the Parthians since the complex received that delegation from Parthia in 20 B.C.⁴⁰ By associating the return of the standards with the temple, Augustus is attempting to shift the temple from a monument of the civil war to a symbol of Julian power, and to give an historical justification to what was in effect an extra-constitutional monarchy.

In his depiction of the temple, Ovid will make use of epic diction to highlight the larger than mortal size of the complex, the fitting accent to a forum constructed by a man who portrayed himself as a living god. This imperial forum gives a complete visual representation of Augustan ideology, which sought to connect Augustus through Iulus to the whole history of rulers at Rome and stands as one of the most important monuments for Augustan propaganda (5.563-570).⁴¹ Along the left portico, the temple contained monuments to the great men of the Julian line (563-564). Opposite it appear the statues of the *Summi Viri*, great men of the Roman republic (565-566). The two porticoes presented the whole lineage of power at Rome while the center of the temple contained a giant statue of Augustus in military garb. The temple clearly presents Augustus as not just one of the great *triumphatores* at Rome but the inevitable destiny

³⁹ Newlands (1995) 89 points out that Ovid's treatment of the temple of Mars Ultor has a genuine ring and does not resemble the mocking tone he employs when speaking of war in Book 3. Boyle (2003) 210 believes that Augustan propaganda created the idea that Octavian made a vow to Mars Ultor before the Battle of Philippi. If he did, why did he wait so long to fulfill the vow? He made a vow to Apollo in 36 B.C. before his victory over Sextus Pompeius and managed to complete the temple of Apollo Palatinus by 28 B.C.

⁴⁰ Newlands (1995) 88.

⁴¹ Zanker (1988) 210, Scheid (1992) 128.

of nearly a thousand years of Italian history. The enormous statue of Augustus proclaims him as the greatest of all these men and the perfect culmination to Roman history. One can see why a poet like Ovid treats Augustus as a living god and one too grand for his meager elegiac couplets. The *princeps* in an attempt to legitimize his position with grand building projects had exceeded all mortal decorum.⁴² By the later years of his life, Augustus had acquired every possible distinction and was in a sense a living god.⁴³ The temple of Mars towers above Rome just as the specter of Augustus' imperial program hangs over Ovid's small elegiac couplets, threatening to crush the individual voices of his elegiac poem. If these panegyrics to Augustus must match in verse the grandeur of his building program, this great distance between the epic and elegiac material will cause his genre-bending experiment to perish utterly.

In his first mention of the temple, our narrator through the use of the periphrastic in line 552 (*conspicienda*) describes the sanctuary as a structure that even the god Mars cannot afford to miss viewing. The depiction once more makes Augustus beyond mortal since his *forum* will impress even the Olympian gods. Mars is an all-powerful god and Augustus' temple to him matches the size of the epic god, *et deus est ingens et opus* (553). The complex is so massive it could house trophies from the Olympian victory over the Giants, a frequent topic in Augustan poetry, *digna Giganteis haec sunt delubra tropaeis* (555).⁴⁴ The narrator then turns to the temple's function as a warning to the world of Roman power (557-558).⁴⁵ The complex houses many statues of heroes: the narrator sees Aeneas burdened (*oneratum*) with the weight of his

⁴² Tacitus notes that some thought Augustus had gone much too far by allowing priests to maintain images of him in the temples during his lifetime, *nihil deorum honoribus relictum cum se templis et effigie numinum per flamines et sacerdotes coli vellet* (*Annales* 1.10.24-26).

⁴³ Ovid addresses him as a god on multiple occasions in his *Tristia*. See for instance 1.1.20, 1.2.3-4, and 1.3.37.

⁴⁴ Tibullus 2.5.7-10, and Horace's Ode 3.4.50ff both mention the *Gigantomachy* with clear associations to Augustus' victory at Actium.

⁴⁵ Notice that Augustan propaganda made use of threats to maintain "peace" as Ovid mentions during the entry on the *Ara Pacis* (1.715).

father and the palladium, (563), the Alban kings (564), and Romulus carrying the spoils of the slain Acron.

