RECONSIDERING OVID'S IDES OF MARCH: A COMMENTARY ON Fasti 3.697-710

JULIA M.E. SINCLAIR

Reconsidering Ovid's Ides of March: A Commentary on *Fasti* 3.697-710

By

© Julia M. E. Sinclair

A thesis submitted to the

School of Graduate Studies

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Classics

Faculty of Arts

Memorial University of Newfoundland

June 2004

St. John's Newfoundland

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-494-02376-7
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-494-02376-7

Abstract

Anti-Augustan readings dominate the scholarship on *Fasti* 3.697-710. This thesis challenges these anti-Augustan readings with arguments for a pro-Augustan reading as a viable alternative in Ovid's mythopoetic conception of Caesar's assassination and deification. Chapter 1 contains a translation of *Fasti* 3.697-710 and a line-by-line commentary. This commentary addresses elements vital to understanding the passage, such as vocabulary, themes, literary conventions, and even punctuation. Chapter 2 reviews the scholarship on this passage and weighs the pro- and anti- Augustan elements, then concludes with a discussion of some ideological parallels between Ovid and Valerius Maximus regarding Julius Caesar's assassination and deification. Appendix I examines the parallel passage *Metamorphoses* 15.749-840 in relation to *Fasti* 3.697-710, discussing both similarities and differences. Appendix II reviews the references to Julius Caesar in Augustan poetry, including the *Fasti*.

Acknowledgements

It's a pleasure to be indebted to so many generous individuals and I would like to extend my thanks to the following:

To the Professors of the Department of Classics for their support, especially Professors Joyal and Tronson for their encouragement and enthusiasm for my thesis topic.

To the Departmental Secretary, Mrs. C. Kieley, for being a source of wisdom and consolation in all things critical pertaining to my studies at Memorial.

To the School of Graduate Studies for funding which enabled me to pursue this graduate degree at Memorial.

To the staff of the Interlibrary loan office at the Queen Elizabeth II library for their assistance in locating several important works for my research.

To my Graduate Supervisor, Professor Butrica, to whom I owe, above all, my most heartfelt thanks. This thesis has benefited greatly from his acuity and critical judgment and I am truly thankful for his partnership in this endeavour. Whatever merit this study possesses is owed to his influence. Whatever flaws remain are mine alone.

To my parents, brothers, and friends – near and far – for their unstinting support and encouragement.

And to Ian, especially, for always rooting for me.

Julia M. E. Sinclair
St. John's, NL
March 15, 2004

Table of Contents

Introduction

> The apotheosis of Julius Caesar was a poetic concept, but that was literature; in real life, deification meant a temple and a ritual, not a belief or a legend.
>
> Gordon Williams, *Change and Decline*, 93-94

Ovid twice applies his mythopoetic invention to the assassination and apotheosis of Julius Caesar, once in the *Metamorphoses* (15.746-870) and once in the *Fasti* (3.697-710). The historical facts are well-known. Ovid supplements them in both passages by including a "non-realistic" and "attempted" rescue made by each goddess that leads to Caesar's apotheosis. While some elements are common to both passages, there are also differences: the deification in *Metamorphoses* 15 recalls similar accounts in Call. fr. 228.5-6 and Theoc. 17.45-50, while Vesta's intervention in *Fasti* 3 with a *simulacrum* recalls the εἴδωλον of Aeneas created by Apollo in *Il.* 5.445-50 and/or the *simulacrum* of Aeneas created by Juno in *A.* 10.636-637.

The *Fasti*

Ovid's poetic calendar on Roman civic and religious holidays, a work that has been described as "one of the most ambitious projects in Latin poetry, the most ambitious in Roman elegy,"[1] has come down to us containing only six books that cover the months January to June. Ovid tells us that he wrote twice six books (*Tr.* 2.549, *sex ego Fastorum scripsi totidemque libellos / cumque suo finem mense volumen habet*), thus one for each of the twelve months. Speculation on this discrepancy has been considerable, and the possibly "unfinished" nature of the text has been an indication for some scholars that Ovid realized that he was on "the wrong track" with a poetic calendar on Roman religion

[1]Miller (1991: 5).

and history.[2] However, if he did abandon his poem, Ovid did not do so until after he had spent some time revising the original six books. For example, after Augustus' death in A.D. 14, he rededicated his work to Germanicus rather than to Augustus' heir apparent, Tiberius (*Fast.* 1.3-26).[3] These revisions have piqued the curiosity of scholars; they may suggest that the exiled poet was trying to rehabilitate his image and perhaps regain admittance to his beloved Rome.

***Fasti* 3.697-710**

Chapter 1 (A Commentary on *Fasti* 3.697-710) contains a comprehensive, line-by-line commentary on *Fasti* 3.697-710. The objective of this commentary is to address questions important to a more thorough understanding of this passage. For instance, the meanings of words such as *princeps, rapio*, *simulacrum, nefas,* and *elementum* are all vital to interpretation. In addition, several thematic links between *Fast.* 3.697-710 and other passages in Ovid's calendar will be explored, such as avenging Caesar, the position of *pontifex maximus*, deification, civil war, and the role of Vesta.

Chapter 2 (Interpretations) examines the interpretations that scholars have proposed for this passage. The possible anti-Augustan elements are discussed first, including the supposed use of a preterition, the sense of *rapio* and the murder of a Julian. Then arguments against these anti-Augustan readings are offered, followed by additional elements that may support a more positive reading, such as the presence of Vesta, the reference to Julius Caesar's temple, and some ideological parallels between Ovid and Valerius Maximus.

---

[2]Newlands (1995: 5).
[3]See Fantham (1986: 243-281).

Two appendices are included. The first, *Metamorphoses* 15.746-870, examines this parallel passage, briefly identifying similarities and differences. The second, Julius Caesar in Augustan Poetry, examines several categories of Julian references (such as family and deification) that reflect the varied but favourable depictions of Caesar in Augustan poetry.

Ovid's Intent

There continues to be a debate about the significance of Ovid's account of Caesar's assassination and deification in *Fasti* 3.697-710. Was it created to flatter Augustus, or to slight him or neither? Was Ovid trying to please both *Princeps* and *Populus Romanus* with his entries for March 15: Anna Perenna for the people and Caesar for Augustus?[4] In the years before his relegation in A.D. 8, there was an increasingly repressive political climate at Rome. Ovid, who had been punished supposedly for writing the *Ars Amatoria*, was perhaps attempting to rehabilitate himself at this time with both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* by including topics that a Roman *princeps* would like – Rome's history, monuments, and festivals, and the *Princeps* himself. The weightier topics do suggest that Ovid becomes a more obviously serious poet in the *Fasti*,[5] though playfulness still presents itself. The fact that Ovid in the *Fasti* seems to view the assassination and divinity of Caesar in much the same way as Valerius Maximus does in his *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* suggests that he may be following current imperial "orthodoxy" on the point. In addition, his account is also compatible with Augustan monuments and coins.

---

[4]See McKeown (1984: 169-187) who discusses Ovid's entries for March 15 in the *Fasti*.
[5]Miller (1991: 140-142) and Salzman (1998: 340-341).

The Teubner editions of the *Fasti* (Alton, Wormell, and Courtney: 1978) and the *Metamorphoses* (Anderson: 1977) have been used. Translations of the *Fasti* and other relevant passages under discussion are my own except when otherwise stated. Collections and editions of ancient texts and modern reference works such as lexica are referred to by standard acronyms or the abbreviations found in *L'Année philologique*, the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, and Liddell and Scott.

Chapter 1: A Commentary on *Fasti* 3.697-710

Praeteriturus eram gladios in principe fixos,
Cum sic a castis Vesta locuta focis:
"Ne dubita meminisse: meus fuit ille sacerdos;
Sacrilegae telis me petiere manus.
Ipsa virum rapui simulacraque nuda reliqui:
Quae cecidit ferro, Caesaris umbra fuit.
Ille quidem caelo positus Iovis atria vidit,
Et tenet in Magno templa dicata Foro.
At quicumque nefas ausi, prohibente deorum
Numine, polluerant pontificale caput,
Morte iacent merita: testes estote, Philippi,
Et quorum sparsis ossibus albet humus.
Hoc opus, haec pietas, haec prima elementa fuerunt
Caesaris, ulcisci iusta per arma patrem."[6]

I was about to pass over the swords stuck in a *princeps*,
When Vesta spoke as follows from her chaste hearth:
"Don't be reluctant to remember: He was my priest;
It was me that the sacrilegious hands attacked with their weapons.
I myself snatched the man and left behind an unarmed image:
What fell by the sword was Caesar's likeness.
He in fact has been placed in heaven and has seen Jove's palace,
And he possesses a temple dedicated in the Great Forum.
But all who dared this crime and violated the priestly head,
Though the will of the gods averted it,
Lie in a death deserved: be witness, Philippi,
And they whose scattered bones whiten the ground.
To avenge his father by lawful war: this was Caesar's work,
This his piety, this his first beginnings."

SUMMARY OF PASSAGE

After the Anna Perenna αἴτια that dominate the entry for March 15 (3.523-696), Ovid abruptly changes the subject to another event on the Ides of March, the assassination of Caesar, saying that he was about to pass over the murder of a *princeps* (697) when Vesta spoke to him from her chaste hearth (698).

Vesta urges Ovid not to be reluctant to recall the event (699), and then proceeds to

[6]Frazer's translation (1929) has been adopted for the problematic line 708; see discussion below on pp. 44-45.

inform him of her own account of that infamous day. As *Pontifex Maximus*, Caesar was her priest (699, *meus sacerdos*), and so the attack on him was really against her (700, *me*), a tutelary goddess of Rome. Vesta then snatched Caesar away herself (701, *ipsa*) and left behind an unarmed image (701, *simulacra nuda*) to be attacked by the swords of the assassins, who stabbed a mere likeness of Caesar (702, *umbra*) and not the god.

Even though it is not stated, it can surely be inferred that it was Vesta who transported Caesar to the heavens. His entrance into heaven and presence at Jupiter's hall implies his acceptance as a god by Jupiter and all of the other gods (703, *Iovis atria*), while his terrestial deification is represented by the temple to *Divus Iulius* in the Forum (704, *in Magno templa dicata Foro*), which was dedicated in 29 B.C.

The contrasting *at* (705) marks a transition from the moment of Caesar's death to its aftermath. The murderers who dared to commit this crime (705, *quicumque nefas ausi*) violated the *Pontifex Maximus* of Rome (706, *polluerant pontificale caput*) and Vesta's priest. Though the will of the gods tried to avert it (705, *prohibente*), the assassination took place, and the murderers later died a death deserved (707, *morte merita*).

Ovid next recalls the battleground of Philippi (707), as well as the conspirators against Caesar and his avenging son Augustus, in a vivid image of the ground whitened by the bones of the war dead (708, *et quorum sparsis ossibus albet humus*).

In the final couplet, Ovid has Vesta assert the justice and legality of Augustus' vengeance (710, *iusta arma*), calling it an act of *pietas* and identifying it as the first step in the *Princeps'* formation (709, *hoc opus, haec pietas, haec prima elementa*).

COMMENTARY

697 PRAETERITURUS ERAM GLADIOS IN PRINCIPE FIXOS

The first line provides a dramatic transition from the festival of Anna Perenna to the murder and deification of Julius Caesar. Although the word order is normal with a noun and a participle surrounding the phrase (*gladios in principe fixos*), one still wonders if it might suggest the murder scene at the Senate meeting where Caesar was surrounded and stabbed by the conspirators.

praeterituruseram

Ovid's use of *praeterire* has led many to assume the presence of a preterition, a rhetorical device that emphasizes something by appearing to pass over it.[7] For that very reason *praeterituruseram* has been described as an "afterthought,"[8] as "wicked,"[9] and as "gespielte"[10] ("playful"). For Barchiesi, "a formula like *praeterituruseram* can also suggest that the event does not merit great attention."[11]

---

[7]Lanham (1991: 104, s.v. *occultatio*). Only two ancient sources discuss the rhetorical device *praeteritio*, referring to it respectively as παράλεψις and as *occultatio* (Hermog. 408, *ad Her.* 4.37). Preteritions are a stock feature of rhetorical and historical works. In verse, they appear chiefly in didactic poetry. For instance Virgil's *Georgics* contains three examples: 2.118 (*quid referam*), 4.116 (*ni ... forsitan ... canerem*), 4.147-148 (*haec ... praeteritio*), of which Thomas (1988: I, 176; 1988: II, 168) calls the first two a "virtual *praeteritio*," (which I have taken to mean) a preterition without the verb *praeterire*. Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* has one occurrence (3.612, *praeterituruseram*).

[8]Newlands (1995: 61) and McKeown (1984: 169).

[9]It is not clear whether Johnson's (1978: 11, n.7) "wicked" implies something offensive, mischievous, clever or even all of these.

[10]Voit (1985: 49).

[11]Barchiesi (1997: 128).

The appearance of *praeteriturus eram* here, however, does not signal a preterition, and in fact this is also true elsewhere in the *Fasti* when *praeterire* appears:[12] 5.729-730, *nec te praetereo, populi Fortuna potentis / Publica, cui templum luce sequente datum est* ("I am not passing over you, Public Fortune of the powerful People, to whom a temple was given on the following day"); 6.319-320, *praeteream referamne tuum, rubicunde Priape, / dedecus? Est multi fabula parva ioci* ("Shall I pass over or relate your disgrace, ruddy Priapus? It's a short story long on jokes"); 6.417-418, *Cetera iam pridem didici puerilibus annis, / non tamen idcirco praetereunda mihi* ("I long ago learned the rest in my childhood years, though I shouldn't pass over it for that reason").

Praeterire in these three passages introduces a new topic, as in 3.697, though in different ways; for example, 5.729-730 has *praeterire* with a negation (*nec*). Here Ovid says that he is not passing over the anniversary but instead recalling that May 25 is the day that the temple to Public Fortune was dedicated. The occurrence in 6.319-320 appears in an indirect question (6.319, *praeteream referamne*) that pretends to consider omitting a particular story about Vesta and Priapus as part of a much larger entry for June 9 dealing with Vesta. In this *fabula parva*, Priapus attempts to bed Vesta at a feast celebrating Cybele[13] and because of the untimely bray of an ass, Priapus' ploy is

---

[12]Newlands (1995: 137) identifies the occurrence of *praeterire* in 6.319 and 418 as preteritions when she says that "the apologetic air of the *praeteritio* alerts the reader to the possible unsuitability of the following narrative and its unreliability as a description of an historical event."

[13]For a discussion of similarities between this passage and Priapus' earlier attempt to rape Lotis (*Fast.* 1.393-440), see Fantham (1983), Richlin (1992), and Newlands (1995). While some critics have argued that one of these stories would have been omitted in a revision of the *Fasti* (Frazer 1929: II, 171; IV, 231; Le Bonniec 1965: 75; Fantham 1983: 203; Williams 1991: 197; Newlands 1996: 127), Murgatroyd (2002: 623) suggests that they "work rather well where they are".

interrupted and revealed to all. The sexual nature of this story explains why Ovid questions its inclusion. This farcical tale is an example of Ovid dealing with a sensitive topic and so provides a possible parallel to the handling of a sensitive subject of the murder of a *princeps* in 3.697-698. The last use of *praeterire*, in 6.417-418, also appears in Ovid's treatment of June 9. Here again Ovid uses a negation (*non*) in tandem with *praeterire* as he discusses a story that he claims to have learnt in childhood about the Palladium, a relic of Roman history.

The best parallel for *Fast.* 3.697-710, however, is *Ars* 3.611-612 (*qua vafer eludi possit ratione maritus, / quaque vigil custos, praeteriturus eram*, "how a crafty husband and how a vigilant guardian can be deceived, I was about to pass over"), where Ovid does use a preterition to get around the difficult and awkward topic of adultery, which contravened the current legislation at Rome.[14] This handbook was a dangerous undertaking because it provided women with tips on how they could beguile a husband and guardian to be with a lover, even though Ovid specifically warns the bride (*nupta*) to respect her husband (3.613-614, *nupta virum timeat: rata sit custodia nuptae; / hoc decet, hoc leges iusque pudorque iubent*). At the time of this work the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* and the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* had existed for nearly two decades.[15] For Ovid to provide women, especially *nuptae,* with advice on being successful adulterers at this time was to risk challenging Augustus' laws and angering him. In his defence, Ovid later claimed that this handbook was not intended for any

[14]Dalzell (1996: 160) says that "this passage is the single passage in the poem which is in clear contravention of Augustan moral policy." See also, Gibson's commentary on *Ars* 3 (2003: 30-32, 334-336).
[15]Since 18 B.C. For the Augustan legislation, see L.F. Raditsa (1980: 278-339). For the elegists and Augustus' legislation, see Wallace-Hadrill (1985: 180-184).

woman other than a courtesan (Ov. *Tr.* 2.241-251, 303-304, 347-348; Ov. *Pont.* 3.3.51-52), yet his clever explanations do not release him from having treated this sensitive topic in the *Ars Amatoria*. According to the *Digest*, those who encouraged men and women to overlook these laws were just as guilty as those who disobeyed them.[16] Now, even though Ovid appears to be sincere in his advice to women, this preterition suggests the awkwardness of dealing with a subject that challenged current legislation. Here, in *Fast.* 3.697, Ovid does not use a preterition, but *praeterire* may indicate that the topic is sensitive, as it does in *Fast.* 6.319-320. In addition, the use of *praeterire* at the start of a new entry may just signify a discomfort for the poet. Vesta, however, does not want Ovid "to pass over" Caesar's murder. Caesar is her priest and she does not want Ovid to be reluctant in remembering him (3.699, *ne dubita meminisse: meus fuit ille sacerdos*).

gladios

Swords and daggers are both mentioned in the historical and literary sources as the weapons used to kill Julius Caesar.[17] The historical references clearly show that *pugiones*, "daggers" were used. A poet's options, however, were limited by metre, and the long u makes *pugio* impossible in dactylic hexameters except for the nominative

---

[16]*D.* 48.5.13 (12) *Ulpianus libro primo de adulteriis. Haec verba legis 'ne quis posthac stuprum adulterium facito sciens dolo malo' et ad eum, qui suasit et ad eum, qui stuprum vel adulterium intulit, pertinent.*

[17]In Latin *pugio* (dagger): Suet. *Jul.* 82, 89; Cic. *Phil.* 2.12.28, 30 (*bis*); *gladius* (sword): Ov. *Fast.* 3.697; Ov. *Met.* 15.801; Sen. *De Ira* 3.30.4; *mucro* (sword): V. Max. 4.5.6; *ferrum* (sword): Ov. *Fast.* 3.700; *ensis* (sword): Ov. *Met.* 15.776. Two generic terms for weapon occur: Ov. *Fast.* 3.702, *tela* and Ov. *Met.* 15.763, *arma*. In Greek ξιφίδιον (dagger): App. *B.C.* 2.16.117 (*bis*); ἐγχειρίδιον (dagger): Nic. Dam. *Vit. Caes.* 23.81, 24.88, 25.91; Plu. *Brut.* 14.3, 16.3; ξίφος (sword): Nic. Dam. *Vit. Caes.* 24.89 (*bis*), 25.94; D.C. 44.16.1; Plu. *Caes.* 66.7, 66.10, 66.12; *Ant.* 14.7; *Brut.* 17.2, 17.3, 17.4, 18.4; App. *B.C.* 2.16.117 (*bis*); σίδηρος (sword): Plu. *Caes.* 66.10.

singular (and even this only in Silver Latin poetry).[18] *Philippic* 2 contains the only nearly contemporary account of Caesar's assassination. In three references to Brutus' weapon, Cicero uses *pugio* twice when Antony speaks (*Phil.* 2.12.28, *cruentum pugionem*; 2.12.30, *stillantem pugionem*) and once in his own words (*Phil.* 2.12.30, *stillantem pugionem*).[19] Suetonius uses *pugio* twice: to describe Caesar surrounded by drawn daggers (*Jul.* 82.2, *strictis pugionibus*), and to indicate that some of the assassins killed themselves with the very same daggers they had used to kill Caesar (*Jul.* 89, *nonnulli semet eodem illo pugione...interemerunt*).