*hinc videt Aenean oneratum pondere caro
et tot Iuleae nobilitatis avos;
hinc videt Iliaden umeris ducis arma ferentem,
claraque dispositis acta subesse viris.*
563-566

To review, the narrator has presented Aeneas enduring the fall of Troy, Romulus carrying the *spolia opimia*, and countless other kings and republican leaders at the moments of their ultimate triumphs. He, however, has the temerity to describe the whole temple as greater because of the presence of Augustus Caesar's name, *et visum lecto Caesare maius opus* (568). Can any one man really so greatly outshine the entire collection of *summi viri* enshrined in the temple that the Ovidian reader would consider the narrator reliable in this statement? I suspect not and for this reason believe that Ovid's panegyric to Augustus is intentionally overblown so as to match the bombastic pomp of Mars' temple and the disparity between his epic topics and his elegiac couplets.⁴⁶ By inflating Mars' epic temple, Ovid subtly leads the reader to the truth that Rome's greatness emerged as result of the constant efforts of diligent men and can never be reduced to the achievement of one man.

⁴⁶ Compare the hyperbolic language in this passage from the *Fasti* to the opening panegyric to Nero in Lucan's *Pharsalia* in which the poet warns the emperor that when he becomes a star he ought not to lean too far toward either pole lest his immense gravity topple the whole universe.

*aetheris immensi partem si presseris unam,
sentiet axis onus. librati pondera caeli
orbe tene medio;*
55-58

Bartsch (1994) 1-3 discusses how Roman audiences at spectacles often voiced their displeasure with the current emperor by seeking political concessions or cheering for rivals of the emperor. She points out that Nero's decision to go on stage and perform caused a reversal of roles. The audience now within the gaze of a performing emperor could no longer offer their applause based on the aesthetics of performance but like actors were forced to laud the emperor's performance. Ovid like these Neronian audiences cannot show any outward contempt for Augustus and reveals his displeasure with Augustus' revolution through the hyperbolic rhetoric contained in the panegyric.

CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION

I have attempted in this project to analyze how Ovid alters the epic-driven model of Roman identity that crystallized in the works of Livy and Vergil after Augustus' victory at Actium. Ovid's elegiac model emphasizes the historical value to the city of elegiac virtues such as diligence, patience, foresight, and piety, the crown virtue of Vergil's Aeneas. Ovid seeks to elevate the whole genre of elegy, establish himself as the elegiac equal to the epic Vergil, and thus emphasize his significant contribution as an elegist to the forging of a new elegiac identity for Rome. No project gave Ovid a better opportunity to treat Roman history and issues of Roman identity than the *Fasti*. I have shown how Tibullus 2.5 and Propertius 4 proved to Ovid that he could tackle a poem on Roman political themes in his elegiac couplets without abandoning this notion of Callimachean aesthetics or undermining his credibility by appearing too deferential to the imperial family.

Through a critical analysis of the origins of Roman elegy and its Callimachean aesthetic, I suggest that Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid all found ways to compose elegiac poetry on epic topics and even include panegyrics to the imperial family and friends. They succeeded in doing this without losing their credibility as elegiac poets, marked as they were by leisure and life in the pursuit of erotic thrills and standing in opposition to the epic model of leadership promoted by Augustus and confirmed by Livy and Vergil. Tibullus 2.5 while offering praise to Augustus' patron deity Apollo and celebrating the investiture of Messalinus never mentions the emperor himself giving thanks for the peace that followed Actium without naming its biggest proponent. His panegyric reveals a poet hesitant to speak of the civil wars and not fully prepared to leave off entirely from elegiac themes despite his intentions (111-114).