Ovid refers three times to Caesar's assassination, once in the *Fasti* and twice in the *Metamorphoses* (1.200-201, *sic, cum manus inpia saevit / sanguine Caesareo*[20] *Romanum exstinguere nomen*, and 15.746-870, see Appendix I). In *Metamorphoses* 15, Ovid uses two different words for the murder weapon (776, *ensis*; 801, *gladius*), and uses two others in *Fasti* 3: one poetic word (702, *ferrum*[21]), and one prose word (3.697, *gladius*). *Gladius* is the one word common to both passages, and it may have been preferred for metrical convenience.

It is perhaps worthwhile asking whether Ovid could have used *gladius* in *Fast.* 3.697 to allude to the gladiatorial games taking place on the day of the murder. Caesar had decided to hold a meeting of the Senate at the *Curia Pompei* on the Ides of March (Suet. *Jul.* 80.4, Plu. *Brut.* 14.1), the same day gladiatorial games were to be held in the

[18]Mart. 14.33.1, *pugio, quem curva signat brevis orbita vena.*
[19]Cicero emphasizes the death of the mortal Caesar, by reference to the "dripping" blood.
[20]Hill (1985: 176) accepts that Julius Caesar is the subject in *Met.* 1.200-201; see also Otis (1970: 99). Scholars that interpret these lines as a reference to the conspiracy attempt(s) against Augustus include Bömer 1961: 1, 87-88; Due 1974: 71-72; Feeney 1991: 199; Von Albrecht 1999: 168, 182.
[21]Similarly, cίδηρος, is used at Plu. *Caes.* 66.10.0

Theatrum Pompei (or *Pompeianum*) (App. *B.C.* 2.17.118).[22] Appian (*B.C.* 2.16.115) tells us that it was customary for the Senate to meet in the *Curia Pompei* when games were taking place at the *Pompeianum*.[23] Dio Cassius (44.16.2) suggests that the presence of the gladiators would have ensured the safety of the assassins either inside or outside the building. The implication is perhaps that the *liberatores* were tainted by their association with the gladiators who themselves could be seen as "hired thugs;" the reputation of gladiators is well-known – as Wiedemann (1992: 28) says, "both gladiators and their trainers are declassé, and suffer *infamia*, the loss of their identity as respectable citizens."

gladios fixos

This is the only occurrence of *gladius* and *figere* together in Ovid's poetry, though a similar and more common phrase, *tela figere*, appears in *Fast.* 2.838 (*fixaque semianimi corpore tela* [sc. Brutus] *rapit*). In this example, Lucretia's self-inflicted wound exemplifies her heroic suicide while also imparting an element of *pathos* through the image of a sword fixed in her chest. This same element of *pathos* is present in Ovid's vivid portrayal of Caesar's corpse stuck with swords.

principe

While it is clear from the context that Ovid is referring to Julius Caesar, the title *Princeps* had long been associated with Augustus (*OLD* 6, "adopted by Augustus as a

[22]Horsfall (1974: 196-199).
[23]For a discussion on the location of Caesar's murder, see Moles (1982: 89-90).

title to emphasise the non military nature of his rule [3b],[24] but later acquiring the connotation of autocratic ruler").[25]

In Republican times, the leading citizens had been called *principes*,[26] a title which recognised their authority or power[27] (*OLD* 3a, "a leading member, chief man [of a group, state, class, etc]"). In addition, an individual could be called a *princeps* (see note 21). Cicero applies this Republican meaning to Antony (*Phil.* 2.53); Pompey (*Att.* 8.9a.2); and Julius Caesar (*Fam.* 9.17.3).

Ovid was the first after Cicero to call Julius Caesar *Princeps*.[28] His choice of titles was limited, however, and *princeps* was far more desirable than *dictator*, a title associated with Caesar which evoked forms of power that Augustus would find undesirable.[29] To be the son of a god was one thing, but to present oneself as the son of a dictator was something to avoid. Ovid could use *princeps* to downplay the autocratic aspect of Caesar's character, or its use could suggest a throwback to the Republican title. Ovid calls Augustus *Princeps* in the *Fasti* (2.142, *tu* [sc. Romulus] *domini nomen, principis ille tenet*), and the implication of calling Caesar *Princeps* in *Fasti* 3.697 might

---

[24]*OLD* 3b, "(without gen.) a leading citizen."
[25]Except for Tibullus who makes no mention of Augustus, the Augustan poets referred to him in a variety of ways: *princeps* (Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.50, 1.21.14; *Ep.* 2.1.256; Prop. 4.6.46; Ov. *Fast.* 2.142; Ov. *Pont.* 2.1.48, 4.9.53; Man. 1.7, 4.935); *dux* (Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.52; Ov. *Fast.* 3.428); *pater* (Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.50; Ov. *Pont.* 4.13.25); *deus* (Ver. *Ecl.* 1.6-7 *bis*; Prop. 3.4.1, 4.11.60). Virgil is the only Augustan poet to not call him *princeps*.
[26]Cic. *Att.* 2.1 (*nostri principes*); Liv. 103 (*conspiratio inter tres civitatis principes facta est, Cn. Pompeium, M. Crassum, C. Caesarem*).
[27]Syme (1930: 311-312), see also Beringer in *RE* 22.2.1998-2296, s.v. *princeps*.
[28]Bömer (1957-58: II, 192-193). Salzman (1998: 338, note 79) says "the use of *princeps* for Caesar is surprising, but there are precedents." For a list of references to Julius Caesar as *Princeps*, see Beringer in *RE* 22.2.2025-2026, s.v. liste der *principes* (Rep.).
[29]Ovid uses *dux* (Caesar: *Fast.* 4.381; Augustus: *Fast.* 3.428); see Appendix II for Julius Caesar in Augustan poetry.

even be that Augustus' own status as *Princeps* was inherited, signifying a connection to the Republican usage.

698 CUM SIC A CASTIS VESTA LOCUTA FOCIS

Vesta

Vesta is one of the Roman divinities featured most prominently in the *Fasti* and appears in all books (1.528; 2.69;[30] 3.45, 141-143, 417-428, 698-702; 4.732, 828, 949-954; 5.573-574; 6.227, 249-468, 713).[31] Newlands (1995: 132) suggests that Ovid presents three types of Vesta: one is the traditional animistic entity that symbolizes the fire and earth of Rome, while a second is the popular Republican Vesta who is the goddess of the people (cf. Prop. 4.1 and Ov. *Fast.* 6.311-318), and a third is the Vesta associated with the Augustan *domus*.[32] The last, as Feeney (1991: 215) notes, "was an extraordinary transformation for *Vesta publica populi Romani Quiritium*, the guarantor of the city's identity and continuity, whose whole raison d'être consisted in remaining fixed in her *sedes*."

Traditionally, Vesta's primary role is as the goddess of the hearth and fire. In that role, she oversees Rome's health and safety (Liv. 5.52.7, 26.27.14; Cic. *Scaur.* 23.48; Cic. *Phil.* 11.10.24) as its tutelary goddess. The most important aspect of this identity is that

---

[30]Newlands (1995: 131) says that Vesta does not appear in book 2, but in 2.69 there is an indirect reference to her temple, called the shrine of Numa (*penetrale Numae*). Vesta's temple was believed to have been formerly included in Numa's house (*regia*), see Frazer (1929: II, 301; cf. *Fast.* 6.263-264, *hic locus exiguus, qui sustinet Atria Vestae, / tunc erat intonsi regia magna Numae*; Ov. *Tr.* 3.129-30, *hic locus est Vestae, qui Pallada servat et ignem, / haec fuit antiqui regia parva Numae*).

[31]In general, see Bömer (1957-58) and Frazer (1929). For Vesta in the *Fasti*, see Kötzle (1991: 177-252).

[32]For a discussion of the iconography and representations of Vesta in Roman art and architecture, see Fischer-Hansen in *LIMC* (1990: V, 412-420, s.v. Vesta). For a general discussion of Vesta, see Beard, North, and Price (1998: I, 51-54).

Vesta is the protectress of the state hearth, the sacred fire of Rome (*Fast.* 6.258, *flammae custos*). Another important aspect of her character is her chastity: the sexual purity of Vesta and her Vestal virgins was a vital component of the order of Vestals.[33]

Ovid's treatment of the Augustan Vesta in the *Fasti* emphasizes her connection with the imperial family and demonstrates her dual nature – the public and private cults of Vesta.[34] In particular, a renewed emphasis on chastity became a very important aspect of Augustus' "new" religion, and his wife Livia personified this Vestal quality as the chaste wife (Ov. *Pont.* 4.13.29, *esse pudicarum te Vestam, Livia, matrum*).[35]

Among his religious reforms, Augustus strengthened his connection with Vesta when he became *Pontifex Maximus* in 12 B.C. and subsequently the priest of Vesta.[36] The *Fasti* marks the event on March 6 (3.415-428):

Sextus ubi Oceano clivosum scandit Olympum
Phoebus et alatis aethera carpit equis,
Quisquis ades castaeque colis penetralia Vestae,
Gratare, Iliacis turaque pone focis.
Caesaris innumeris, quos maluit ille mereri,
Accessit titulis pontificalis honor.
Ignibus aeternis aeterni numina praesunt
Caesaris: imperii pignora iuncta vides.

[33]Vesta's chastity is prominent in the first half of the *Fasti* while other attributes are introduced in the later three books, especially in book 6, where Porte (1985: 353) describes the treatment of Vesta as "une mosaique de thèses disparates, que le poète ne se soucie pas d'harmoniser." For the sexual ambiguity of Vesta, see Beard (1980: 12-27 and also 1995: 166-177). For a recent discussion on the Vestals' virginity, see Wildfang (2003: 557-564).

[34]For the former, see the Vestalia (*Fast.* 6.249-468).

[35]Ovid never associates Livia directly with Vesta in the *Fasti* but he does so indirectly when he celebrates her as the restorer of the temple to Bona Dea, the goddess of chastity and piety (5.157-158). The rites of the Bona Dea were always performed by the Vestal Virgins and so Ovid does link Livia with Vestal chastity circuitously. For a discussion of the reference to Livia in the *Fasti*, see Herbert-Brown (1996: 130-172), who examines the complex and unique nature of Livia's dual image as both chaste and maternal.

[36]Some reforms occurred before he became *Pontifex Maximus* (see Suet. *Aug.* 31).

Di veteris Troiae, dignissima praeda ferenti,
Qua gravis Aeneas tutus ab hoste fuit,
Ortus ab Aenea tangit cognata sacerdos
Numina: cognatum, Vesta, tuere caput.
Quos sancta fovet ille manu, bene vivitis, ignes:
Vivite inexstincti, flammaque duxque, precor.

When the sixth sun climbs up steep Olympus from the ocean,
And pushes along the sky with winged steeds,
Whosoever be present, rejoice and worship at the shrine of
Chaste Vesta, and place incense on her Ilian hearth.
To Caesar's countless titles which he preferred to earn
Was added the honour of the pontificate.
The divinity of an eternal Caesar is in charge of the eternal fire:
You see joined the pledges of the empire.
O gods of ancient Troy, the most worthy prize for the one carrying you,
Heavy with which Aeneas was safe from the enemy,
A priest born of Aeneas handles the kindred divinity:
Vesta, guard your kinsman's head.
You live well, you fires, that he maintains with a sacred hand:
Live on unextinguishable, both flame and leader, I pray.

Epigraphical evidence also attests to this new religious affiliation between the *Pontifex Maximus* and Vesta. The *Feriale Cumanum* (A.D. 4-14) attests to the religious relationship forged between Augustus and Vesta on his investiture as *Pontifex Maximus* (*[eo die Caesar pontifex] maximus creatus est. Supplicatio Vestae, dis publicis penatibus populi Romani Quiritium*).[37] This affiliation was cemented with the consecration of a cult statue of Vesta in her new Palatine shrine.[38] Two calendars mark the consecration of the Palatine shrine on April 28: *Fasti Caeretani* (ca. A.D. 8), *Fer[iae], q[uod] e[o] d[ie]*

[37]Degrassi (1963: 279). While Herbert-Brown (1996: 72) considers this calendar inscription to be an example of "dynastic ties," I think this inscription reveals more regarding the religious relationship between Augustus and Vesta rather than their filiation.

[38]The construction of the Palatine shrine only became feasible once Augustus became *Pontifex Maximus* in 12 B.C. after the death of M. Lepidus (Aug. *Anc.* 10.2). In A.D. 2 or 3, a part of Augustus' home became public property after a fire which then made the construction of this shrine possible (D.C. 54.27.3); the *Pontifex Maximus* had to live in a public dwelling (Beard, North, and Price 1998: I, 189).

sig[num] vest[ae] in domo P[alatina];[39] *Fasti Praenestini* (A.D. 6-9), *Feriae ex S[enatus] C[onsulto] quod eo di[e signu]m et [ara] Vestae in domu Imp. Caesaris Augu[sti po]ntif[icis] max[imi] dedicatast Quirino et Valgio co[n]s[ulibus]*.[40] Vesta now becomes the guardian of the Augustan hearth, and Ovid's *Fasti* also includes an entry on April 28 to celebrate Vesta's "moving day" to the Palatine (4.949-954):[41]

Aufer, Vesta, diem: cognati Vesta recepta est
Limine; sic iusti constituere patres.
Phoebus habet partem: Vestae pars altera cessit:
Quod superest illis, tertius ipse tenet.
State Palatinae laurus, praetextaque quercu
Stet domus: aeternos tres habet una deos.

Vesta, take away your day: Vesta was admitted on her
Kin's threshold; so the just Fathers decreed.
Phoebus has a part: another part has passed to Vesta:
What is left from them, he himself holds as third.
Endure, Palatine laurels, and let the home trimmed with
Oak leaves endure: one home has three eternal gods.

Ovid signals this "new" association – religious and filial – between goddess and *Princeps* by using the word *cognatus* thrice to emphasize it (*Fast.* 3.425-426 *bis*; 4.949).[42] The filial relationship is based on "the Trojan origin of Vesta which makes the *Princeps* a descendant of Aeneas, her kinsman"[43] (see above *Fast.* 3.415-428, pp. 17-18), and here *cognatus* means "of, belonging to, or connected with kinsmen, kindred" (*OLD* 2a).

---

[39]Degrassi (1963: 66).
[40]Degrassi (1963: 132). Degrassi restored the text to mention an altar and an image of Vesta. In her textual restoration, Guarducci (1971: 101) prefers *aedis* over *ara* stating that an altar had "scarsissima importanza nel culto di Vesta." For Guarducci the *signum* is the Palladium, a relic housed in the Vestal temple and not a statue of Vesta. For a discussion of the textual restorations, see Herbert-Brown (1996: 74-78).
[41]Newlands (1995: 130-131), Herbert-Brown (1996: 67), Liebeschuetz (1979: 70); cf. *Met.* 15.864-865.
[42]Fraschetti (1992: 956-957, 960-962) and Feeney (1991: 205-224).
[43]Wagenwoort (1980: 216); see also Fraschetti (1992: 952-953).

Elsewhere this Trojan connection is made when Ovid calls the goddess and her hearth "Ilian" (3.142, 418; 6.456). The religious affiliation is based on the connection between the *Pontifex Maximus* and his guardianship of Vesta (see *Fast.* 3. 415-428; cf. *Met.* 15.864-865).[44] Here *cognatus* can also mean "related by position" (*OLD* 3b), i.e. the goddess as related to the *Pontifex Maximus*.

698 CASTIS FOCIS

There are two candidates in Rome for the hearth associated with Vesta at *Fast.* 3.698.[45] The first, usually referred to as the round temple (*aedes Vestae*), was located in the Forum adjacent to the Regia and the residence of the Vestal Virgins (*atrium Vestae*), and contained the hearth that they tended. The other candidate was a part of Augustus' home on the Palatine that is believed to have contained an altar (see above *Fast.* 4.949-954, p. 19).[46] Ovid makes numerous references to both Vestal hearths in the *Fasti*.[47] Though there is nothing to suggest with certainty which hearth Vesta is speaking from or Ovid's specific location, Newlands (1996: 333) is sure that *castis focis* is the Palatine shrine.

---

[44]Fraschetti (1992: 949-956).
[45]Steinby (1993: V, 125-128; fig. 72-73, 350).
[46]See also Fraschetti (1992: 949-952).
[47]The *aedes Vestae*: 2.69 (*penetrale Numae*); 3.143 (*aede*), 281 (*templi*), 296 (*curvo tholo*); 6.227, (*ab Iliaca Vesta*), 258 (*aede*), 263 (*atria*), 265 (*templi*), 297 (*templo*), 437-438 (implied), 713 (implied). The Palatine shrine: 3.417 (*penetralia*); 4.950 (*limine*). Vesta's altar: 3.47 (*ara*); 4.731 (*ara*). Vesta's hearth: 3.142 (*Iliacis focis*), 418 (*Iliacis focis*); 6.227 (*Iliaca Vesta*), 268 (*focusque*), 301 (*focus*), 305 (*focus*), 456 (*Iliacis focis*). Vesta's fire: 3.48 (*flamma*), 143 (*novus ignis*), 144 (*flamma*), 421 (*ignibus aeternis*), 427 (*ignes*), 428 (*flammaque*); 6.234 (*ignea*), 258, (*flammae custos*), 267 (*ignis*), 291 (*vivam flammam*), 297 (*ignis inexstinctus*), 298 (*ignis*), 301 (*flammis*), 440 (*profana flamma*) 455 (*sacrae flammae*), 456 (*ignis*).

699 NE DUBITA MEMINISSE: MEUS FUIT ILLE SACERDOS

Vesta's speech

On fifteen occasions in the *Fasti* deities appear as interlocutors.[48] Vesta serves only here in the *Fasti* in that role and, according to Miller, she typifies a third type of divine informant (invented by Ovid rather than taken from Callimachus' *Aetia*) who "discusses someone with whom he or she has a special connection."[49]

The question of where Vesta's speech ends is raised by only two recent scholars. Both Barchiesi (1997: 124, note 30) and Newlands (1995: 132, note 30) suggest 710, while others propose 702 or 708.[50] No concrete arguments have appeared in any discussions of this passage, but other speeches in the *Fasti* do suggest a reason for Vesta's speech terminating at 710. Ovid appears to have two ways of ending an episode that involve the speech of an informant. He either explicitly says that the informant stops (e.g., *Fast.* 4.215, *desierat*), thus returning to his own voice (*coepi*), or simply switches to an entirely new entry (*Fast.* 4.373-374, *Postera cum caelo motis Pallantias astris / fulserit*) at the end of the informant's speech. Vesta's speech belongs to the second category because it has no cue like *desierat* at the end, and a new entry clearly begins in

---

[48]Miller (1983: 160, note 14): "Janus 1.89; Muse 1.657; Mars 3.1, 167; Vesta 3.697; Venus 4.1; Erato 4.181; 3 Muses 5.1; Flora 5.183; Mercury 5.445; Tiber 5.635; Mercury 5.693; Juno, Juventas, and Concordia 6.9; Sancus 6.213; Minerva 6.652; Clio 6.798."

[49]According to Miller (1983: 163), there are three types of divine informants in Ovid's calendar; two of these can be defined as Callimachean in that they either talk about themselves or provide information on a totally unrelated subject. For more on divine informants, see Miller (1983: 160).

[50]699-702: Burmann (1727); Hermann (1889); Merkel (1841, 1850-52, 1884); Peter (1874, 1889, 1907); Davies (1894); Frazer (1929, 1931); Bömer (1957-58); Castiglioni (1960); Le Bonniec (1969-70); Alton, Wormell and Courtney (1978). 699-708: Nisard (1850).

711 (*Postera cum teneras aurora refecerit herbas*), and therefore her speech cannot end before 710.

Sacerdos

Sacerdos refers to the religious office of *Pontifex Maximus*, to which Caesar was elected in 63 B.C. after defeating two more senior candidates, P. Servilius Isauricus and Q. Lutatius Catulus (Suet. *Jul.* 13; Vell. 2.43.3).

Sacerdos refers to a *pontifex maximus* three times in the *Fasti* (3.425, 699; 5.573), and two of these occurrences refer specifically to Julius Caesar. In addition to the present passage, where Vesta calls him "my priest" (3.699, *meus sacerdos*), Ovid has Augustus call Caesar "Vesta's priest" (5.573, *Vestae sacerdos*), and the poet calls Augustus *sacerdos* (3.425) on the anniversary of his investiture as Pontifex Maximus on March 6, 12 B.C. (*Fast.* 3.420).

The position of *Pontifex Maximus* was a position that had always enjoyed considerable prestige, but it "was technically (and in practice) merely head of one of the priestly colleges, with no general authority over any other college or over 'religion' more generally."[51] This concept of the office of *Pontifex Maximus* would change with Caesar and even more when Augustus was elected to the position in 12 B.C. Dio (44.5.3) tells us that the Senate decreed that Caesar's heir should become *Pontifex Maximus*,[52] which suggests that the position had changed from being the head of a priestly college to a title inherited along with Augustus' other powers.[53]

---

[51]Beard, North, Price (1998: I, 191); see also Beard (1990).
[52]The Senate's decree may have been an attempt to ingratiate themselves with Caesar. This section in Dio records an extensive list of honours for Caesar decreed by the Senate.
[53]See discussion in Beard, North, Price (1998: I, 191).

Yet as Herbert-Brown (1994: 69) points out, "the idea of Vesta having a male priest did not exist before Augustus became Pontifex Maximus," and she considers this to be an example of retrojection – a method that takes current propaganda (such as a title like *princeps*) and employs it in reference to the past to assist in creating a desired image in the present. She also observes (1994: 71) that "Ovid's technique of retrojection was intended to convey a sense of continuity and tradition to legitimate and camouflage the new meaning of the office of Pontifex Maximus as held by Augustus." The retrojection of this title appears elsewhere in a second/third century A.D. work by the historian Florus who called Scaevola (a *Pontifex Maximus* during the Republican era) a pontiff of Vesta (Flor. *Epit.* 2.21, *nam Mucius Scaevola pontifex Vestalis aras amplexus tantum non eodem igne sepelitur*).[54]

700 SACRILEGAE TELIS ME PETIERE MANUS

Sacrilegae manus denounces the assassins as sacrilegious. Figuratively speaking, the hands that used the murder weapons have attacked Vesta, and *me*, positioned at the beginning of the second half of the pentameter, emphatically draws attention to Vesta (*me*).

Vesta is Rome, and any attack on her could lead to instability (such as the aftermath of Caesar's assassination). Herbert-Brown (1994: 127) states that "the point of the whole passage is that the crime of the assassins was a crime not against Caesar but Vesta, goddess of the Roman hearth, and, by implication, against the heart of the Roman

[54]Herbert-Brown (1994: 71). It is interesting to note that this Scaevola was assassinated next to a statue of Vesta in 82 B.C. (Cic. *N.D.* 3.80, *ante simulacrum Vestae pontifex maximus est Q. Scaevola trucidatus*; Cic. *Orat.* 3.10, *pontificis maximi sanguine simulacrum Vestae respersum esse vidit*).

state."[55] To attack Vesta was to threaten not only the cornerstone of Rome but also its permanence. This concern for Rome appears in *Metamorphoses* 15 when Venus asks the gods to avert Caesar's assassination so that Vesta's flames (=Rome) will not be extinguished by her priest's blood (15.777-778, *neve / caede sacerdotis flammas exstinguite Vestae*; *Met.* 1.201, *sanguine Caesareo Romanum exstinguere nomen*). Ovid takes this concept a step further in the *Fasti* when he prays for both an unextinguishable flame (Vesta) and an unextinguishable leader (Augustus) (*Fast.* 3.428, *vivite inexstincti, flammaque duxque, precor*). In this context, one wonders if Ovid is praying for a leader that will not be assassinated or "extinguished," in other words he is praying for an *immortal* leader.

701 IPSA VIRUM RAPUI SIMULACRAQUE NUDA RELIQUI

rapio

While for Newlands (1996: 335), "*rapere* in Ovidian poetry carries with it a long association with rape and sexual exploitation," *rapio* here means "to snatch/hurry away" (*OLD* 3a), with an associated idea of rescue.

In the *Fasti, rapere* (*OLD* 3a) occurs eight times (2.188; 3.504, 647, 701; 4.556; 6.453, 487, 494). Five of the references involve a divine rescue: 2.188, *in superas raptus uterque domus* (Jupiter rescues Callisto and Arcas, who was about to spear her); 3.504, *patria raptus ab igne manu* (Jupiter rescues Bacchus from a fire); 3.647, *corniger hanc tumidis rapuisse Numicius undis* (Numicius rescues Anna from Lavinia); 3.701, *ipsa virum rapui* (Vesta rescues Caesar from being murdered); and 6.487, *raptum quod paelice*

[55]Cicero asserts a criminal act when he refers to Caesar's assassination as *crimen* in *Phil.* 211.29, see discussion below on *nefas* (p. 39).

[sc. Ino] *natum* (Jupiter rescues Bacchus from a fire).[56] In three of the five references, the mortal is deified after the rescue: 2.188 (Callisto with Arcas by Jupiter); 3.647, (Anna by Numicius); and 3.703 (Caesar by Vesta).[57]

In *Metamorphoses* 15, *rapere* (*OLD* 3a) also occurs in reference to the parallel passage of Caesar's deification and rescue. *Rapio* is used twice when Venus snatches the soul out of Caesar's body (840, *raptam*, and again, in a compound, 845, *eripuit*). Caesar's soul is also deified in this passage (841, *fac iubar*; 846, *recentem animam caelestibus intulit astris*).

In Greek tragedy, the combination of a rescue and deification appears in Euripides' *Orestes*. At the end of the play, Apollo relates to Orestes and Menelaus how he rescued Helen from Orestes' sword and then placed her in heaven next to her brothers Castor and Polydeuces (*Or.* 1633-37):

ἐγώ [sc. Apollo] νιν ἐξέσωσα χὐπὸ φασγάνου
τοῦ σοῦ κελευσθεὶς ἥρπασ' ἐκ Διὸς πατρός.
Ζηνὸς γὰρ οὖσαν ζῆν νιν ἄφθιτον χρεών,
Κάστορί τε Πολυδεύκει τ' ἐν αἰθέρος πτυχαῖς
σύνθακος ἔσται, ναυτίλοις σωτήριος.

I saved her from under your very sword and spirited
Her away. Those were the orders of Zeus my father.
For she is Zeus's daughter and so must live an imperishable life,
And with Castor and Polydeuces in heaven's recesses
She will be enthroned as a saviour to seafarers.[58]

[56]In 6.453 the *Pontifex Maximus*, L. Caecilius Metellus, rescues a statue of Vesta from a fire. A mortal mother rescues her child in both 4.556 (Metanira rescues Triptolemus from a fire) and 6.494 (Ino rescues Melicertes from a mad father).
[57]The mortals Ino and Melicertes were made sea divinities by Carmenta (6.543). Earlier they were rescued by Panope and her one hundered sisters (6.499).
[58]Text and translation from Kovacs (2002).

The most notable similarity is the verb ἁρπάζω (1634, ἥρπασ'), which is the Greek equivalent of *rapere* (*OLD* 3a). Though Helen is rescued by Apollo, she is the semi-divine daughter of Zeus who is placed in the sky for protection, whereas Caesar, the mortal, is deified as well as protected from his assassins.

Other deifications (with ἁρπάζω) appear in Hellenistic poetry. In Theocritus 17, the mother of Ptolemy II, Berenice, is deified when Aphrodite snatches her up (ἁρπάξασα, 48) before she can reach Acheron and the ferryman Charon, then places her within Aphrodite's temple (Theoc. 17.45-50):

> κάλλει ἀριστεύουσα θεάων πότν' Ἀφροδίτα,
> σοὶ τήνα μεμέλητο· σέθεν δ' ἕνεκεν Βερενίκα
> εὐειδὴς Ἀχέροντα πολύστονον οὐκ ἐπέρασεν,
> ἀλλά μιν ἁρπάξασα, πάροιθ' ἐπὶ νῆα κατελθεῖν
> κυανέαν καὶ στυγνὸν ἀεὶ πορθμῆα καμόντων,
> ἐς ναὸν κατέθηκας, ἑᾶς δ' ἀπεδάσσαο τιμᾶς.[59]
>
> Aphrodite, queen of goddesses, pre-eminent in beauty,
> Thy care was she, and thine the aid whereby the fair
> Berenice passed not Acheron, that bourn of tears, for ere
> She came to the dark ship and Ever-grim ferryman of the
> Dead thou didst catch her away and set her in thy temple,
> Giving her a share of thine own prerogatives.[60]

Here Berenice is turned into a goddess before she dies as mortal, which is how Caesar is deified.

Callimachus offers another example in a poorly preserved fragment of the Ἑκθέωις Ἀρσινόης where Arsinoë is snatched up by the gods and placed in the heavens by the Dioscuri (fr. 228.5-6 Pf.):

---

[59]Berenice is also said to have been made immortal by Aphrodite in the dirge of Theoc. 15.106-111.

[60]Text and translation from Gow (1950: I).

[νύμφα, cὺ μὲν ἀcτερίαν ὑ]π' ἅμαξαν ἤδη
κλεπτομέν]α παρέθει celάναι[61]

O bride, already up under the stars of the Wain,
Snatched away [i.e. by the Dioscuri],
You were speeding past the (full) moon[62]

Pfeiffer (1949-1953: I, 219) prints κλεπτομένα, which is suggested by a scholion on the line which glosses it with ἡρπαcμένη. The idea of "snatching" occurs again at fr. 228.46, ὦ δαίμοcιν ἁρπαγίμα, "the one snatched away by the gods". Here Arsinoë is made divine in the same manner in which Caesar is deified.

SIMULACRAQUE NUDA

Scholars are not unanimous about what Ovid means by *simulacra nuda*. Five definitions of *simulacrum*[63] are possible in 701: (*OLD* 1) "that which resembles something in appearance sound, etc. a likeness;" (*OLD* 2a) "a visual representation, image;" (*OLD* 3a) "an image, statue (usually of a god)[64];" (*OLD* 4b) "a ghost, phantom, a phantom object;" and (*OLD* 4c) "(in Epicurean philosophy) the εἴδωλον image which emanates from an object and, impinging on the eye, causes sight." Four definitions are possible for *nudus*: (*OLD* 1a) "(of a person, his body) naked, nude, unclothed;" (*OLD* 1c) "(of parts of the body) uncovered, bare (sim. of persons, w. acc. or abl. of respect);" (*OLD* 2) "having one's main garment removed, stripped;" and (*OLD* 4a) "having no

[61]*Dieg.* 10.10.
[62]Translation by Trypanis (1958).
[63]The poetic plural is a common device in Ovid and convenient metrically (see also in this passage *atria* and *templa*).
[64]*Simulacrum* is the technical term for a cult statue and not an ornamental statue which would be called a *statua*; see Fishwick (2002: III, 90, note 182).

armour or weapons, unarmed."[65] I prefer the last definition for both *simulacrum* and *nudus* because they create an effective picture of Caesar as a victim who is vulnerable as an "unarmed image" (= εἴδωλον) in opposition to arm-bearing assassins.

Several literary precedents for a *simulacrum* (εἴδωλον) were available for Ovid to draw on for his passage. Bailey (after Hallam 1881: 128) thought that Ovid borrowed from Sophocles' *Iphigenia at Aulis* (of course, it is by Euripides), where Iphigenia's body was replaced with a dead deer before she was killed (E. *IA* 1580-1589). Most critics think that Ovid had the εἴδωλον of Helen in mind when he composed 3.701. Voit (1985: 50) suggests that Ovid took the *simulacrum* from the Παλινωιδία of Stesichorus,[66] whose own recantation may have been a source for Euripides' *Helen*, where, as revenge for Paris picking Aphrodite in the The Judgement of Paris, Hera gives to Paris an εἴδωλον of Helen (*Hel.* 33-35):

> δίδωσι δ' οὐκ ἔμ', ἀλλ' ὁμοιώσας' ἐμοὶ
> εἴδωλον ἔμπνουν οὐρανοῦ ξυνθεῖς' ἄπο,
> Πριάμου τυράννου παιδί
>
> She gave to king Priam's son not me
> But a breathing image she fashioned
> From the heavens to resemble her,

---

[65]Nagle (1995: 99), "a mere likeness;" Frazer (1929: 173), "his wraith;" Voit (1985: 53 ff.), "sein Scheinbild;" Newlands (1995: 44), "naked image" and (1996: 333) "false image;" Herbert-Brown (1994: 126), "only his semblance;" Salzman (1998: 336), "an unarmed image;" Boyle and Woodard (2000: 75), "a bare likeness;" Le Bonniec (1969: 220), "un vain simulacra." The *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française* (1694, 1798, 1835) says that when *simulacre* is used to mean a phantom (*fantôme*), it is regularly used with the epithet *vain* as it is in Le Bonniec's translation. Saltzman (1998: 336), for example, suggests that "*nuda* has the sense of unarmed, lacking protection as it does in *Fast.* 2.710, *traduntur ducibus moenia nuda suis*" (cf. *Ars* 3.5, *non erat armatis aequum concurrere nudas*).

[66]Austin (1994: 90-117).

while Hermes transports Helen to Egypt (44-45):

> λαβὼν δέ μ' Ἑρμῆς ἐν πτυχαῖσιν αἰθέρος
> νεφέλῃ καλύψας.
>
> So Hermes took me up within the recesses
> Of the sky, hiding me in a cloud.[67]

This εἴδωλον, not a person, was what the Trojans and Greeks fought over.[68] On the other hand, Bömer (1957: 129) considers the *simulacrum* in *Fast.* 3.701 to be a "gedankliche Verbindung" to the εἴδωλον in Euripides' *Electra*, where Zeus has sent an image of Helen to Troy which became the catalyst for the Trojan war (*El.* 1282-1283),

> Ζεὺς δ' ὡς ἔρις γένοιτο καὶ φόνος βροτῶν,
> εἴδωλον Ἑλένης ἐξέπεμψ' ἐς Ἴλιον.
>
> Rather, in order to cause strife and the slaying of mortals,
> Zeus sent an image of Helen of Troy.[69]

Scholars have missed a possible epic source for Ovid's *simulacrum*. In *Iliad* 5, Apollo removes Aeneas from battle and replaces him with an εἴδωλον for Diomedes to fight (*Il.* 5.445-450):

> 445 Αἰνείαν δ' ἀπάτερθεν ὁμίλου θῆκεν Ἀπόλλων
> Περγάμῳ εἰν ἱερῇ, ὅθι οἱ νηός γ' ἐτέτυκτο.
> ἦ τοι τὸν Λητώ τε καὶ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα
> ἐν μεγάλῳ ἀδύτῳ ἀκέοντό τε κύδαινόν τε·
> αὐτὰρ ὁ εἴδωλον τεῦξ' ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων
> 450 αὐτῳ τ' Αἰνείαι ἴκελον καὶ τεύχεσι τοῖον.
>
> 445 Aeneas then did Apollo set far from the throng
> In holy Pergamus, where his shrine had been built.
> There Leto and the archer Artemis healed him in the

[67]Text and translations from Kovacs (2002).
[68]In the same way, it is a *simulacrum* that the assassins attack in 3.701 and not Caesar. Barchiesi (1997: 126) says that "the assassins murdered a *simulacrum*" and Salzman (1998: 336) says that "the attackers here assaulted an unarmed image."
[69]Text and translations from Kovacs (2002).

Great sanctuary, and gave him glory; but Apollo of the
Silver bow fashioned a wraith in the likeness of
450 Aeneas himself and in armor like his.[70]

Ovid might have had this passage in mind, or perhaps Virgils' imitation at *A.* 10.636-637, where Juno creates a phantom Aeneas to protect her favourite Turnus from fighting the real Aeneas:

> Tum dea nube cava tenuem sine viribus umbram
> In faciem Aeneae visu mirabile monstrum.
>
> Then the goddess from hollow mist fashions a thin, strengthless Phantom in the likenes of Aeneas, a monstrous marvel to behold.[71]

702 QUAE CECIDIT FERRO, CAESARIS UMBRA FUIT

Caesaris umbra

Two definitions of *umbra* might be applicable here: (*OLD* 7a) "the disembodied form of a dead person, ghost, shade" or (*OLD* 9) "an empty form, semblance, phantom." Translations vary[72], but the second definition, however, is likely to be correct: Vesta did not leave behind a ghost of Caesar but an image for the assassins to stab. Most translators treat the *simulacra nuda* and *Caesaris umbra* independently,[73] while Voit (1985: 49-50) discusses them together.[74]

---

[70]Text and translation from Murray, rev. Wyatt (1999).
[71]Text and translation by Fairclough, rev. Goold (2000). Le Bonniec (1969: 220) has drawn attention to this passage as Ovid's possible source.
[72]Nagle (1995: 99), "phantom of Caesar;" Frazer (1929: 173), "Caesar's shade;" Le Bonniec (1969: 220), "l'ombre de Cèsar;" Voit (1985: 53 ff.), "sein Scheinbild;" Herbert-Brown (1994: 126) and Boyle and Woodard (2000: 75), "Caesar's shadow."
[73]See notes 62 and 69.
[74]"Caesar war von Vesta also schon unmittelbar vor seiner tatsächlichen Ermordung in seiner Person (*virum*) *in atria Iovis* (703) entführt worden, zurückblieb nur sein Scheinbild (*simulacra nuda*; *umbra*), das den Dolchen der Mörder zum Opfer fiel."