My discussion of the importance of Propertius 4 as a predecessor to Ovid's *Fasti* concludes that Propertius 4, like the *Fasti*, creates a Roman *Aitia* on various important city sites. In a typical elegiac characteristic, Propertius allows the Roman people and her monuments to speak for herself. The poet shows the reader many different types of people including foreigners, astrologers, soldiers, women, kings, lovers, and farmers. In his presentation all these people contribute to what makes the city of Rome special or rather what constitutes Roman identity. His inclusive approach contrasts sharply with Vergilian epic where the narrator often speaks exclusively of aristocratic men. Readers of elegy in general will find that Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid all tend to emphasize the popular elements of festivals while downplaying certain elements of Augustan propaganda, which Syme and Holleman argue sought to keep women in their place while incorporating municipal men into the Roman aristocracy.¹

My analysis of the *Fasti* specifically examines the roles of 2 gods (Janus and Hercules) and one family (the Fabii) in the course of Roman history. The Janus narrative reveals a patient and elegiac god who ruled over a primitive period of peace and used his elegiac craftiness and forethought to save Rome from the Sabine attack without directly confronting Juno, who was at the time aiding the Sabine siege. Ovid's description of Janus during the Sabine attack offers a model for how to approach powerful agents like a god or say a soon to be deified emperor. When handling such a powerful figure, one must use his wits and patience to show indirect opposition much like Fabius Maximus Cunctator's strategy against Hannibal.

The story of Hercules and Omphale presented on the Lupercalia offers a parallel to the author's genre-bending project. When Hercules and Omphale switch clothes, their actions are a

¹ Syme (1939) 414 and Holleman (1973) 260. Augustus' model appears much more exclusive than the paradigm depicted by the elegiac poets where women and foreigners contribute to Rome's greatness. Vergil's *Aeneid* and Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* helped codify this inclusive model.

nice foil to Ovid's genre-bending poem on the calendar. The narrator tries unsuccessfully to restrain the epic Hercules in his meager elegiac couplets, but his massive body bursts through all of Omphale's elegiac clothes. Hercules, then, stands as a physical embodiment of Ovid's project, where he attempts to restrain epic men and events in his elegiac couplets. As with Hercules, Ovid has trouble constraining Augustus and complains that his couplets lack the force to properly honor the *princeps* (2.119ff). The character of Hercules like Augustus threatens to topple his puny elegiac couplets.

The Fabii offer a contrasting portrait and negative *exemplum* to the elegiac leaders presented in the poem. Unlike their descendant Cunctator, the rash actions of the Fabii lead to the destruction of the whole family and their attendants save one boy left at home, the ancestor of Cunctator. Ovid uses quick epic narration to describe the Fabii's maneuvers, but it is their quickness which causes their downfall since they lack elegiac virtues like patience and cunning of which their descendant had plenty, *quo ruitis, generosa domus* (2.225).

Chapter 4 follows Romulus' transformation in the *Fasti* as he moves from epic brute to pious brother and contemplative leader. The transformation takes place across the poem as the epic and rash hero of books 1 and 2 becomes the pious brother Romulus who honors his dead brother with the *Remuria* in book 5. In many ways Ovid's comments about Romulus and particularly his deification foreshadow the imminent apotheosis of Augustus, who was at the time a god in all but name.²

Chapter 5 analyzes Ovid's relationship with the emperor and his role in the *Fasti* where Ovid gives him two "panegyrics" one for the first settlement (1.587-616) and another for the conferment of *pater patriae* (2.119-148). He also gives *aitia* in two entries for important

² The narrator of the *Ars Amatoria* uses divine language to describe Augustus and his grandson Gaius as the youth prepared to head to Parthia in 2 B.C. (1.181-204).