Caesaris

The context immediately clarifies the identity of *Caesaris* as Julius Caesar. The ambiguity of nomenclature in Augustan literature has been discussed by Rubincam (1990: 165), who says that "[most ancient authors were] content to preserve what was probably the informal practice of the time, calling both men 'Caesar' and leaving the reader to judge from the context which [was] meant where." So, when there is any chance of ambiguity in the *Fasti*, Ovid does use a different name for Augustus (5.567-568, *spectat et Augusto praetextum nomine templum, / et visum lecto Caesare maius opus*), or else the context clarifies the Caesar in question, as in *Fast.* 3.709-710.[75]

703 ILLE QUIDEM CAELO POSITUS IOVIS ATRIA VIDIT

One of the first acts of the newly formed Triumvirate of Antony, Octavian, and Lepidus was the deification of Julius Caesar in January 42 B.C. (D.C. 47.18.3).[76]

The theme of deification appears frequently in both the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*, and sometimes both works treat the same mythological figures (Callisto, Persephone, Ariadne, Romulus). In addition, Ovid also introduces in both poems the divinization of an historical figure (Julius Caesar), not simply or solely by referring to the new divinity but by creating a historically based myth of transformation. The notion that a living Roman could be considered a god was awkward, but "the distinctions between some of the leading figures in the state and the gods were increasingly blurred."[77] Pompey, Caesar's rival, received divine honours in the East that included a cult in Delos and the

[75]See also Rubincam (1992: 88-103) and Hardie (2002: 254-255).
[76]For these events, see Taylor (1931), Syme (1939, 1986), Weinstock (1971), Fishwick (1990: I), Galinsky (1996).
[77]Beard, North and Price (1998: I, 143) and Dyck's commentary on Cic. *Off.* 3.80 (1996: 600). See also Feeney (1998: 108-114) for a discussion on the "divinised human."

title "saviour" at Samos and Mytilene.[78] In Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*, Scipio explains that great statesmen can achieve immortality (*Rep.* 6.16, *iustitiam cole et pietatem, ... ; ea vita via est in caelum*), and that a person has a body on earth and a soul (from a star) that will return (it is implied) to the heavens (*Rep.* 6.15).

Both Ovid and Valerius Maximus describe the death of Julius Caesar as a separation of a divine soul form a mortal body. In *Met.* 15, Caesar's soul is snatched form his mortal body by Venus, then carried away and released into heaven (844-846, *alma Venus ... / Caesaris eripuit membris nec in aera solvi / passa recentem animam caelestibus intulit astris*; cf. 840-841), while it is implied in *Fast.* 3. 697-710. In Valerius Maximus it is Caesar's divine spirit that was separated from his mortal body when he was murdered (4.6.6, *divinus spiritus mortali discernbatur a corpore*; cf. 1.8.8).

Ovid alludes to this separation again in reference to Augustus' deification when he tells us that he wrote a poem in Getic that taught that the body of Father Augustus[79] was mortal and that his spirit went from his home to heaven (*Pont.* 4.13.25-26 *patris Augusti docui mortale fuisse / corpus, in aetherias numen abisse domos*; cf. Germ. *Arat.* 558-560, *hic, Auguste, tuum genitali corpore numen / attonitas inter gentis patriamque parentem / in caelum* [sc. Capricorn] *tulit et maternis reddidit astris*). Here the deified mortal (Augustus) is not merely going to heaven but returning home (see also Vell. 2.123.2, *animam caelestem caelo* [sc. Augustus] *reddidit*; Man. 1.799-800; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.45; *Met.* 15.868-870; Vell. 2.124.3). This idea is also expressed in Valerius Maximus 4.5.6,

[78]Beard, North and Price (1998: I, 147).
[79]The usual title of a male god. Caesar is also called *Pater* in Prop. 4.6.59. This title also emphasizes the paternal aspect of the deity (cf. *Pater Bacchus* in Hor. *Carm.* 1.18.6 and 3.3.13).

where the modesty shown by Caesar in his death is called the way immortal gods return to their abodes (*non homines exspirant sed di immortales sedes suas repetunt*, cf. *Fast.* 2.833).

The *Metamorphoses* includes other passages that treat the "mortal/divine" separation of figures: Ino and Melicertes (4.539-542), Hercules (9.268-270), Aeneas (14.602-607) and Romulus (14.824-826).[80] In some cases, it is said that the best part remains – a divine spirit that becomes immortalized (14.603: Aeneas; 9.268: Hercules).

caelo positus

The phrase *caelo positus*, meaning "placed in the sky," is a metaphor for deification (*OLD* 3c, *caelum*). A phrase with a similar meaning, *imponere caelo* ("to place in the sky"), appears in the *Metamorphoses* (cf. 2.507, 4.614, 14.810).[81] In *Orestes* (see above pp. 25-26), the "snatched" Helen is put in heaven (1636-1637, ἐν αἰθέρος πτυχαῖς / σύνθακος ἔσταιεν). This idea is also present in Callimachus fr. 228, where Arsinoë is snatched and placed in heaven by the Dioscuri (above pp. 26-27). In the parallel passage in *Metamorphoses* 15, a phrase with a similar meaning also appears (846, *caelestibus intulit astris*).

The notion that Caesar was placed in the sky with the gods was established long before Ovid. At his funeral, mourners took Caesar's bier up to the Capitoline to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus to cremate and bury him in the temple's cella so that he

---

[80]Mythological figures in the *Metamorphoses* can have their mortal bodies melted away (14.824: Romulus), washed away (14.603: Aeneas), or burnt away (9.268: Hercules), or can have a deity change it (4.539: Ino and Melicertes).

[81]Bömer (1969-86: I, 364) calls it "eine speziell ovidische Wendung". Other phrases that appear in the *Metamorphoses* include: 8.179, *inmisit caelo*; 9.272, *intulit astris* (cf. Germ. *Arat.* 558, *in caelum tulit*; Sen. *Her. O.* 1433-1434, *inter astra positus*).

would be (physically) placed among the gods though on earth (Suet. *Jul.* 84.3; App. *B.C.* 2.20.148; D.C. 44.50.2).[82] Valerius Maximus writes ironically that the assassins themselves added Caesar to the council of the gods (1.6.13, *deorum concilio adiecerunt*).[83]

A comet seen during the funeral games held in July 44 B.C. to pay homage to the assassinated Caesar further strengthened the view that he had become a god. During the *ludi Veneris Genetricis* (Nic. Dam. *Caes.* 28.108; App. *B.C.* 3.28.107) or *ludi Victoriae Caesaris*[84] (Cic. *Fam.*11.28.6; Suet. *Aug.* 10.11) a comet was seen in the early evening (Plin. *Nat.* 2.93-94; Sen. *Nat.* 7.17.2; D.C. 45.6.4-7.1; Obseq. 68; Serv. *Ecl.* 9.47; Serv. *A.* 1.287, 6.790, 8.681).[85] There are also literary illusions to the comet (Verg. *Ecl.* 9.46-49; Verg. *A.* 8.681; Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.46-48; Prop. 3.18.33-34, 4.6.59; Val. Max. 1 *praef.*, 3.2.19, 6.9.15; Sil. 13.862-866). This comet was accepted as being both propitious (Ov. *Met.* 15.746-750, 840-850) and baleful (Verg. *G.* 1.487-488; Tib. 2.5.71; Calp. *Ecl.* 1.77-83). Traditionally, the appearance of a comet was ominous (Man. 1.892; Plin. *Nat.* 2.89;

---

[82]Taylor (1931: 80-84). Since this was not allowed by the temple's priests, the bier was taken back to the Forum, where a pyre was set up for the cremation (Suet. *Jul.* 84.3, App. *B.C.* 2.20.148, Cic. *Phil.* 2.91; Cic. *Att.* 14.10.1). Later, Caesar's ashes were buried on the Capitoline as planned (D.C. 44.51.1).

[83]Cf. V. Max. 1.7.2 (*sed iam alter* [sc. Caesar] *operibus suis aditum sibi ad caelum instruxerat*). For a discussion of Caesar's divinity in Valerius Maximus, see Wardle (1997: 336-343).

[84]"Not only do we find that our Greek and Latin texts call Octavian's games by two different names ... the bulk of our sources, including most likely Octavian himself in his autobiography, chose to refer to the games as the *ludi Veneris Genetricis*, a name that is regarded by modern scholars as already obsolete by 44 B.C.," Ramsey and Licht (1997: 2-3).

[85]Modern discussions of this event can be found in Taylor (1931: 91); Weinstock (1971: 370); Fishwick (1990: I, 74); Ramsay and Licht (1997: 135-153).

Sen. *Nat.* 7.17.2; Serv. *A.* 10.272; Lyd. *Ost.* 11),[86] but this one was considered favourable by the Roman people and rationalized as signifying Caesar's soul being taken up and put with the gods in heaven (Plin. *Nat.* 2.94, *eo sidere significare vulgus credidit Caesaris animam inter deorum immortalium numina receptam*). Augustus relished the people's interpretation and made that public (Plin. *Nat.* 2.94). In addition, he regularly promoted this comet since it symbolized Caesar's divinity, his own descent from a god (*divi filius*) and perhaps his own future apotheosis.[87] Privately his interpretation was that the comet "was born for him and he was born in it" (Plin. *Nat.* 2.94, *interiore gaudio sibi illum natum seque in eo nasci interpretatus est*).

The so-called Belvedere Altar[88] (ca. 12-2 B.C.) contains a tableau with four reliefs, one perhaps depicting Caesar's apotheosis and unification with the gods. A figure on the far left is presumed to be Augustus standing below the chariot of the sun-god, which flies towards the east. Directly to the left of Augustus is a *quadriga* carrying Caesar as it commences its journey up to heaven. On the other side of the *quadriga* stand three figures, one adult (perhaps Venus) and two smaller ones (apparently children) on either side. Above and to the far right of Venus, Caelus the sky god personifies heaven,

---

[86]A comet had appeared during the Catiline conspiracy, the battle at Pharsalus, and the battle at Philippi. See also Weinstock (1971: 371, notes 8-10). Only two other positive interpretations of a comet have occurred before in ancient literature, both celebrating the birth and accession of Mithridates; see Weinstock (1971: 371, note 12).

[87]Zanker (1990: 34-36) and Galinsky (1996: 313).

[88]See discussion on this monument in Taylor (1931: 186-190, figs. 36-39), Weinstock (1971: 359, pl. 22.2); Zanker (1990: 220-222, Fig. 177); Galinsky (1996: 320-321, fig. 151); Beard, North, and Price (1998: I, 186-187, figure 4.3).

Caesar's destination. This depiction on the relief is consistent with "official" Augustan representations of Caesar's deification.[89]

While Ovid clearly depicts Caesar's ascension in *Met.* 15.845-846, it is only implied in *Fast.* 3.703, yet he presents the image of other figures being transported to heaven. In *Metamorphoses*, Hercules is transported by Jupiter in a quadriga (9. 272, *quadriiugo curru radiantibus intulit astris*), Romulus is transported by Mars Gradivus and his horses (14.820-822, *in pavidos conscendit equos Gradivus et ictu / verberis increpuit pronusque per aera lapsus / constitit in summo nemorosi colle Palati*) and in the *Fasti*, Romulus transports himself with his father's horses (2.496, *rex patris astra petebat equis*) which may suggest a chariot (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.15-16, ... *hac Quirinus / Martis equis Acheronta fugit*).[90]

Iovis atria

An *atrium* can be the first main room in a house where callers are received (*OLD* 1; often plural for singular in poets); the whole house, a palace (*OLD* 2; plural); or a room in a temple or other building used for doing business (*OLD* 3). In the context of this passage the second definition is correct, "Jove's palace," as Ovid's use of *atria* in another work can illustrate (*Met.* 1.171-172, *dextra laevaque deorum / atria nobilium valvis celebrantur apertis*; see also Stat. *Theb.* 1.197, Apul. *Met.* 6.19).

While he was alive, Caesar connected himself to Jupiter,[91] as his descendant (through Venus), and received the title Caesar Jupiter Julius from the Senate before his

[89]Beard, North and Price (1998: I, 185-186).
[90]Bömer (1969-86: IV, 359) says that Ovid is the only one to speak of a quadriga and that this is a Roman convention and not a Greek one.
[91]See Weinstock (1971: 287-317).

assassination (D.C. 44.6.4). In a dream the night before his assassination, he saw himself flying above the clouds holding Jupiter's hand (Suet. *Jul.* 81.3; D.C. 44.17.1).

704 ET TENET IN MAGNO TEMPLA DICATA FORO

Construction of the temple to Divus Iulius began ca. 36 B.C.[92] This temple was built on the very spot of Caesar's cremation (D.C. 47.18.4), a place previously containing an altar (App. *B.C.* 2.20.148),[93] and was dedicated on August 18, 29 B.C. (D.C. 51.22.2). It was a hexastyle temple that had a rectangular platform at its front, known as the Rostra Julia, which was unique in Rome and was decorated with the prows of ships captured at the Battle of Actium.[94]

This temple already appeared on coins several years before it was dedicated in 29 B.C. One coin dated to 36 B.C. depicts a statue of Caesar standing inside the temple as both a *pontifex maximus* with *capite velato* and an augur holding a *lituus*, while outside the temple the altar can be seen. A star prominently displayed on the pediment of the temple alludes to Caesar's divinity (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 94).[95]

Magno Foro

The unique designation *Magno Foro* has been overlooked by scholars. Literally, *Magnum Forum* stands for the "Great Forum of Rome"[96] though it was usually called "the Roman Forum" or just "the Forum." In a catalogue of the fourteen regions of Rome

---

[92]Steinby (1993: III, 116-119, figs. 77-81, 426-428).
[93]Weinstock (1971: 364-367).
[94]Zanker (1990: 80-81).
[95]Discussions on this coin can be found in Sydenham (1952: 208, pl. 1338), Grueber (1970: pl. 122.4), Weinstock (1971: 378), Crawford (1974: 540), and Galinsky (1996: fig. 1, 17).
[96]Boyle and Woodard (2000: 75) translate this phrase as "in his great Forum" which suggests the Julian Forum.

(*Curiosum Urbis Romae Regionum XIIII*) that is believed to be based upon Augustus' topographical division of Rome created ca. 7 B.C., the title of Region 8 is *Forum Romanum Magnum.*[97] Dio refers to the Forum Romanum once as μεγάλη[98] in order to distinguish between the Roman Forum and the Julian Forum while Ovid is the only extant Latin literary source for this appellation.[99]

705-707 AT QUICUMQUE NEFAS AUSI, PROHIBENTE DEORUM NUMINE, POLLUERANT PONTIFICALE CAPUT, MORTE IACENT MERITA

quicumque nefas ausi

The reader of *Fasti* 3.697-710 would know to whom Ovid was referring with the phrase *quicumque nefas ausi* ("all who dared this crime"), and so he did not need to name the murderers, suggesting also perhaps that they did not deserve to be named (cf. *Fast.* 3.700, *sacrilegae manus*; *Met.* 1.200, *manus inpia*). In his entry on the Temple to Mars Ultor, Ovid calls them "conspirators" (*Fast.* 5.572, *coniuratis*)[100] and "enemy" (*Fast.* 5.578, *hoste*) while Augustus himself does not mention them except as *eos* (Aug. *Anc.* 2). Livy calls them *coniurati* (*Per.* 116) and *percussores* (*Per.* 117), while Valerius calls them *parricidae* (4.5.6). *Parricidae* alludes to Caesar's title *Pater patriae* (Suet. *Jul.* 76.1, *cognomen Patris patriae*), inscribed on a column that was raised in the Forum after his death (Suet. *Jul.* 85). Suetonius attests to the Ides of March being called the

[97]Valentini and Zucchetti (1940: 89; for the name of this catalogue, see pp. 68-88).
[98]D.C. 43.22.2. Valentini and Zucchetti say that (1940: 113, note 1) "quello di Magnum, secondo Cassio Dione, XLIII.22.2 gli sarebbe venuto dopo la construzione del foro di Caesare."
[99]See also Steinby (1993: II, 313-325).
[100]See also *Met.* 15.763 (*coniurata arma moveri*).

Parricidium after the assassination (*Jul.* 88, *placuit Idus ... Martias Parricidium nominari*).[101]

nefas

Nefas is "something contrary to divine law, sinful, unlawful, execrable, abominable, criminal; an impious or wicked deed, a sin, a crime" (*OLD*). Other sources for the assassination use a variety of synonyms. In the *Metamorphoses* Ovid uses *facinus* twice (15.777, 802), "a bad deed, misdeed, outrage, villany, crime" (*OLD* 2), as does Augustus (Aug. *Anc.* 2). Cicero (*Phil.* 2.11.29) calls it *crimen*, Livy (*Per.* 116) calls it *caedes* and Valerius Maximus calls it both *scelus* (6.8.4) and *parracidium*.[102]

Unlike *facinus*, *crimen*, *caedis*, *scelus* and *parracidium*, *nefas* connotes "something contrary to divine law," and because of this and the powerful religious language of 705-707, Ovid's choice of words suggest a sacrilegious desecration against the gods and the Roman state.

prohibente deorum numine

The *OLD* has 7 main definitions for *prohibeo*: to "keep apart, "avert," "defend (someone or something)," "prevent (someone from doing something)," "preclude (an action)," "ban," and "prohibit." Translations vary,[103] but the most probable meaning of

---

[101]The historical sources also report that the conspirators suggested that Rome's birthday be moved to the day of Caesar's assassination. For the conspirators the assassination signalled a turning point in Roman history, and their liberation from an enemy of Rome. They had a coin minted with a liberty cap framed by daggers on either side to mark this significant change (Crawford, 1974: 513). This liberty cap represented the *libertas* gained from this assassination which was depicted by the daggers. Similarly, Cassius had coins minted with the legend "LEIBERTAS" (see Crawford, 1974: 452).

[102]See also *Fast.* 5.575, [sc. assassins] *scelerato sanguine*.

[103]Nagle (1995: 99), "forbidden by the power of the gods;" Frazer (1929: 173), "in defiance of the god's will;" Le Bonniec (1969: 220), "bravant la volonté des dieux;"

prohibeo here is "to avert" (*OLD* 2). *Prohibeo* also appears in the parallel passage in the *Metamorphoses*. The fact that Ovid use *prohibeo* at *Met.* 15.777 of "averting" swords from Caesar supports that same meaning here (15.777, *quos* [sc. gladios] *prohibete, precor, facinusque repellite*).

In the *Metamorphoses*, it is the Fates who have decided Caesar's misfortune and not the gods (15.780-81, *qui rumpere quamquam / ferrea non possunt veterum decreta sororum*); even though they did not want Caesar dead, their own forewarnings could still not avert the crime (15.799-800, *non tamen insidias menturaque vincere fata / praemonitus potuere deum*).

polluerant

Polluo here means to "pollute, violate, dishonour, and desecrate" (*OLD* 2a). Caesar as a religious figure has been violated through an assassination which constitutes a sacrilegious act against a Roman religious symbol connected with Vesta, the hearth of Rome. Similarly, Valerius Maximus twice uses *violo*, meaning "to dishonour, outrage, and violate not just emotionally but also physically" (*OLD* 1), of Julius Caesar's murder (1.8.8, *sed mortali adhuc corpore utentem violando meruisti ut tam infestum haberes deum*; 4.5.6, *compluribus enim parricidarum violatus mucronibus*), as does Suetonius (*Jul.* 89, *eodem illo pugione, quo Caesarem violaverant*).[104]

Herbert-Brown (1994: 126) and Boyle and Woodard (2000: 75), "against the will of the gods."