Augustan monuments, the *Ara Pacis* on January 30 (1.709-724) and the temple of Mars Ultor on May 12 (5.545-598). Throughout the work Ovid characterizes Augustus as the most epic of men surpassing a whole list of republican leaders including Fabius Maximus Cunctator (1.593-606) and requiring the voice of a Homeric bard in order to properly honor this new Achilles (2.119-120). Likewise, Ovid's description of the *Ara Pacis* dwells on implements of war and the vigilance required to maintain this new "peace" implying that this peace in no way resembles peace during the republican period. Finally, through exaggeration and hyperbolic rhetoric Ovid brings the epic characterization of Augustus to ridiculous heights by describing the grandeur of the temple of Mars Ultor. Like the temple itself, Augustus was a huge figure in Rome and cast his shadow over everything including Ovid's poetry. Ovid's choice to retain his knight's ring and remove himself from a possible seat in the senate no doubt irritated Augustus who longed to bring in new municipal men to the Senate who would be loyal to him alone. In the end only hyperbole and exaggeration can offer any "criticism" of the imperial system. Like Janus and Fabius Cunctator, Ovid must cloak his opposition to the imperial state in craftiness and forethought. If he wished to contribute to the dialogue on Roman identity started in the 20's B.C., he had to tread more carefully than his predecessors and co-opt aspects of the emperor's program without seeming to directly undermine it. Ovid in the *Fasti* seeks above all to create a Rome built on the virtues and talents of many men and women throughout the city's history and not the efforts of one man or his family.

It remains to evaluate how effective Ovid was at altering concepts of Roman identity and leadership. Despite Ovid's complaints, a poet can in fact use the elegiac couplet to construct panegyric as we have seen in Tibullus 2.5. Ovid's first priority in the *Fasti* does not pertain to the emperor and his family. While Augustus' accomplishments litter the *Fasti*, there exist many

other important dates and people from Rome's 700 plus year history on the Roman calendar. Ovid's *Fasti* like the works of his elegiac predecessors tends to emphasize the popular aspects of festivals and monuments over the imperial associations. One may debate how sincere Ovid's panegyrics to Augustus are, but such discussions are somewhat moot since Ovid had to deal with the presence of Augustus whether he wanted to or not. Augustus' rule while violent and turbulent at its inception gained wide support once he proved he could maintain peace. It is not, therefore, in Ovid's interest to inveigh against the imperial state directly. Like Janus, Fabius Maximus Cunctator, and other elegiac characters in the *Fasti*, he must use his cunning and patience to survive these imperial times. In so much as Ovid shows irreverence towards much of Rome's legends and history, he seems to undermine imperial propaganda which seeks to persuade the people that this is the one and only path Rome was destined to take under Octavian Caesar. The statuary at the temple of Mars Ultor connects Augustus with all the early origins of Rome from Aeneas to Gaius Caesar and the other republican commanders. The message is clear: Roman history has been building towards this most splendid age of Augustus. Therefore, the elegiac concept of strength through diversity contrasts diametrically with the Augustus notion of exclusivity which is seen throughout Vergil's *Aeneid* where only free men participate in the community. Likewise, the shield of Aeneas depicts Augustus in the same manner as the images in the temple of Mars as the ultimate destiny of Rome. If Ovid set out to alter Vergil's model of leadership as I suggest, the extant work we have leaves something to be desired. First, he promised twelve books, and we have only six. Likewise, he admits that his exile "broke" his composition of the *Fasti*, and one notices passages in book 1 that he could not have constructed before A.D. 15 and more likely in A.D. 17. Thus, we must judge the success through the poet's eyes. In this case Ovid cannot claim a complete victory for an unfinished work. I doubt he gave

up on the work because he could not sustain long narratives in elegiac couplets. He had faced that obstacle in every work but the *Metamorphoses*. Perhaps, his isolation from Rome made his project impossible or at least deprived him of the passion to complete this national elegy. How can the poet properly influence Roman identity when he can never again see the city?