[104]Wardle (1997: 336) says that "Valerius' use of *violatus* with its usual moral overtones of ill-treatment of something sacred or quasi-sacred heightens the portrayal of enormity."

pontificale caput

Pontificale caput stands for *pontifex* by synecdoche. Ovid may have chosen the expression to refer to the veiled head of the *pontifex*, and may be referring to the cult statue of Julius Caesar in his temple, where he was shown as *Pontifex Maximus* with *capite velato* (see above, p. 37). A *lituus* showed him as an augur as well, and this is the first time that a Roman was portrayed with the attributes of both a *Pontifex Maximus* and an augur simultaneously. Numismatic evidence shows that Augustus had himself depicted in the same way (Sydenham 1952: 206, pl. 1321), and a relief, dedicated in 2 B.C., on the front of the Altar of the Lares from the *vicus Sandaliarius* portrays him with head covered and bearing a *lituus* (Galinsky, 1996: 304-307, figs. 142-143).

morte merita

The phrase *morte merita*, which literally means "in a death deserved", appears also in Verg. *A.* 4.696 (*nam quia nec fato, merita nec morte peribat*), where Dido commits suicide, and in *A.* 11.849 (*morte luet merita*) where Diana says that the murderer of Camilla deserves death.[105] People who die such a death are those who have committed a crime.[106]

The sentiment that the assassins deserved to die may be related to the retribution that Augustus sought via the Pedian law, which gave him the legal means to carry it out

[105] A Homeric parallel is found in the *Odyssey* (1.46, ἐοικότι κεῖται ὀλέθρωι).

[106] In his commentary on *A.* 4, Pease (1935: 531 [citing Norden]) says that "death may be roughly divided ... into those arising from natural causes ... and the latter class into the deaths of those punished for criminal acts ... and those whose life is ended untimely ... those condemned on false charges, suicides, and deaths from love and in war." Caesar's assassins fall into this second category of death. The criminals who die in a death deserved "have their souls placed in Tartarus, according to 6.548-625." See also Serv. *A.* 4.696, *ille enim dicuntur non fato perire sed merito qui maxime in deos et non ignoscenda committunt, ut Salmoneus, ut ...Mezentius, ut Tityus.*

(Aug. *Anc.* 2, *qui parentem meum [interfecer]un[t, eo]s in exilium expuli iudiciis legitimis ultus eorum [fa]cin[us]*; Vell. 2.69.5, *at lege Pedia, quam consul Pedius collega Caesaris tulerat, omnibus, qui Caesarem patrem interfecerant, aquas ignique interdictum erat*; Liv. *Per.* 120, *C. Caesar consul legem tulit de quaestione habenda in eos, quorum pater occisus esset*; Suet. *Aug.* 10, *legibus adgredi reosque caedis absentis deferre statuit*; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 9, App. *B.C.* 3.14.95). Valerius Maximus shares this sentiment, also using *mereo* (6.8.4, *quas merebatur poenas*). He also tells Cassius that he "deserved" to have the hostility of the deified Caesar (1.8.8, *sed mortali adhuc corpore utentem violando meruisti ut tam infestum haberes deum*), and suggests that the assassin was driven to suicide (6.8.4, *tu profecto tunc, dive Iuli, caelestibus tuis vulneribus debitam*[107] *exegisti vindictam, perfidum erga te caput sordidi auxilii supplex fieri cogendo, eo animi aestu conpulsum, ut neque retinere vitam vellet neque finire sua manu auderet*).[108]

707-708 TESTES ESTOTE, PHILIPPI, / ET QUORUM SPARSIS OSSIBUS ALBET HUMUS

testes estote

Littlewood (1980: 320) wrongly considers *testes estote*, "be the witnesses," to be an example of the epic formula *testis erit*.[109]

Estote appears only four times in Ovid, once here in 3.707, once in the *Metamorphoses* and twice in the *Ars Amatoria* (*Met.* 4.154-155, *hoc tamen amborum verbis estote rogati, / o multum miseri meus illiusque parentes*; *Ars* 3.59-60, *venturae*

[107] *Debeo* is a synonym of *mereo*; *debita vindicta* amounts to *mors merita*.
[108] Plu. *Brut.* 42.4-5; App. *B.C.* 4.15.113, 131; D.C. 47.46.5, 47.1.
[109] *Testis erit* is not exclusive to epic (cf. Prop. 3.15.11).

memores iam nunc estote senectae: / sic nullum vobis tempus abitibit iners, and 3.547-548, *vatibus Aoniis faciles estote, puellae: / numen inest illis, Pieridesque favent*).

A future imperative like *estote* "specifies an action whose realization is to be non-immediate ... and the non-immediacy may be either temporal or conditional."[110] It is commonly found in both prose and verse didactic works, and in Ovid's *Ars* more than a third of the imperatives in Books 1 and 3 are future imperatives.[111] Studies on the future imperative in prose works, especially Cato's *de Agricultura*, show that it is more common than the ordinary imperative, and that "the continuing popularity of the imperative in *–to* may suggest that these authors were at some level conscious of writing in a particular tradition of technical prose, which stretches back to the time of Cato."[112]

Philippi

The battle of Philippi (42 B.C.) is generally referred to in the singular, but most sources indicate two battles: Aug. *Anc.* 2 (*[e]t postea bellum inferentis rei publicae vici b[is a]cie*); Vell. 2.70 (both battles); Suet. *Aug. 13* (*duplici*); App. *B.C.* 4.14.110-112 (first battle); 4.16.128 (second battle); Plu. *Ant.* 22.2-5 (both battles).[113]

Numerous references to Philippi appear in Augustan and post-Augustan poetry.[114] The battles of Philippi and Pharsalia are sometimes conflated by the poets, as one can best

---

[110]Gibson (1998: 83).

[111]*Ars* 2 was not considered in Gibson (1998). Most of the future imperatives in that work are second person singular.

[112]Gibson (1998: 84, especially note 26).

[113]Liv. *Per.* 124, does not discuss the number of battles but rather the number of days. For the battle of Philippi, see Holmes (1928: I, 80-89) and Fuller (1954: 207-216); and *CAH* X.1.2.5-8 (C. Pelling) for a more general discussion.

[114]*Eleg. Maec.* 43-44; Hor. *Carm.* 2.7.9-10, 3.4.26; Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.49-52; Prop. 2.1.27; Ov. *Met.* 15.824; [Sen.] *Oct.* 515-517; Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.64-66; Verg. *G.* 1.489-492; Man. 1.907-909; Juv. 8.241-243; Petr. 121.109-112, 114; Serv. *A.* 1.294, 6.832; Calp. *Ecl.* 1.50-51; Flor. *Epit.* 2.13.43.

see from Lucan, who has seven references in his *Bellum Civile*.[115] At times he appears to refer to Philippi and Pharsalia as the same battle (Luc. 1.680, 694, 7.872), and therefore some scholars, notably Ahl (1976: 71), suggest that the conflation is "not the result of Lucan's ignorance" but rather was influenced by a desire to make a rhetorical point about the similarity of these two civil wars.[116] Manilius also conflates the battles for a rhetorical purpose (1.907-909, *nec plura alias incendia mundus / sustinuit, quam cum ducibus iurata cruentis / arma Philippeos implerunt agmine campos*).

Quorum

Quorum has no obvious antecedent. It cannot be Philippi since *et* seems to connect Philippi and whatever the antecedent is, and the only possibility seems to be an understood *vos* – the dead Romans whose scattered bones whiten the battlefield – or perhaps, *ei / illi* (as in Frazer's translation). It is difficult to say whether having the conspirators bear witness to their having deserved to die by the presence of their bones is too much "over the top" for Ovid, but Valerius Maximus seems to go almost as far, at 1.8.8. and especially at 6.8.4 (see above p. 42). Two emendations have been proposed: Gertz (1885-87: 314) offered *heu* or *a(h)* to replace *et* ("ideoque 'et' interpositum corruptum sit, in quo interiectionem heu vel potius a latere suspicor"), while Alton (1926: 118) replaced *et quorum* with *quorum bis*. Manuscript R[117] had *et quorum sparsibus* before the correction. Alton (1926: 118) says that, "the blunder may have arisen from the omission of *bis* or from a disarrangement (*sparsis bis*)." Alton's emendation emphasizes

[115]Luc. 1.679-680, 693-694; 6.580-581; 7.590-59, 853-854, 871-872; 9.270-271.
[116]Ahl (1971: 71, note 19).
[117]Manuscript "R", the Vaticanus Reginensis 1709, is the oldest and best manuscript dating back to the late tenth century. It is known as "A" in other editions of the *Fasti*.

the two battles at Philippi[118] and provides the best solution: "be witness, Philippi, whose ground is twice whitened with scattered bones".

As noted above (pp. 43-44), some sources do refer to two battles at Philippi. Such references can draw attention to the fact that it took Augustus two battles to defeat his father's assassins, or downplay the fact that Antony was widely regarded as the winner of the first. Many of Rome's potential future leaders died here, and the battlefield was littered twice with corpses that became the reminder of not only the cost of war but more importantly the cost of *civil* war (Vell. 2.71.1, *non aliud bellum cruentuis caede clarissimorum virorum fuit*).

sparsis ossibus humus albet

There are several references to Philippi and the battlefield of bones: Verg. *G.* 1.497, *grandiaque effossis mirabitur ossa sepulcris*; Man. 1.910-911, *vixque etiam sicca miles Romanus harena / ossa virum lacerosque prius super astitit artus*; Luc. 7.538, *hic numerus totos tibi vestiat ossibus agros*; Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.65, *albos ossibus Italis Philippos*; Sid. *Ep.* 3.2.1, *campos sepultos ossibus insepultis.*[119] Such descriptions of battlefields strewn with white bones occur elsewhere in Latin poetry and history and can be regarded as a literary convention (Verg. *A.* 12.36, *sanguine adhuc campique ingentes ossibus albent*; Tac. *Ann.* 1.61.10, *medio campi albentia ossa*).

---

[118]The editions by Bömer (1957-58) and Le Bonniec (1969) both mention Alton's emendation, as does Landi (1928) and Castiglioni's revised edition of Landi (1960). This emendation does not appear in the Teubner *Fasti*, finished by Wormell and Courtney after Alton's death.

[119]For the idea of a battlefield as a graveyard, see Prop. 2.1.27, *civilia busta*, 1.22.3, *si Perusina tibi patriae sunt nota sepulcra*; and Catul. 68.89, *commune sepulcrum*.

709 HOC OPUS, HAEC PIETAS, HAEC PRIMA ELEMENTA FUERUNT

Anaphora appears often in Latin poetry, and often, as here, with forms of a demonstrative pronoun; cf., for example, *Fast.* 2.774, *hic color, haec facies, hic decor oris erat.*

pietas

Pietas is the Roman virtue that consists of the fulfillment of duty by one man toward another, particularly between blood relations and relations by marriage, but also towards the gods and the state.

Pietas was one of four virtues listed on Augustus' golden shield of 27 B.C. placed in the new Curia Julia, named for Caesar (Aug. *Anc.* 34.2, *clupeus aureus in curia Iulia positus, quem mihi senatum populumque Romanum dare virtutis clementiae iustitiae pietatis causa testatum est per eius clupei inscriptionem*).[120]

In 43 B.C., the moneyer L. Livineius Regulus issued a coin which on one side depicted Octavian, on the other Aeneas and Anchises. Weinstock (1971: 254) says that "[Aeneas and Anchises] did not refer to Octavian's *pietas* but to his heroic ancestry." Even without the image of Caesar and Augustus, father and son together, Aeneas' depiction with his father Anchises is a direct reference to Augustus' own filial *pietas* towards Caesar.

---

[120]Compare, *iusta arma*, p. 50. For a discussion of Augustus' virtues, see Galinsky (1996: 83-88). Augustus found other ways in which to promote an image of filial piety. After Philippi, Augustus established a colony named Pietas Iulia in Pola (Plin. *Nat.* 3.129). The date of establishment for this colony is disputed; see Weinstock (1971: 255, note 2).

elementa

When *elementum* appears in the plural it can mean either "the basic principles of an art or science or a person's education in general, rudiments" (*OLD* 4) or "the first beginnings, germs, etc. (of a quality, condition, or similar)" (*OLD* 4b).

Its probable meaning here is the first, emphasizing Augustus' revenge as the start of his growth and development as a political leader. Elsewhere Ovid refers to his formation in the entry for May 12, a day that is not only the anniversary date of the dedication of the temple to Mars Ultor but also a day that recalls Philippi and the avenging of Caesar as the necessary beginning of his career (*Fast.* 5.569-570, *voverat hoc iuvenis tum, cum pia sustulit arma: / a tantis Princeps incipiendus erat*).

Prima elementa appears one other time in the *Fasti* (3.179, *parva fuit, si prima velis elementa referre*) where it means the "first beginnings" (*OLD* 4b).[121]

710 CAESARIS, ULCISCI IUSTA PER ARMA PATREM

Once his adoption became official, Octavian set out to avenge Caesar's death.[122] For this reason the *lex Pedia* was promulgated in 43 B.C. with the purpose of putting the assassins on trial, banishing them and confiscating their property (see above pp. 41-42). For Augustus, then, the *lex Pedia* made it possible to avenge Caesar's death legally (Aug. *Anc.* 2, *iudiciis legitimis*), in a civil war if necessary.

---

[121]Horace uses it in a similar way (Carm. 3.24.51-54, *eradenda cupidinis / pravi sunt elementa et tenerae nimis / mentes asperioribus / formandae studiis*).

[122]For a more thorough discussion of the sources, see Riedl (1989: 40-52, "Die Rache an den Caesarmörden"). For Augustus as avenger see Hor. Carm. 1.2.80, *Caesaris ultor*; Ov. *Met.* 15.821, *fortissimus ultor*; V. Max. 6.8.4, *gravissimi sceleris ultor.*

ulcisci

Ovid's use of *ulcisci* is surely intended to imply that the war was a just war (to the extent that revenge can be identified with justice), emphasized further by the erection of the temple to Mars Ultor[123] to celebrate the victory at Philippi over Caesar's assassins (Suet. *Aug.* 29, *aedem Martis bello Philippensi pro ultione paterna suscepto voverat*; Vell. 2.100.2, *divus Augustus abhinc annos triginta se et Gallo Caninio consulibus, dedicato Martis templo animos oculosque populi Romani repleverat*; D.C. 60.5.3, ἐν τῇι τοῦ Αὐγούστου νουμηνιᾶι, ἐν ᾗι ἐγεγέννητο, ἠγωνίζοντο μὲν ἵπποι, οὐ δι' ἐκεῖνον δὲ ἀλλ' ὅτι ὁ τὸ Ἄρεως ναὸς ἐν ταυτῇι καθιέρωτο καὶ δία τοῦτο ἐτησίοις ἀγῶσιν ἐτετίμητο).[124]

Another episode of the *Fasti* deals with the avenging of Julius Caesar at Philippi. The entry for May 12 (5.569-580) is the anniversary date of the dedication of the temple to Mars Ultor:[125]

Voverat hoc iuvenis tum, cum pia sustulit arma:
A tantis Princeps incipiendus erat.
Ille manus tendens, hinc stanti milite iusto,
Hinc coniuratis, talia dicta dedit:
"Si mihi bellandi pater est Vestaeque sacerdos
Auctor, et ulcisci numen utrumque paro,
Mars, ades et satia scelerato sanguine ferrum,
Stetque favor causa pro meliore tuus.
Templa feres et, me victore, vocaberis Ultor."

[123]Herbert-Brown (1996: 108) calls the dedication to Mars Ultor "one of the greatest hoaxes of the Augustan regime;" for more on this topic, see Herbert-Brown (1994-95-108); for the idea of the vow as invention, see Weinstock (1971: 130).

[124]Dio also records that a temple was decreed to Mars Ultor because of the Parthian war (54.8.3).

[125]For a discussion of this dedication date, see Simpson (1977: 91-94). For other discussions on this passage see Newland's chapter "The Temple of Mars Ultor" (1995: 87-123) and Barchiesi (2002: 1-22).

Voverat et fuso laetus ab hoste redit.
Nec satis est meruisse semel cognomina Marti:
Persequitur Parthi signa retenta manu.

The young man had vowed this when he took up pious arms:
The *Princeps* had to get his start from such great things.
With extended hands, with a just army on one side
And the conspirators on the other, he spoke the following words:
"If my father and Vesta's priest is my authority to wage war,
And I am preparing to avenge both divinities,
Be present, Mars, and glut my sword with criminal blood
And let your favour stand for the better cause.
You will earn temples, and when I win you will be called Avenger."
He had made his vow, and returned in joy from routing the enemy.
It is not enough for Mars to have deserved this title once:
He pursues the standards retained by the Parthian's hand.

The entries for both March 15 (3.697-710) and May 12 (5.569-580) contain a number of ideological parallels. Augustan vengeance is a prominent theme in these two passages (*Fast.* 3.710; 5.574). The avenging of Caesar at Philippi is expressed in both passages as being Augustus' beginning and formation (3.709-710; 5.569-570). While the battle of Philippi has already happened in 3.707-708, Augustus is at Philippi (5.5.71-572, it is implied), standing between the opposing armies and invoking Mars Ultor. Augustus' method of avenging Caesar's murder is just (3.710, *iusta arma*; 5.571, *milite iusto*) and also an act of piety towards Caesar (3.709, *pietas*; 5.569, *pia arma*). Augustus is not only avenging his father (3.710, *patrem*; 5.573, *pater*) but also Vesta's priest – the *Pontifex Maximus* (3.699, *meus sacerdos*, 705, *pontificale*; 5.573, *Vestae sacerdos*). This religious affliation between goddess and priest is made clear in both passages.

Each passage contains a speech with common elements. Vesta's speech (3.699-710) and Augustus' speech (5.573-577) are linked not only through the themes of a son as

the avenger of both his father and a *pontifex maximus* but also through language (*sacerdos, ferrum, templum, numen, mereri, ulcisci, pater*).

There are other linguistic parallels as well. Ovid uses *princeps* of both Caesar (3.697) and Augustus (5.570). The assassins are referred to in both passages but more explicitly in *Fasti* 5, with *coniuratis* (572) and *hoste* (578) (cf. 3.705, *quicumque nefas ausi*, 700, *sacrilegae manus*). That Caesar's murder was a crime is expressed by both *nefas* (3.705) and *scelerato sanguine* (5.575).

iusta arma

Literally, *iusta arma* means "just arms" or "just warfare," a common expression in prose works (Cic. *Phil.* 11.37; Liv. 30.31, 35.33, 38.22; Curt. 4.14, 9.7; Tac. *Ann.* 14.32.11), and in poetry (Sil. 12.470), including elegiacs, where military motifs are frequently used to depict the war of love (Ov. *Ep.* 5.98; Ov. *Ars* 2.397). A close parallel to *Fast.* 3.710 is *Met.* 7.458 (*iustis ulciscitur armis*), where a father (Minos) seeks to avenge the death of his son Androgeus.

The virtue *Iustitia*, espoused by both Caesar and Augustus, was connected to the principles of war. A Roman war had to have just cause and be pious and therefore was often called "*iustum et pium.*"[126] In Rome, a *bellum iustum* "was never an aggressive war but one waged in self-defence, in defence of treaties, for the protection of the citizens and of their property."[127] Augustus had *just* reasons to wage war against Caesar's assassins (Aug. *Anc.* 2, *iudiciis legitimis*).

[126]Weinstock (1971: 244, note 2).
[127]Weinstock (1971: 243, note 8).

patrem

Caesar's adoption of his grand-nephew Octavian is well documented: Aug. *Anc.* 8; Liv. *Per.* 116; Suet. *Jul.* 83.2; Vell. 2.59.1; Plin. *Nat.* 35.7.21; Nic. Dam. *Vit. Caes.* 13, 17; D.C. 45.5.3; App. *B.C.* 2.20.144; 3.2.11; 3.13.94. Appian (*B.C.* 3.13.94) records that it was ratified by a *lex curiata*, a vote of the *curiae*. Augustus' adoption, then, was confirmed by a law as well as a will.

Caesar was given the title *Parens Patriae*, literally "Parent of the Fatherland" (cf. Suet. *Jul.* 76.1, *Patris patriae*, Aug. *Anc.* 35, *patriam patriae*),[128] which was inscribed on a column in the Forum after his death (Suet. *Caes.* 85).

[128]App. *B.C.* 2.16.106, 2.20.144; D.C. 44.4.4; see also Weinstock (1971: 200-205).

Chapter 2: Interpretations

Anti-Augustan readings of Ovid's *Fasti* in general and of 3.697-710 in particular appear to dominate scholarship and overshadow pro-Augustan treatments.[129] This chapter will demonstrate that a pro-Augustan reading of *Fasti* 3.697-710 warrants consideration as a viable interpretation of Ovid's treatment of Caesar's assassination and deification.

I. Negative Elements

This section reviews anti-Augustan readings of this passage, then presents pro-Augustan arguments in response.

1. Length

For some scholars, a long passage (174 lines) about the annual festival of Anna Perenna, a time of song and drinking, including six aetiologies of her origin, juxtaposed next to a much shorter passage (14 lines) on Caesar's assassination and Augustus' revenge, indicates subversion. Ahl (1985: 315) states that "Ovid rubs some salt in this Julian wound by giving Anna 174 of the 188 lines he writes about the Ides of March. Julius Caesar gets only 14 lines and does not enter the account until Anna's story is fully told (*Fasti* 3.697-710)." Likewise McKeown (1984: 173-174) suggests that "this passage can be accommodated to the view that Ovid is bent on attacking the regime, for one might

[129]These terms have been used for the sake of convenience in describing the polarity of interpretations; in recent years scholars are moving away from these terms finding them reductive. For a discussion on the inadequacies of such terminology see Little (1972: 389-401), Galinsky (1975: 210-217), Williams (1978: 93-94), McKeown (1984: 177), and Barchiesi (1997: 43-44). For the interpretation of the *Fasti* as "a purely literary exercise", see Kenney (1982: 429) and McKeown (1984: 177). Fantham (2002: 230) believes that "we should judge Ovid's *Fasti* as a poetic enterprise, an artistic meditation on the calendar and its religious associations, which shows considerable consultation of learned sources, but as much poetic invention as religious expertise."

argue that the sincerity of the encomium of the divine Julius and of Augustus is undermined by its subordination to the lengthy and hardly sober account of the festival of such a minor deity as Anna Perenna." However he also argues that the passage on Anna Perenna is compatible with others that flatter the Augustan regime.[130]

Daily entries in Ovid's calendar can include more than one topic, and their treatments can vary in length. For example, January 11 (*Fast.* 1.461-586), has two entries, with one entry being substantially longer: Carmentalia (1.461-542, 579-586: 88 lines) and Hercules and the Ara Maxima (1.543-578: 35 lines). Though the Carmentalia dominates January 11, it does not suggest that Ovid was going out of his way to favour one entry over another. In fact, Ovid returns to the Carmentalia on January 15 (1.617-636), the second day of the festival, because he has more to say about the goddess. On the other hand, Hercules' story would be well-known and therefore would not require a lengthy piece especially if we consider the frequency of his stories in the *Fasti* (Jan. 11: 1.543-578, Feb. 15: 2.303-358, May 3: 5.390-395, 14: 5.629-650, June 4: 6.209-210, 11: 6.519-526, 30: 6.799-804).

The difference in length between the Carmentalia and Hercules and the Ara Maxima is similar to the calendrical entries of Anna Perenna (long) and Caesar (short) on March 15. Fourteen lines may be all that Ovid needed for Caesar especially since there is the lengthy passage in the *Metamorphoses*. As a subject, Julius Caesar was well-known, unlike Anna Perenna, who might just have been a more interesting subject for Ovid and as Littlewood (1980: 319) has said "no discussion of the Ides of March could be concluded without references to the murder of Caesar." However, Ovid's decision to

[130]McKeown (1984: 186).

concentrate on Anna Perenna does not necessarily indicate discomfort in dealing with Caesar. In the *Metamorphoses* (1.200-201, 15.746-870), he includes the topic twice. The reference in Book 1, at just 2 lines, is very brief in contrast to Book 15, which contains a much longer entry (126 lines). The fact that two passages are short might suggest a level of discomfort, yet the appearance of a much longer passage on the same theme along with a short one in the same work can simply suggest poetic variation. If he had truly felt uncomfortable, Ovid could have avoided the topic. Yet he makes several references to Caesar throughout his poetry, including elsewhere in *Fasti*, and these show that he had no qualms about referring to him.[131] In addition, the juxtaposition of short and long passages in the *Fasti* is probably a matter of poetic variation rather than an attempt to slight or to give prominence to one entry over another.

2. Anna Perenna

The juxtaposition of a light, farcical story with a serious one has also engaged scholars. In *Fasti* 3. 555-710,[132] the farcical story ends with the *ioci veteres* in the last αἴτιον of Anna Perenna, where Anna dupes Mars, while the serious commemoration begins with Vesta speaking from her chaste hearth. Newlands (1995: 141) says that "in addition to suggesting the playful character of Ovid's elegiac verse, the word *iocus* is exclusively used to describe sexually licentious or farcical stories."[133] She also considers the juxtaposition of the popular and imperial events on the Ides to be subversive (1996, 321). Similarly, Barchiesi (1997: 129) says that "the strident incompatibility between

[131]See Appendix II.
[132]Six calendars record Anna Perenna on March 15, see Degrassi (1963: 423-424).
[133]Barchiesi (1997: 240) says that "the use of terms like *ioci*, *iocusus*, *obscenus*, and also *fabula* seems to be reserved for burlesque tales, almost always of a sexual nature."

these mutually irrelevant commemorations undermines the efficacy of the propaganda of Caesar's avenger."

Ovid's practice of juxtaposing light and serious themes in the *Fasti* does not suggest an attempt on his part to undermine the Augustan principate. As Littlewood (1980: 321) says of the Anna Perenna and Julius Caesar passages "it is a cogent demonstration of the art, ingenuity and, incidentally, impeccable patriotism with which Ovid juxtaposes these two incompatible events." Other sexually licentious and/or farcical stories that appear in the *Fasti* include: Priapus and Lotis, 1.396-440; Faunus, Hercules and Omphale, 2.303-358; Silenus, Bacchus, and bees, 3.738-762; plays at Flora's games, 4.946 and 5.332-354; Vesta and Priapus, 6.319-348.[134] Each *fabula* occurs among Ovid's αἴτια explaining the rites and origin of a festival (*Agonalia, Lupercalia, Anna Perenna, Liberalia, Floralia, Vestalia*). This juxtaposition of *levitas* and *gravitas* is surely a stylistic choice. As McKeown (1984: 184) says, "it is only natural that the conventional lightness of [elegiac] metre should have encouraged the Roman aetiological elegists to treat at least some of their themes in a light manner." A juxtaposition of differing themes does not indicate a subversive tone, nor are frivolous elegy and religion incompatible.[135] Episodic by nature, the *Fasti* contains many opposing stories placed side by side, and the different tones that the *ioci* can express do not appear to undermine the primary message of the poetic calendar as a reflection of the Augustan principate. Ovid's *Fasti* is a book of stories, some factual, some fictitious, and some promoting Augustan ideology like his

[134]For farcical tales in the *Fasti*, see Fantham (1983: 185-216); Newlands (1995: 124-145), Chapter 4, "Priapus Revisited;" and Barchiesi (1997: 238-256), especially Chapter 7, "The Satyric Element."
[135]Herbert-Brown (1994: 53).

entry for May 12 (*Fast.* 5.569-580), a day that commemorates the temple to Mars Ultor and Augustus' revenge (see above, pp. 48-50).

3. praeterīturus eram

Barchiesi (1997: 128) says of this phrase that "it is Ovid's unease at giving the ides of March a bloody epilogue (*Praeterīturus eram* ...) that makes an ambivalent reading of this 'day' possible."[136] Littlewood (1980: 319) has a similar reservation regarding 697-698 and picks up on the "uneasiness" of *praeterīturus eram* when she says that it signals "the delicate nature of this task," though "[Ovid] presents an irreproachable Augustan interpretation of the facts,"[137] while Fantham (2002: 199) wonders, "must we read the *praeteritio* as casual, almost flippant?"

The earlier discussion (pp. 9-12) has established that Ovid did not use a preterition, contrary to scholars' claims. Now, even though a preterition is not present, *praeterire* does suggest that the author is about to embark on a sensitive subject, as it does in *Ars.* 3.611-612 and *Fast.* 4.319-320. The use of a *preterire* may have been a way for Ovid to mention in passing the assassination, an event that is not necessarily an entry in the "official" Augustan calendar, especially if we consider the minimal extant calendrical remains (see below p. 64). But since Ovid refers to Caesar (both his murder and his deification) elsewhere, *praeterire* need not confirm a negative reading especially if we consider Vesta's encouragement to Ovid to remember her priest (*Fast.* 3.699). Vesta's

[136]Barchiesi (1997: 125) suggests that if lines 697-698 are forgotten "a possible observation would be that Ovid outdoes all his predecessors in Augustanism." Line numbers (697-710) are wrong in Barchiesi (1997: 124-125) who has 695-710.
[137]Barchiesi (1997: 125) and Littlewood consider *Fast.* 3.697-710 to be compatible with Augustan propaganda.

encouragement can be viewed as a way of saying that the state religion demands the commemoration.[138]

4. princeps

The potent combination of the title *princeps* and the murder of a Julian could be construed as a sign of an indignity towards the current Princeps.[139] Barchiesi (1997: 128) has said that this topic "would not have been a popular subject with the court."

While the *Princeps* of this passage is clearly Caesar, *Princeps* was the established title for Augustus (above pp. 14-16). The subject of murdering a Julian and a *princeps* may be an allusion to the many conspiracies against Augustus. Throughout his adult life, Augustus endured the threat of conspiracy. His autocratic powers angered the proponents of a Republic and gave rise to conspiracies, not unlike the one that led to the assassination of Julius Caesar.[140] Velleius Paterculus, who gives the fullest account of the conspiracies against Augustus,[141] records three specific assassination attempts, one involving the son of Lepidus, who had planned to assassinate Augustus upon his return to Rome in 30 B.C.[142] (2.88.1; see also Suet. *Aug.* 19.1, App. *B.C.* 4.50), another involving Fannius

[138]Newlands (1996: 333-337), suggests that Vesta "insists" and "commands" Ovid to commemorate the apotheosis of Caesar and the victory of Augustus at Philippi.
[139]The reference to the death of Caesar at *Met.* 1.200-201, has also been interpreted as referring to the attempt(s) on Augustus' life, see Bömer (1961: I, 87-88), Due (1974: 71-72), Feeney (1991:199) and Von Albrecht (1999: 168, 182). Hill (1985: 176) however finds that there is "no merit in the suggestion sometimes made" that this is a reference to any Augustan conspiracy; see also Otis (1970: 99).
[140]See Raaflaub and Samons II (1990: 417-454).
[141]Suetonius (*Aug.* 19.1). provides a list of names.
[142]Appian is the only source that dates this conspiracy to 31 B.C., see Woodman (1983: 237).

Caepio and Lucius (or Varro) Murena and perhaps others, who plotted in 23/22 B.C.[143] (2.91.2; see also Suet. *Aug.* 19.1 and D.C. 54.3.4-5), and a third involving a Rufus who planned to kill Augustus in 19 B.C. (2.91.3; see also Suet. *Aug.* 19.1, where he is called M. Egnatius). These conspiracies occurred early in the principate, but sources suggest that Augustus endured threats against his life and rule throughout his career, specifically the conspiracies involving members of his own family mentioned in Suetonius (*Aug.*19.1) and Pliny (*Nat.* 7.45.149).[144] Suetonius records one involving the husband of Julia the Younger, L. Aemilius Paulus, along with Plautius Rufus (*Aug.*19.1, *exin Plauti Rufi Lucique Pauli progeneri sui*), while Pliny reports that Augustus knew of plans devised by his daughter Julia (*Nat.* 7.45.149, *luctusque non tantum orbitate tristis, adulterium filiae et consilia parricidae palam facta*), his wife Livia and her son Tiberius (*Nat.* 7.45.150, *hinc uxoris et Tiberii cogitationes*).

5. Vesta

Vesta's presence has been interpreted as subversive. Some scholars like Newlands (see above, p. 24) have taken *rapio* to mean "rape", and have focused their discussion on the implications for Vesta's chastity in her physical closeness to a *vir*. As Barchiesi (1997: 208) says, "Vesta has had some contact with a male, after all, and the verb *rapio* makes us think of a curious reciprocity with the masculine sphere." Newlands (1996: 334-335), emphasizing Vesta's chastity, points out that it was a soul that is taken away in *Met.* 15. 850 while "in the *Fasti* it is his body, although Vesta and her virgin

[143]For a discussion on the names of the conspirators and the date of the conspiracy, see Woodman (1983: 270-271).
[144]Velleius Paterculus includes no familial conspiracies in his history which is not surprising since he was close to the Julio-Claudian court.

priestesses are otherwise ritually denied all sight, let alone touch, of a man."[145] Newlands also says that (1996: 335) "Caesar as *virum* emphasizes the paradoxical action of Vesta, a goddess not only chaste but also forbidden the sight of man."

Because Vesta is a symbol of chastity and this aspect of her divinity is clearly recognized in the *Fasti*, there is nothing that suggests a violation of Vesta's *pudicitia* in her proximity to Caesar (nor is there in Venus' rescue). The new religious relationship between Vesta and her priest (whether Julius or Augustus) is represented throughout Ovid's calendar (above pp. 16-20). On March 6 of 12 B.C. (3.415-428), this day attests to the new religious relationship between Augustus and Vesta when he becomes *Pontifex Maximus* and the priest of Vesta. On April 28 (4.949-954), Vesta became the guardian of the Augustan hearth and this affiliation was cemented with the consecration of a cult statue of Vesta in her new Palatine shrine. At the same time, the filial relationship between Vesta and Augustus (through Aeneas) appears in the *Fasti* (3.415-428, 4.949-954). Therefore the physical proximity between Augustus (or Caesar) and Vesta is appropriate in the context of their religious and filial relationships and has no sexual implications.

In addition, the termination point of Vesta's speech affects the interpretation of lines 699-710 in this passage. As I have shown already above (pp. 21-22), there is no reason to end her speech before 710. One critic has said that Ovid had his informants in the *Fasti* serve as "agents of propaganda,"[146] and Vesta is probably the definitive "agent

[145]Ovid (*Fast.* 6.253-254) is jesting when he tells us that he senses Vesta's presence and assures us that he did not really see her because she should not be seen by man.
[146]Rutledge (1980: 330).

of propaganda" in the *Fasti* as she endorses the *new* Augustan Rome and Augustan ideology such as the avenging of Caesar and *Pontifex Maximus*.

6. rapio

The presence of *rapere* has also contributed to a negative reading. For Newlands (1996: 335), it has an established connection to rape in Ovidian poetry. The implications of such an interpretation would without a doubt be uncomplimentary to the Augustan *domus*. The meaning here "to snatch up" (*OLD* 3a) as in a rescue is the correct meaning (p. 24).

Defining *rapere* as "rape" has caused scholars to think that Caesar attempted to rape Vesta or that Vesta has raped Caesar.[147] The idea that Vesta would rape Caesar, her priest, is hard to rationalize.[148] Still, if rape is plausible, the notion of incest is equally probable since Vesta is related to Caesar through Venus (and Aeneas), though one wonders how "unnatural" this rescue would be to a contemporary Roman reader.

The claims of rape are also refuted by the evidence of the Hellenistic parallels (pp. 25-27), which show the Greek equivalent of *rapio*, ἁρπάζω, being used in reference to rescue, and deification, just as *rapio* itself is used in the parallel passage in *Met.* 15.840 and in *Fast.* 2.188 (Callisto); 3.504, (Bacchus); 3. 647, (Anna); 3.701, (Caesar); 6.487, (Bacchus).

---

[147]Newlands (1996: 335) sees Vesta as the rapist. In *Fast.* 6.319, Vesta is rescued by Metellus, and Barchiesi (1997: 208) says that "the verb *rapere* is suspect, seeing that we have witnessed an attempt to rape Vesta in flesh and blood."

[148]I suppose a metaphysical argument could be made to suggest that a raped person has been robbed of their corporeal self through that rape.

7. Philippi

It has been suggested that a reference to the battle of Philippi is itself subversive. Barchiesi (1997: 128) claims that Philippi is "an awkward theme for Augustan historical ideology" for the very reasons that it recalls civil war and possibly Antony's ability rather than Augustus' as a military leader.

Philippi (see above, pp. 43-44) brings to mind a horrific civil war that took "two" battles to achieve victory and Augustus' alleged cruelty in refusing burial to his enemies, who were Roman citizens. This reminder could contribute to an unflattering picture of the *Princeps*. Herbert-Brown (1994: 126) has gone so far as to say that "Ovid's entry for this day is an ill-disguised justification of Octavian's rampage against the assassins and anyone who supported them." While Augustus claimed that he had legal recourse, he was anything but the heroic avenger (Herbert-Brown, 1994: 100, note 146).

The sources report that the conspirators were sought out and killed in retaliation, but there is very little evidence substantiating allegations of Augustus' cruelty towards them apart perhaps from Suet. *Aug.* 13.1-2, *nec successum victoriae moderatus erat, sed capite Bruti Romam misso, ut statuae Caesaris subiceretur, in splendidissimum quemque captivum non sine verborum contumelia saevit.* Most allegations of cruelty concern the period immediately following the battle (Sen. *de Clem.*1.9.1, 1.11.1; St. *Silv.* 4.1.31-33; [Sen.] *Oct.* 504-509), and some of them may be rooted in Antonian propaganda.