LIST OF REFERENCES

Texts

- Alton, E.H., Wormell, D.E.W., and E. Courtney. 1978. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*. Leipzig.
- Barber, E.A. 1960. *Sexti Properti Carmina*. Oxford.
- Clark, A. 1916. *Ciceronis Philippicae*. Oxford.
- Clausen, W.V. 1968. *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturae*. Oxford.
- Conway, R.S. and C.F. Walters. 1955. *Ab Urbe Condita, 1-5*. Oxford.
- _____. 1950. *Ab Urbe Condita, 6-10*. Oxford.
- _____. 1950. *Ab Urbe Condita, 21-25*. Oxford.
- Courtney, E. 1990. *P. Papini Stati Silvae*. Oxford.
- Douglas, A.E. 1966. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Brutus*. Oxford.
- Fisher, C.D. 1906. *Cornelii Taciti Annalium Ab Excessu Divi Augusti Libri*. Oxford.
- _____. 1911. *Cornelii Taciti Historiarum Libri*. Oxford.
- Goetz, Georg and Friedrich Schoell. 1910. *M. Terenti Varronis "De Lingua Latina" Quae Supersunt; Accedunt Gramaticorum Varronis Librorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig.
- Håkanson, Lennart. 1987. *Oratorum et Rhetorum Sententiae, Divisiones, Colores*. Leipzig.
- Heraeus, W. and Iacobus Borovskij. 1976. *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri*. Leipzig.
- Ihm, M. 1908. *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Opera*. Oxford.
- Jacobus, Carolus. 1998. *Dionsysii Halicarnasei Antiquitatum Romanarum quae supersunt*. Stuttgart.
- Keil, Heinrich. 1889. *Res Rusticae*. Leipzig.
- Kenny, E.J. *P. Ovidi Nasonis: Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris*. Oxford.
- Klingner, F. 1959. *Q. Horatii Flacci Opera*. Oxford.
- Krohn, Friedrich. 1912. *Vitruvii de Architectura Libri Decem*. Leipzig.
- Kurfess, A. 1957. *C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina, Iugurtha, Fragmenta Ampliora*. Leipzig.

- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh and N.G. Wilson. 1990. *Sophoclis Fabulae*. Oxford.
- Luck, G. 1967. *Tristia*. Oxford.
- Malcovati, E. 1962. *Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti Operum Fragmenta*. Turin.
- Martin, Joseph. 1969. *T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura Libri Sex*. Leipzig.
- Maurenbrecher, Bertold. 1893. *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum Reliquiae*. Leipzig.
- Murray, Gilbert. 1902. *Euripidis Fabulae*. Oxford.
- Mynors, R.A.B. 1958. *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*. Oxford.
- _____. 1969. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford.
- Oppermann, Hans. 1961. *Aristotelis Athenaiion Politeia*. Stuttgart.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolph. 1965. *Callimachus*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Stadtmüller, Hugo. 1906. *Anthologia Graeca Epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea*. Leipzig.
- Postgate, John Percival. 1915. *Tibulli Aliorumqve Carminum Libri Tres*. Oxford.
- Powell, J.G.F. 2006. *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Re Republica, De Legibus, Cato Maior de senectute, Laelius de Amicitia*. Oxford.
- Richmond, Jan A. 1990. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Ex Ponto Libri Quattuor*. Leipzig.
- Rzach, Aloisius. 1967. *Hesiodi Carmina*. Stuttgart.
- Shackleton Bailey, David Roy. 1997. *M. Annaei Lucani de Bello Civili Libri X*. Leipzig.
- Sintenis, Karl Heinrich. 1881-1902. *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae*. Leipzig.
- Skutsch, Otto. 1985. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford.
- Snell, Bruno and Herwig Maehler. 1987. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*. Leipzig.
- Tarrant, R.J. 2004. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses*. Oxford.
- Von der Muehll, Peter. 1998. *Odyssea*. Leipzig.
- West, M.L. 1992. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*. Oxford.
- _____. 1998. *Ilias*. 2 vols. Leipzig.

Wilson, N.G. 2007. *Aristophanis Fabulae: Tomus 2, Lysistrata, Thesmophoriazusae, Ranae, Ecclesiazusae, Plutus*. Oxford.

Commentaries and Companions

Bömer, Franz. 1957. *Ovid, Die Fasten*. 2 vols. Heidelberg.

Camps, W.A. 1965. *Propertius: Elegies IV*. New York.

Easterling, P.E. and B.M.W. Knox. 1985. *Cambridge History of Classical Literature Vol. 1*. Cambridge.