On the other hand, Ovid (like Augustus) presents Philippi as a just war (of revenge) that was the start of Augustus' shaping as a leader. Barchiesi (1997: 129) says that "Ovid's aim is to explain where the prince began his career and his education ... and

his A.B.C.'s." Ovid links Philippi, revenge for Julius Caesar's murder, and Vesta twice in the *Fasti*, in both cases as the start of Augustus' career (3. 709-710, 5.569-570).

8. sparsis ossibus albet humus

An anti-Augustan slant has been found in *sparsis ossibus albet humus*, by Newlands (1996: 335), who says that this phrase "focuses on the tragedy of war, not on the triumph of Augustus." While the dead enemies are part of Augustus' success, the success is marred by the tragedy of dead Roman citizens.

The frequency of such descriptions of battlefields covered in white bones indicates a literary convention (see above p. 45). Though the image of unburied remains is stark, Horace writes about a *scary* cemetery ("a field ugly with white bones") for paupers and criminals that Maecenas had converted into a garden (*Sat.* 1.8.16, *albis informen spectabant ossibus agrum*). Though the image is fundamentally negative, Horace's humourous description of a cemetery demonstrates that the image of unburied bones does not have to be horrific and negative (cf., Vir. *A.* 5.865, *difficiles* [*sc. scopulos*] *quondam multorumque ossibus albos*).

Newlands also suggests (1996: 335) that this phrase, by alluding to *Fast.* 1.557 (*squalidaque humanis ossibus albet humus*), establishes an unfavourable similarity between Cacus and Augustus as agents of terror.[149] The bones at Philippi, however, are not identified explicitly as human, and the effect is therefore somewhat less horrific.[150]

---

[149] See also McKeown (1984: 181).

[150] Compare *Met.* 14.800-801, where Roman ground is strewn with both the bodies of Sabines and Romans (*et strata est tellus Romana Sabinis / corporibus strata estque suis*).

II. Other *Anti*-Augustan Elements

Scholars who want to find negative implications have perhaps missed some opportunities.

1. Magno Foro

Only here is the Roman Forum called the *Forum Magnum*, a term that evolved in order to differentiate between the "Roman Forum" from the "Julian Forum" (pp. 37-38).

If this is not simply an innocent first occurrence, then perhaps the choice of *Magnum* alludes to Pompey the "Great", Caesar's rival at Pharsalia. Caesar, of course, was murdered next to a statue of Pompey outside the *Curia Pompei*, a special chamber dedicated as a temple within the *Theatrum Pompei* (or *Pompeianum*), in which the Senate meeting took place in 44 B.C. (see above, pp. 13-14; Nic. Dam. *Vit. Caes.* 24. 90; Suet. *Jul.* 88; D.C. 47.19). The irony was not lost on Plutarch (*Caes.* 66. 7, καὶ πολὺ καθήιμαξεν [sc.Caesar] αὐτὴν ὁ φόνος, ὡς δοκεῖν αὐτὸν ἐφεστάναιτῇι τιμωρίαι τοῦ πολεμίουΠομπήϊον). Of course, this may all be coincidental.

2. nefas

Ovid's use of *nefas* could be read as a covert reference to the increasingly repressive regime during the Augustan principate and the control of speech. Feeney has said that (1992: 9), "the problem of what may be said, by whom, where, and when, is one which the reader encounters before even reading any of the poem, in the title itself: *dies fasti*, after all, are *dies quibus fari licet* ('days on which it is allowable to speak' Varro *ling.* 6.29)." The very first two words of this passage (*praeterīturus eram*) would give further credence to this idea with the suggestion that the poet is somewhat hesistant or

uncomfortable with a *sensitive* subject like a murdered *princeps* and that Caesar was an "unspeakable" topic. Yet *nefas* ("something contrary to divine law") clearly suggests that Caesar's assassination is a sacrilegious desecration against the gods and a crime against the Roman state (see above, p. 39) and therefore the topic of Caesar as "unspeakable" is untenable. The fact that there are *two* stories of Caesar's murder minimizes a negative reading of *nefas* in *Fast* 3.697-710.

3. Calendrical evidence

Since Ovid includes the assassination of Caesar in his poetic calendar, it is important to understand the calendrical evidence for 15 March if we are to understand whether commemoration was standard or if Ovid was going out of way to draw attention to Caesar's murder.[151] The evidence in actual calendars proves to be slight indeed. There are fragments from eight different calendars for March 15 (seven of these are post-Augustan) and only one of these records the assassination.[152] The extant remains of March 15 in the *Fasti Ostienses* (ca. 2 B.C.) have been restored to read as the day of Caesar's murder (*Caesar pare[ns patriae occisus]*). This suggests that little attention was paid to Caesar's murder in comparison with Anna Perenna, and while it might suggest that Ovid did go out of his way to mention Caesar, the much greater attention to Anna Perenna, instead of being subversive, might just reflect the reality of the current calendar.

---

[151]Horsfall (1974: 191) says that "on the Ides, more varied and abundant information survives, I believe, than on any other day in Greek and Roman history." Without question the event that is always associated with this day is the Ides, which not only marks the midpoint of the month but also belongs to Jupiter. The popular festival to Anna Perenna, the goddess of the New Year (when the Roman calendar began with March), appears on this day in the calendars.

[152]Degrassi (1963: 423-424). Fragments of six calendars record Anna Perenna while one records March 15 as the day sacred to Jupiter.

III. Pro-Augustan Arguments

1. caelo positus

Ovid's concept of Caesar being placed with the gods (see above, pp. 33-36) obviously fits with the official Augustan line.

2. pontificale caput

The phrase *pontificale caput* surely recalls the cult statue of Julius Caesar as *pontifex maximus* with *capite velato* that appeared in the temple of Divus Iulius (see above, p. 41). This statue also identifies Caesar as an augur and at the same time that Ovid composes the *Fasti* the relief of the Altar of the Lares shows Augusutus as the same combination of *pontifex maximus* and augur.

3. templa

Augustus built the temple to Divus Iulius (see above, p. 37). This temple is an example of Augustus' *pietas* towards his adopted father, not unlike the reconstruction of the *Curia Julia* which he completed after Caesar's death. The Julian temple is also an allusion to his building program (Aug. *Anc.* 19-21).

4. pietas

Presenting Augustus' revenge as *pietas* is another element that is pro-Augustan (see above, p. 46); as Barchiesi (1997: 129) says, "Augustan discourse saw this exemplary punishment of the conspirators as a sign of religious and filial piety." For Weinstock (1971: 255), Augustus "proved by his vengeance on the conspirators ... that he was a man of *pietas*," while for Herbert-Brown (1996: 126) Octavian, by avenging the murder of Vesta's priest, "was thus piously righting a wrong committed against the state and its gods (and so paving the way for his own apotheosis)." Moreover, the fact that

Ovid explicitly has Augustus avenge a *Pontifex Maximus*, suggests that he was engaged in a religious war as much as civil war. The speech of Vesta on March 15 and her prominence on May 12 (see above, pp. 48-50), all suggest that she is endorsing this Augustan viewpoint.

5. ulcisci iusta per arma patrem

Ovid's phrase echoes an Augustan opinion, a sentiment also expressed in *Fast.* 5.573-574 where Philippi was just vengeance for the murder of Caesar, the *Pontifex Maximus*.

The meaning of *ulcisci* in this passage is consistent with Augustan views and alludes to the temple of Mars Ultor, which Ovid celebrates with its dedication on 12 May (5.569-580; see above, pp. 48-50), and the role of Augustus as avenger (Ov. *Met.* 15.821, *fortissimus ultor*; V. Max. 6.8.4, *gravissimi sceleris ultor*).

6. Prominence of Caesar

The numerous references to Julius Caesar in the *Fasti* show that he was an acceptable topic for Ovid.[153] Throughout the *Fasti,* Ovid makes links to the Augustan *domus* through language and ideas, and this presentation may well echo a standard Augustan ideology. Pasco-Pranger (2002: 274) states that "the calendar challenges readers to make connections between days, asks them to make sense of their relationship between coinciding or calendrically close events, invites them to read meaning into its structure." For example, Ovid's Ides of March is linked to May 12 (5.569-580), the anniversary of the dedication of the temple to Mars Ultor.[154] This event, just like 15

[153]See Appendix II.
[154]For a discussion on the intertexuality of these passages, see Barchiesi (2002: 1-22).

March, commemorates the assassination and deification of Caesar as well as Augustus' revenge and the start of his career (see above, pp. 48-50). Another example is the references that connect Caesar and Augustus as *pontifex maximus* (see above, pp. 22-23). As well, Vesta's prominence in the *Fasti*, especially in Books 3 and 5, reflects Augustan religious innovation (see above, p.16).

IV. The Divinity of Caesar

The commentary mentioned several ideological parallels on this subject between Ovid and Valerius Maximus.[155] Valerius Maximus is an important source, as the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* is "a perfect reflection, composed under Tiberius, of the moralizing deployment of exempla from the Roman past in Augustan historiography."[156] Wardle discusses the treatment of Caesar in the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*[157] and his discussion on the *exempla* dealing with the topics of "Caesar's Death" and "Caesar's Divinity" is of most interest in assessing the Augustanism of *Fast.* 3.697-710.

In the thirty five references to him in Valerius Maximus, Caesar is called *Divus Iulius* nine times (1.6.13, 1.7.1, 1.8.8; 3.2.19, 3.2.23; 6.2.11, 6.8.4; 7.6.5; 8.8.3), while allusions to his divinity appear 20 times (*Praef.* 1.6.13, 1.7.2, 1.8.8; 2.1.10, 2.10.7; 3.2.19, 3.2.23; 4.5.6, 4.7.7; 5.1.10, 5.7.2; 6.2.11, 6.6.15, 6.8.4; 7.6.5, 7.6.6; 8.8.3; 9.2.4, 9.15.1), with three of these references being allusions to Caesar's comet.[158] In Ovid, Caesar is

---

[155]Miller (1993:4) sees Ovid as a contemporary to Valerius Maximus.
[156]Miller (1993: 4). Wardle (2000: 479) suggests a later date.
[157](1997: 323-345). Wardle presents six themes relating to Caesar (Caesar's Bravery, Expansionism, Caesar and the Civil War, Caesar's Clementia, Caesar's Death, and Caesar's Divinity).
[158]Wardle (1997: 337) says that "his divinity is described in varied vocabulary: *deus, divus, divinitas, divinus, caelestis, numen, sidus.*"

called *divus Iulius* twice (*Met.* 15. 842; *Pont.* 2.2.84), *deus* three times (*Met.* 15.746, 761, 818), *numen* once (*Fast.* 5.574), and an allusion to his divinity is made once (*Fast.* 3.703).

Caesar's murder is mentioned in eight Valerian passages, and in three of these the assassination is called *parricidium*, while in two others the assassins are called *parricidae*. Ovid calls the assassins "conspirators" (*Fast.* 5.572, *coniuratis*; cf. *Met.* 15. *coniurta arma moveri*), and "enemy" (*Fast.* 5.578, *hoste*), while in *Fast.* 3.705 the reader would know whom is meant by the phrase *quicumque nefas ausi*. In addition, Caesar's assassination is viewed as a sacrilegious desecration against him as *Pontifex Maximus* (V. Max. 1.8.8., *violando*; 4.5.6, *violatus*; *Fast.* 3.706, *polluerant*).

The idea that the assassins deserved to die is expressed by each author (V. Max. 6.8.4, *parricidii quas merebatur poenas*; *Fast.* 3.707, *morte iacent merita*; cf. V. Max. 1.8.8, *meruisti ut tam infestum haberes deum*, 6.8.4, *debitam exegisti vindictam*).

The separation of mortal body and divine soul at death is expressed in both writers. In Ovid, Caesar's soul is rescued and transported to the heavens. This transformation is implied in *Fast.* 3. 697-710 but expressed clearly in *Metamorphoses* 15. Caesar's soul is snatched from his body by Venus before his assassination, then carried away and released him into the heavens (844-846, *alma Venus ... / Caesaris eripuit membris nec in aera solvi / passa recentem animam caelestibus intulit astris*; cf. also 840-841, *hanc animam interea caeso de corpore raptam / fac iubar*). In Valerius Maximus the language of a separation between spirit and mortal body is just as explicit: Caesar's divine spirit was separted from his mortal body when he was assassinated (4.6.6, *divinus spiritus mortali discernebatur a corpore*; cf. also 1.8.8, *mortali adhuc corpore utentem*).

The concept of Julius Caesar being placed in heaven with the gods appears in both authors. Ovid describes Caesar's ascension three times (*Fast.* 3.703, *caelo positus; Met.* 15. 818, *accedat caelo*, 846, *caelestibus intulit astris*) while Valerius Maximus, ironically, writes that the assassins themselves added Caesar to the council of the gods (V. Max. 1.6.13, *deorum concilo adiecerunt*).

Augustus is called an avenger by both (V. Max. 6.8.4, *gravissimi sceleris ultor*; *Met.* 15. 821, *fortissimus ultor*; *Fast.* 3.710, 5.574), and he avenges not only the murder of Caesar, a *pontifex maximus*, but a crime (V. Max. 6.8.4, *scelus*; *Fast.* 3.705, *nefas*; *Met.* 15. 777, *facinus*, 802, *facinus*; cf. *Fast.* 5.575, *scelerato sanguine*).

In general, these parallels suggest a shared orthodoxy between Ovid and Valerius Maximus regarding Julius Caesar's rescue and deification. Caesar was from the beginning a god trapped in a mortal body; his death was an act of sacrilege, duly avenged by his son, but it provided the occasion for his "divine spirit" to return to its proper abode among the gods.

Conclusion

Fantham (2002: 231) has said that "in the age of Augustus the poets, loyal or sceptical, could not avoid being Augustan in their conceptions and presentation of the world of Rome." Ovid's poetry presents two incompatible versions of Julius Caesar's assassination and deification, a *historical* event, and one wonders how seriously Romans (and Augustus) would have received two different poetic inventions of Caesar's murder and deification. Would these passages be interpreted as "anti-Augustan," "pro-Augustan," or simply as an Augustan presentation of an historical event? The decision to write about the murder of a Julian (twice) may not have been a welcome subject for the

Princeps, as Barchiesi suggests, and the anti-Augustan conspiracies also indicate the potential sensitivity of this subject. But Ovid is a poet who would test boundaries, as he did when he composed the *Ars Amatoria* nearly two decades after the inception of the Augustan legislation on adultery.

This chapter has reviewed the interpretations which have dominated scholarship on *Fasti* 3.697-710. Though Ovid's intentions are hard to define in *Fasti* 3.697-710, the anti-Augustan readings, such as the topic of murdering a Julian and the horror of Philippi, are hard to ignore. But a reassessment of other elements, like *rapio* and *praeteriturus eram*, has proven useful in isolating the correct meanings and it has resulted in a reading that is consistent with a pro-Augustan interpretation and merits consideration.

Additional unnoticed signs of orthodoxy include the fact that Ovid seems to agree exactly with Valerius Maximus about Caesar's divine nature, about the assassination, about the fate of the assassins, and about certain thematic connections with other Augustan anniversaries such as March 6 and May 12. All of these can be argued to be signs of a pro-Augustan attitude in *Fasti* 3.697-710 that deserve attention when reading Caesar's assassination and its aftermath at Philippi.

Appendix I: *Metamorphoses* 15.746-870

METAMORPHOSES 15.745-870

Hic tamen accessit delubris advena nostris:
Caesar in urbe sua deus est; quem Marte togaque
Praecipuum non bella magis finita triumphis
Resque domi gestae properataque gloria rerum
In sidus vertere novum stellamque comantem
Quam sua progenies. Neque enim de Caesaris actis
Ullum maius opus quam quod pater exstitit huius,
Scilicet aequoreos plus est domuisse Britannos
Perque papyriferi septemflua flumina Nili
Victrices egisse rates Numidasque rebelles
Cinyphiumque Iubam Mithridateisque tumentem
Nominibus Pontum populo adiecisse Quirini
Et multos meruisse, aliquos egisse triumphos,
Quam tantum genuisse virum? Quo praeside rerum
Humano generi, superi, favistis abunde.
Ne foret hic igitur mortali semine cretus,
Ille deus faciendus erat; quod ut aurea vidit
Aeneae genetrix, vidit quoque triste parari
Pontifici letum et coniurata arma moveri,
Palluit et cunctis, ut cuique erat obvia, divis
"Adspice" dicebat, "quanta mihi mole parentur
Insidiae quantaque caput cum fraude petatur,
Quod de Dardanio solum mihi restat Iulo.
Solane semper ero iustis exercita curis?
Quam modo Tydidae Calydonia vulneret hasta,
Nunc male defensae confundant moenia Troiae;
Quae videam natum longis erroribus actum
Iactarique freto sedesque intrare silentum
Bellaque cum Turno gerere, aut, si vera fatemur,
Cum Iunone magis! Quid nunc antiqua recordor
Damna mei generis? Timor hic meminisse priorum
Non sinit: in me acui sceleratos cernitis enses?
Quos prohibete, precor, facinusque repellite neve
Caede sacerdotis flammas extinguite Vestae!"
Talia nequiquam toto Venus anxia caelo
Verba iacit superosque movet; qui rumpere quamquam
Ferrea non possunt veterum decreta sororum,
Signa tamen luctus dant haud incerta futuri.
Arma ferunt inter nigras crepitantia nubes
Terribilesque tubas auditaque cornua caelo
Praemonuisse nefas. Solis quoque tristis imago
Lurida sollicitis praebebat lumina terris.

Saepe faces visae mediis ardere sub astris,
Saepe inter nimbos guttae cecidere cruentae;
Caerulus et vultum ferrugine Lucifer atra
Sparsus erat, sparsi lunares sanguine currus;
Tristia mille locis Stygius dedit omina bubo,
Mille locis lacrimavit ebur, cantusque feruntur
Auditi sanctis et verba minantia lucis.
Victima nulla litat, magnosque instare tumultus
Fibra monet, caesumque caput reperitur in extis;
Inque foro circumque domos et templa deorum
Nocturnos ululasse canes umbrasque silentum
Erravisse ferunt motamque tremoribus urbem.
Non tamen insidias venturaque vincere fata
Praemonitus potuere deum, strictique feruntur
In templum gladii; neque enim locus ullus in urbe
Ad facinus diramque placet nisi curia caedem.
Tum vero Cytherea manu percussit utraque
Pectus et Aeneaden molitur condere nube,
Qua prius infesto Paris est ereptus Atridae
Et Diomedeos Aeneas fugerat enses.
Talibus hanc genitor: "Sola insuperabile fatum,
Nata, movere paras? Intres licet ipsa sororum
Tecta trium: cernes illic molimine vasto
Ex aere et solido rerum tabularia ferro,
Quae neque concussum caeli neque fulminis iram
Nec metuunt ullas tuta atque aeterna ruinas:
Invenies illic incisa adamante perenni
Fata tui generis. Legis ipse animoque notavi
Et referam, ne sis etiamnum ignara futuri.
Hic sua conplevit, pro quo, Cytherea, laboras,
Tempora, perfectis, quos terrae debuit, annis.
Ut deus accedat caelo templisque colatur,
Tu facies natusque suus, qui nominis heres
Inpositum feret unus onus caesique parentis
Nos in bella suos fortissimus ultor habebit
Illius auspiciis obsessae moenia pacem
Victa petent Mutinae, Pharsalia sentiet illum,
Emathiaque iterum madefient caede Philippi,
Et magnum Siculis nomen superabitur undis,
Romanique ducis coniunx Aegyptia taedae
Non bene fisa cadet, frustraque erit illa minata,
Servitura suo Capitolia nosta Canopo.
Quid tibi barbariem gentesque ab utroque iacentes
Oceano numerem? Quodcumque habitabile tellus
Sustinet, huius erit; pontus quoque serviet illi.