Fantham, Elaine. 1998. *Fasti Book IV*. Cambridge.

Galinsky, G.K. 2005. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge.

Green, Steven J. 2004. *Ovid, Fasti 1: a Commentary*. Leiden.

Murgatroyd, Paul. 1994. *Tibullus: Elegies 2*. Oxford.

Richardson, L. 1977. *Propertius: Elegies I-IV*. Norman.

Robinson, Matthew. 2011. *A Commentary on Ovid's Fasti, Book 2*. Oxford.

Secondary Sources

Ahl, F. 1984. "The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome." *AJPh* 105.2: 174-208.

Armstrong, James. I. 1958. "The Arming Motif in the *Iliad*." *AJP* 79: (4) 337-354.

Balland, André. 1984. "La casa Romuli au Palatin e au Capitole." *REL* 62: 57-80.

Barchiesi, A. 1991. "Discordant Muses." *PCPhS* 37:1-21.

_____. 1997a. *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley.

Bartsch, Shadi. 1994. *Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*. Cambridge, MA.

Beard, Mary. 1987. "A Complex of Times: No More Sheep on Romulus' Birthday." *PCPhS* 33: 1-15.

Bergren, A. 1982. "Sacred Apostrophe: Re-presentation and Imitation in the Homeric Hymns." *Arethusa* 15: 83-108.

Block, E. 1982. "The Narrator Speaks: Apostrophe in Homer and Vergil." *TAPA* 112:7-22.

Bloom, Harold. 1973. *The Anxiety of Influence: a Theory of Poetry*. Oxford.

- Bowersock, Glen. 1984. "Augustus and the East: the Problem of the Succession." In Millar and Segal (eds.): 169-188.
- Boyle, A. J. 2003. *Ovid and the Monuments: A Poet's Rome*. Victoria.
- Brenk, F. E. 1980. "The Twofold Gleam: Vergil's Golden Age and the Beginning of Empire." *Thought* 55.216: 81-97.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. 1994. *Latin Literature: A History*. Trans. Joseph B. Solodow. Baltimore.
- Cornell, T. J. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars*. London.
- DeBrohun, Jeri Blair. 2003. *Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy*. Ann Arbor.
- Dumézil, Georges. 1970. *Archaic Roman Religion*. Chicago.
- Duval, Y. 1972. "La victoire de Remus à la course des Lupercales chez Ovide *Fastes* 2.359-380." *Caesarodunum* 7: 201-217.
- Edwards, Catharine. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality*. Cambridge.
- _____. 1996. *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*. Cambridge.
- Edwards, Mark W. 1987. *Homer, Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore.
- Elsner, J. 1991. "Cult and Sculpture: Sacrifice in the *Ara Pacis Augustae*." *JRS* 81: 50-61.
- Fantham, Elaine. 1983. "Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*: Sources and Motivation." *HSCP* 87: 185-216.
- _____. 1985. "Ovid, Germanicus, and the Composition of the *Fasti*." *PLLS* 5: 243-282.
- Farney, G. 2007. *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*. Cambridge.
- Favro, Diane. 1996. *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge.
- Fears, J. Rufus. 1980. "Rome: Ideology of Imperial Power." *Thought* 55 (216): 98-109.
- _____. 1981. "Jupiter and Roman Imperial Ideology." *ANRW* II.17.1: 3-141.
- Feeney, D.C. 1984. "The Reconciliations of Juno." *CQ* 34: 179-194.
- _____. 1992. "Si licet et fas est: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate." in Anton Powell, ed. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, 1-25. London.
- _____. 2007. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley.

- Fishwick, D. 1991. "Ovid and Divus Augustus." *CPh* 86.1: 36-41.
- Fox, Matthew. 1996. *Roman Historical Myths: the Regal Period in Augustan Literature*. Oxford.
- Fränkel, Hermann F. 1945. *Ovid: a Poet between Two Worlds*. Berkeley.
- Galinsky, Karl. 1972. *The Herakles Theme: the Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century*. Oxford.
- _____. 1975. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: an Introduction to the Basic Aspects*. Oxford.
- _____. 1981. "Some Aspects of Ovid's Golden Age." *Grazer Beitrage* 10: 193-205.
- Gee, Emma. 2000. *Ovid, Aratus, and Augustus*. Cambridge.
- Gosling, A. 1987. "Tibullus 2.5 and Augustan Propaganda." *EMC* 31 (6): 333-339.
- Gowing, Alain M. 2005. *Empire and Memory: the Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*. Cambridge.
- Green, Steven J. 2008 "Save the Cows?: Augustan Discourse and Animal Sacrifice in Ovid's *Fasti*." *Greece and Rome* 55: 39-54.
- _____. 2009. "Malevolent Gods and Promethean Birds: Contesting Augury in Augustus' Rome." *TAPA* 139: 147-167.
- Griffin, Jasper. 1984. "Augustus and the Poets: 'Caesar qui cogere posset'." In Millar and Segal (eds.): 189-218.
- Halporn, James W. 1963. *The Meters of Greek and Latin Poetry*. Indianapolis.
- Harries, Byron. 1991. "Ovid and the Fabii: *Fasti* 2.193-474." *CQ* 41 (1): 150-168.
- Harrison, S.J. 2007. *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford.
- Heinze, Richard. 1919. *Ovids elegische Erzählung*. Leipzig.
- Herbert-Brown, Geraldine. 1994. *Ovid and the Fasti: an Historical Study*. Oxford.
- Hinds, S.J. 1987. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse*. Cambridge.
- _____. 1992. "Arma in Ovid's *Fasti* Part 1", "Arma in Ovid's *Fasti* Part 2." *Arethusa* 25 (1-2): 81-112, 113-54.
- Holleman, A.W.J. 1973. "Ovid and the *Lupercalia*." *Historia* 22 (2): 260-268.
- Jaeger, Mary. 1997. *Livy's Written Rome*. Ann Arbor.

- Kennedy, D.F. 1992. "Augustan and Anti-Augustan." In Anton Powell, ed. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, 26-. London.
- King, Richard J. 2006. *Desiring Rome: Male Subjectivity and Reading Ovid's Fasti*. Columbus.
- Littlewood, R.J. 2002. "Ovid Among the Family Dead: the Roman Founder Legend and Augustan Iconography in Ovid's *Feralia* and *Lemuria*." *Latomus* 60: (4) 916-935.
- Lord, Albert Bates. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA.
- Lowrie, Michèle, 2009. *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome*. Oxford.
- Marks, J. 2005. "The Ongoing *Neikos*: *Thersites*, *Odysseus*, and *Achilleus*." *AJP* 126 (1) 1-31.
- McKeown, J.C. 1984. "Ovid's *Fasti* and Augustan Politics," in Woodman and West, ed. *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, 169-188. Cambridge.
- Millar, F. and E. Segal. 1984. *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*. Oxford.
- Miller, John F. 1980. "Ritual Directions in Ovid's *Fasti*: Didactic Hymns and Didactic Poetry." *CJ* 75.3:204-14.
- _____. 1982. "Callimachus and the Augustan Aetiological Elegy," *ANRW* II.30.1: 371-417.
- _____. 1991. *Ovid's Elegiac Festivals: Studies in the Fasti*. Frankfurt am Main.
- _____. 1992. "The *Fasti* and Hellenistic Didactic: Ovid's Variant Aetiologies." *Arethusa* 25: 11-31.
- _____. 2002. "The *Fasti*: Style, Structure, and Time." in Barbara Weiden Boyd, ed. *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, 167-196. Leiden.
- _____. 2009. *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Cambridge.
- Nagy, Gregory. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore.
- _____. 1990. *Pindar's Homer: the Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.
- Nappa, Christopher. 2005. *Reading after Actium: Vergil's Georgics, Octavian, and Rome*. Ann Arbor.
- Newlands, Carole E. 1995. *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti*. Ithaca.
- _____. 2002. "*Mandati Memores*: Political and Poetic Authority in the *Fasti*." in Philip Hardie, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 200-217.
- Newman, J.K. 1967. *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry*. Bruxelles.

- Pantelia, Maria. 2002. "Helen and the Last Song for Hector." *TAPA* 132: 21–27.
- Papaïoannou, S. 2003. "Founder, Civilizer, and Leader: Vergil's Evander and his Role in the Origins of Rome." *Mnemosyne* 55 (6): 680-702.
- Pasco-Pranger, Molly. 2006. *Founding the Year: Ovid's Fasti and the Poetics of the Roman Calendar*. Leiden.
- Rea, Jennifer A. 2007. "Finding Archaic-Augustan Rome in Tibullus 2.5." *Scholια* 16: 93-110
- Robinson, Matthew. 2003. "Festivals, Fools, and the *Fasti*: the *Quirinalia* and the *Feriae Stultorum* (Ovid, *Fasti* 2.475-532)." *Aevum Antiquum* N.S. 3: 609-621
- Rothwell, K.S. 1996. "Propertius on the Site of Rome." *Latomus* 55 (4): 829-854.
- Scheid, J. 1992. "Myth, Cult and Reality in Ovid's *Fasti*." *PCPhS* 38: 118-31.
- Schilling, Robert. 1960. "Romulus l' élu et Rémus le réprouvé." *REL* 38: 182-199.
- Scullard, H.H. 1980. *A History of the Roman World: 753-146 B.C.* London.
- Southern, Pat. 1998. *Augustus*. London.
- Spencer, Diane. 2001. "Propertius, Hercules, and the Dynamics of Roman Mythic Space in Elegy 4.9." *Arethusa* 34 (3): 259-284.
- Syme, Ronald. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford.
- _____. 1974. *The Crisis of 2 B.C.* Munich.
- _____. 1978. *History in Ovid*. Oxford.
- _____. 1979. "Problems about Janus." *AJPh* 100.1: 188-212.
- Taylor, Lily Ross and Louise Adams Holland. 1952. "Janus and the *Fasti*." *CPh* 47.2: 137-142.
- Thomas, Richard. 2001. *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. Cambridge.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1982. "The Golden Age and Sin in Augustan Ideology." *P&P* 95: 19-36.
- _____. 1987. "Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus and the *Fasti*." in *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, eds. Michael Whitby, Philip Hardie and Mary Whitby, 221-30. Bristol.
- Welch, Kathryn. 2011. *Magnus Pius: Pompeius and the Transformation of the Roman Republic*. Swansea.
- Welch, Tara. 2005. *The Elegiac Cityscape: Propertius and the Meaning of Roman Monuments*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Wiseman, T.P. 1995. *Remus: A Roman Myth*. Cambridge.

Young, D.C. 1968. *Three Odes of Pindar: a Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7*. Leiden.

Zanker, P. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Trans. A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Robert William Brewer was born in St. Louis, MO in 1982 to Monroe Frank and Barbara Jean Brewer. He has two older siblings, a brother named Chris and a sister named Liz. Robert grew up in Florissant, MO until he turned 16 when the family moved to a more western portion of St. Louis County. He attended the Jesuit secondary school St. Louis University High in St. Louis and graduated in 2001. He then attended Xavier University in Cincinnati, OH where in 2005 he graduated *summa cum laude* with a Bachelor of Arts in the Honors Arts Baccalaureate, a Bachelor of Arts in classical humanities, and a minor in philosophy. After graduation Robert enrolled in the graduate program in classics at University of Florida. He wrote his thesis on a Greek topic and received his Master of Arts in classical studies in 2007. During the summer of 2007, he attended a graduate seminar entitled “The *Iliad* in the Second Millenium B.C.” at the Center for Hellenic Studies in Washington D.C. In 2009 he participated in the Classical Summer School through the American Academy in Rome. He received his Doctor of Philosophy in classical studies from the University of Florida on April 27, 2012.