Pace data terris animum ad civilia vertet
Iura suum legesque feret iustissimus auctor
Exemploque suo mores reget inque futuri
Temporis aetatem venturorumque nepotum
Prospiciens prolem sancta de coniuge natam
Ferre simul nomenque suum curasque iubebit
Nec, nisi cum †senior similes† aequaverit annos,
Aetherias sedes cognataque sidera tanget.
Hanc animam interea caeso de corpore raptam
Fac iubar, ut semper Capitolia nostra forumque
Divus ab excelsa prospectet Iulius aede."
Vix ea fatus erat, media cum sede senatus
Constitit alma Venus nulli cernenda suique
Caesaris eripuit membris nec in aera solvi
Passa recentem animam caelestibus intulit astris,
Dumque tulit, lumen capere atque ignescere sensit
Emisitque sinu: luna volat altius illa
Flammiferumque trahens spatioso limite crinem
Stella micat natique videns bene facta fatetur
Esse suis maiora et vinci gaudet ab illo.
Hic sua praeferri quamquam vetat acta paternis,
Libera fama tamen nullisque obnoxia iussis
Invitum praefert unaque in parte repugnat.
Sic magnus cedit titulis Agamemnonis Atreus,
Aegea sic Theseus, sic Pelea vicit Achilles,
Denique, ut exemplis ipsos aequantibus utar,
Sic et Saturnus minor est Iove: Iuppiter arces
Temperat aetherias et mundi regna triformis,
Terra sub Augusto est; pater est et rector uterque.
Di, precor, Aeneae comites, quibus ensis et ignis
Cesserunt, dique Indigetes genitorque Quirine
Urbis et invicti genitor Gradive Quirini
Vestaque Caesareos inter sacrata Penates
Et cum Caesarea tu, Phoebe domestice, Vesta,
Quique tenes altus Tarpeias Iuppiter arces,
Quosque alios vati fas appellare piumque est:
Tarda sit illa dies et nostro serior aevo,
Qua caput Augustum, quem temperat, orbe relicto
Accedat caelo faveatque precantibus absens!

Translation[159]

745 Now he came to our shrines as a god from a foreign land; but Caesar is god in his own city. Him, illustrious in war and peace, not so much his wars triumphantly achieved, his civic deeds accomplished, and his glory quickly won, changed to a new heavenly body, flaming star; but still more his offspring deified him. For there is no work among all Caesar's achievements greater than this, that he became the father of this our Emperor. Is it indeed a greater thing to have subdued the sea-girt Britons, to have led his victorious feet up the seven-mouthed stream of the papyrus-bearing Nile, to have added the rebellious Numidians, Libyan Juba, and Pontus, swelling with threats of the mighty name of Mithridates, to the sway of the people of Quirinus, to have celebrated some triumphs and to have earned many more – than to have begotten so great a man? With him as ruler of the world, you have indeed, O heavenly ones, showered rich blessings upon the human race! So then, that his son might not be born of mortal seed, Caesar must needs be made a god. When the golden mother of Aeneas saw this, and saw also that dire destruction was being plotted against her high-priest and that an armed conspiracy was forming, she paled with fear and cried to all the gods as she met them in turn:

765 "Behold what a crushing weight of plots is prepared against me, and with what snares that life is sought which alone remains to me form Dardanian Iülus. Shall I alone for ever be harassed by well-founded cares, since now the Calydonian spear of Diomede wounds me and now the falling walls of ill-defended Troy o'erwhelm me, since I see my son driven by long wanderings, tossed on the sea, entering the abodes of the silent shades and waging war with Turnus, or, if we speak plain truth, with Juno rather? But why do I now recall the ancient sufferings of my race? This present fear of mine does not permit me to remember former woes. Look! You see that impious daggers are being sharpened up. Ward them off, I pray, prevent this crime and let not Vesta's fires be extinguished by her high-priest's blood!"

779 The anxious goddess cried these complaints throughout the sky, but all in vain. The gods were moved indeed; and although they were not able to break the iron decrees of the ancient sisters, still they gave no uncertain portents of the woe that was at hand. They say that the clashing of arms amid the dark storm-clouds and fear-inspiring trumpets and horns heard in the sky forewarned men of the crime; also the darkened face of the sun shone with lurid light upon the troubled lands. Often firebrands were seen to flash amidst the stars; often drops of blood fell down from the clouds; the morning-star was of dusky hue and his face was blotched with dark red spots, and Luna's chariot was stained with blood. In a thousand places the Stygian owl gave forth his mournful warnings; in a thousand places ivory statues dripped tears, and in the sacred groves wailing notes and threatening words were heard. No victim sufficed for expiation; the liver warned that portentous struggles were at hand and its lobe was found cleft amidst the entrails. In the marketplace and around men's houses and the temples of the gods dogs howled by night,

[159]Translation by Miller, revised by Goold (1994).

the shades of the silent dead walked abroad and the city was shaken with earthquakes. Yet even so, the warnings of the gods were unable to check the plots of man and the advancing fates. Naked swords were brought into the sacred curia; for no place in the whole city would do for this crime, this dreadful deed of blood, save only that. Then indeed did Cytherea smite on her breast with both her hands and strive to hide her Caesar in a cloud in which of old Paris had been rescued from the murderous Atrides and in which Aeneas had escaped the sword of Diomede. Then thus the Father spoke:

807 "Do thou, by thy sole power, my daughter, think to move the changeless fates? Thou thyself mayst enter the abode of the three sisters. Thou shalt there behold the records of all that happens on tablets of brass and solid iron, a massive structure, tablets which fear neither warfare in the heavens, nor the lightning's fearful power, nor any destructive shocks which may befall, being eternal and secure. There shalt thou find engraved on everlasting adamant thy descendant's fates. I have myself read these and marked them well in mind; and these will I relate, that thou mayst be no longer ignorant of that which is to come. This son of thine, goddess of Cythera, for whom thou grievest, has fulfilled his allotted time, and his years are finished which he owed to earth. That as a god he may enter heaven and have his place in temples on the earth, thou shalt accomplish, thou and his son. He as successor to the name shall bear alone the burden placed on him, and, as the most valiant avenger of his father's murder, he shall have us as ally for his wars. Under his command the conquered walls of leaguered Mutina shall sue for peace; Pharsalia shall feel his power; Emathian Philippi shall reek again with blood; and he of the great name shall be overcome on Sicilian waters. A Roman general's Egyptian mistress, who did not well to rely upon the union, shall fall before him, and in vain shall she have threatened that our Capitol shall bow to her Canopus. But why should I recall barbaric lands to you and nations lying on either ocean-shore? Nay, whatsoever habitable land the earth contains shall be his, and the sea also shall come beneath his sway!

832 When peace has been bestowed upon all lands he shall turn his mind to the rights of citizens, and as a most righteous jurist promote the laws. By his own good example shall he direct the ways of men, and, looking forward to future time and coming generations, he shall bid the son, born of his chaste wife, to bear his name and the burden of his cares; and not till old age, when his years have equalled his benefactions, shall he attain the heavenly seats and his related stars. Meanwhile do thou catch up this soul from the slain body and make him a star in order that ever it may be the divine Julius who looks forth upon our Capitol and a Forum from his lofty temple."

844 Scarce had he spoken when fostering Venus took her place within the senate-house, unseen of all, caught up the passing soul of her Caesar from his body, and not suffering it to vanish into air, she bore it towards the stars of heaven. And as she bore it she felt it glow and burn, and released it from his bosom. Higher than the moon it mounted up and, leaving behind it a fiery train, gleamed as a star. And now, beholding the good deeds of his son, he confesses that they are greater than this own, and rejoices to be surpassed by him. And, though the son forbids that his own deeds be set above his

father's still fame, unfettered and obedient to no one's will, exalts him spite of his desire, and in this one thing opposes his commands. So does the great Atreus yield in honour to his son, Agamemnon; so does Theseus rival Aegeus, and Achilles, Peleus; finally, to quote an instance worthy of them both, is Saturn less than Jove. Jupiter controls the heights of heaven and the kingdoms of the triformed universe; but the earth is under Augustus' sway. Each is both sire and ruler. O gods, I pray you, comrades of Aeneas, before whom both fire and sword gave way, and ye native gods of Italy, and thou, Quirinus, father of our city, and Gradivus, invincible Quirinus' sire, and Vesta, who hast ever held a sacred place midst Caesar's household gods, and thou Apollo, linked in worship with our Caesar's Vesta, and Jupiter, whose temple sits high on Tarpeia's rock, and all ye other gods to whom it is fitting for the bard to make appeal: far distant be that day and later than our own time when Augustus, abandoning the world he rules, shall mount to heaven and there, removed form our presence, listen to our prayers!

Summary of *Metamorphoses* 15.745-870

Ovid's introduction to his last story begins with a transition from a story about a foreign god, Aesculapius, who has come to Rome (745) to a story about Caesar, who is a god in his own city (746). Ovid characterizes Caesar as someone pre-eminent in both martial and civic accomplishments (746-748) who is catasterized as a new heavenly body (749). Caesar is not made a god by his own accomplishments but rather by his "offspring" (750), and it is this son, Augustus, who is Caesar's greatest achievement (750-751); Ovid asks whether it is a greater thing for Caesar to have been so successful than to have been the father of Augustus (752-758), and the answer is that Caesar had to be made a god so that Augustus would be immortal too (760-761).

Venus sees a plot to murder Caesar, a priest (763), unfolding (761-763). In her speech, Venus speaks to all of the gods (764-778) in order to bring attention to this plot against Caesar and against herself (765). She speaks of criminal swords (776) being whetted, and entreats the gods to avert the crime and keep Vesta's fire from being extinguished by the blood of her priest (778).

Now Ovid details the warnings of the gods, portents in the sky (783-790) and on the land (791-793) and in sacrificial victims' livers (794-795). Others were evident in the city in the Forum, in temples and in homes (796); dogs howled, while the dead walked the streets and the city was shaken by tremors (797-798). All these warnings could not prevent Caesar's imminent death, and so Ovid sarcastically condemns the assassins not just for killing Julius Caesar but for doing it in the Senate (801-802).

Next Venus begins to create a cloud to rescue Caesar as she had done before for Paris and Aeneas (803-806), but Jupiter now asks her if she thinks she can change destiny: he has read the fates' records, and she should look at them to see what he himself knows (807-814), which is that Caesar has fulfilled his allotted time on earth, and Venus and Augustus will assist in his deification in heaven and on earth (816-819). Augustus will be a mighty avenger (821) and will have the support of the gods (*nos*, 821). An account of Augustus' accomplishments (822-828) concludes with the statement that he will be sovereign over both the habitable land and the sea (830-831). Jupiter then informs Venus about Augustus' imminent civic achievements (832-834) and apotheosis (836-839). Returning to the subject of Caesar and his impending murder, he tells her to snatch up Caesar's soul from his body and make it a star so that, as divine Julius, he can look down on the Capitol and Forum from his home in the sky (840-842).

Venus follows Jupiter's instructions (843-850): she goes to the Senate (843-844), and snatches up Caesar's soul, carrying it upward to the heavenly stars (845-846). As she carries it, she feels it glow and burn, and lets it go from her lap; then it gleams like a star as it flies up into the heavens higher than the moon with its flaming tail (847-850).

Now in heaven, Caesar looks down and sees the deeds of Augustus and confesses that they are greater than his and that he enjoys being surpassed by him (850-851). Augustus does not want his own accomplishments to exceed those of his own father, but it is inevitable (852-854), and this is no different from other mortal and divine sons and fathers like Agamemnon and Atreus, Theseus and Aegeus, Achilles and Peleus and of course Jupiter and Saturn (855-858). Jupiter may be sovereign over the heavens and universe, but on earth Augustus is sovereign; each one is both a son and a ruler (858-860).

The final section is a prayer (861-870), directed to all the important Roman divinities (Quirinus, Mars, Vesta, Apollo, Jupiter and others) as well as the comrades of Aeneas and the indigenous Italian deities (861-867): may it be a very long time before Augustus dies and joins these divinities in heaven (868-870).

Similarities

The accounts of Caesar's assassination in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* share a number of linguistic and thematic similarities.

Both contain a form of *rapere* (*OLD* 3a) used in reference to the process of deification. Vesta snatches Caesar herself (*Fast.* 3.701, *ipsa virum rapui*), while Jupiter tells Venus to snatch Caesar's soul and to turn it into a comet (*Met.* 15.840-841, *hanc animam interea caeso de corpore raptam / fac iubar*). *Eripere* is used of the same process in *Met.* 15.845-846 (*Caesaris eripuit membris... / recentem animam*).[160]

The assassination is called *nefas* in both passages (*Fast.* 3.705; *Met.* 15.785), emphasizing that the murder of a *pontifex maximus* is both a crime and a sacrilegious

[160] *Eripio* also appears in 15.805 (*ereptus*) where Ovid relates how Venus had rescued Aeneas and Paris from adversaries. This rescue is a reference to *Il.* 5.445-450, see above pp. 28-29.

desecration (cf. *Met.* 15.777, *facinus* and 802, *facinus*). Venus talks of criminal swords being whetted for the assassination (*Met.*15.776, *sceleratos enses*) while Vesta calls the hands of the assassins sacrilegious (*Fast.* 3.700, *sacrilegae manus*).[161]

Both passages use *prohibeo* in reference to divine opposition to the murder. Vesta says that the will of the gods averted Caesar's murder (*Fast.* 3.705-706, *prohibente deorum / numine*; cf. *Met.* 15.799-800) while Venus prays to the gods to avert the assassins' swords (*Met.* 15.777, *quos prohibete, precor*).

Both passages refer to the deification by representing Caesar as placed in the heavens (*Fast.* 3.703, *caelo positus*; *Met.*15.846, *caelestibus intulit astris*).

In both passages a goddess intervenes. In the *Fasti*, Vesta snatches Caesar's mortal body away, leaving a *simulacrum* to be stabbed (3.701), while in the *Metamorphoses*, Venus snatches his soul from his murdered body (15.840, 845-846).

In addition, Caesar is related to each rescuer. Caesar, of course, considered himself to be a descendant of Venus through the *gens Iulia*, the progeny of Ascanius, grandson to Venus, and this makes her a natural rescuer for him, especially in epic poetry, where she frequently rescues her favourites and kin, in particular Aeneas and Paris (*Met.* 15.805-806; *Il.* 5.445-450). On the other hand, Vesta's appearance as a rescuer in the *Fasti* may seem at first glance unusual, but Vesta too is a natural choice because she is related to Caesar through her familial connection to Venus.[162] She is also connected to Caesar as her priest and as *Pontifex Maximus* (*Fast.* 3.699, 706, 5.573; *Met.* 15.763, 778)

[161]Augustus implores Mars Ultor to glut his sword with the assassins' criminal blood (*Fast.* 5.575, *scelerato sanguine*).

[162]Vesta is the Roman equivalent to the Greek goddess Hestia who is one of the Olympian gods. This makes Vesta a sister to Jupiter and an aunt to his children which connects Vesta to Venus and her descendants (Aeneas, Caesar, and Augustus).

and both the filial and religious relationships between Caesar and Vesta make her a logical choice (see above, 16-20).

In the attack on Caesar, each rescuer depicts herself as a target or as the real target. Vesta is attacked by the assassins' sacrilegious hands because her priest is the real target (*Fast.* 3.700, *sacrilegae telis me petiere manus*) while Venus informs the gods of those plots organizing against her (*Met.* 15.765-766, *quanta mihi mole parentur / insidiae*) because Caesar is her kin.

Both passages also present Augustus as the avenger of Caesar's death (*Fast.* 3.710; *Met.* 15.820-821) at the battle of Philippi, and Ovid provides a vivid snapshot of the battlefield in each work, white with scattered bones in *Fast.* 3.708, and wet with blood in *Met.* 15.824.

Differences

Perhaps the most obvious difference between the two stories – besides metre – is length (*Fasti*: 14 lines; *Metamorphoses*: 126 lines). While epic poetry allows for lengthy dramatic narratives and description, elegiac poetry is more pointed and succinct in style, and because of this it makes sense that the passage in the *Metamorphoses* is longer than its counterpart in the *Fasti*. At the same time, Ovid would rarely have chosen to compose two long versions of the same story.[163] Other examples of parallel stories appear in both works, and while the version in the *Fasti* is not necessarily the shorter,[164] it is usually the briefer of the two.[165]

---

[163]He did, however, compose two long accounts of Proserpina (*Fast.* 4.417-618; *Met.* 5.346-571) and Medea (*Her.* 12.1-212; *Met.* 7.1-424).
[164]Ariadne's story is longer in the *Fasti* (*Fast.* 3.459-516; *Met.* 8.152-182).
[165]Callisto (*Fast.* 2.153-192; *Met.* 2. 401-541) and Ino (*Fast.* 6.485-550; *Met.* 4.416-562).

Besides having a different goddess rescue Caesar in each passage, the rescue itself is different. In the *Fasti*, Vesta snatches a "living" Caesar, replacing his body with an unarmed image (3.701-702). In the *Metamorphoses*, Venus snatches Caesar's soul from his body after the killing and carries it up to the heavens where it turns into a comet along the way (*Met.* 15. 845-846, *Caesaris eripuit membris nec in aera solvi / passa recentem animam caelestibus intulit astris*). Here we can say that Julius Caesar was already a god in the *Fasti* but only made a god in the *Metamorphoses*.

Another difference between the two passages is that Vesta is "avenged" in the *Fasti* but not in the *Metamorphoses*. In the *Fasti* Augustus avenges both Vesta's priest and his own father at Philippi (3.699; cf. 5.573-574), while he only avenges his father in the *Metamorphoses* (15.820-821).

The overall tone of the two passages is different. As discussed above (Interpretations, pp. 51-70), many elements in the passage in the *Fasti* appear to promote an Augustan ideology, though many critics read it as containing negative elements. Similarly, the passage in the *Metamorphoses* has also been viewed as containing positive and negative elements. Irony in the *Metamorphoses*, however, sets the two passages apart.[166] For example, the assertion that Caesar needed to be made a god so Augustus could be *born* divine is ironic (15.760-761), and in contrast to the *Fasti*, where Caesar is already a god in a mortal body (3.701-702; cf. V. Max. 4.6.6), is in keeping with the more serious tone of the *Fasti* both here and elsewhere when dealing with Augustan themes (cf. *Fast.* 5.569-580).[167]

---

[166]For irony in *Met.* 15. 746-870, see Feeney (1991) and Salzman (1998).
[167]Salzman (1998: 340-341) and Miller (1991: 140-142).

Summary

The two accounts of Caesar's murder and deification share many elements, such as Augustan themes like revenge, paternity and deification, and a common vocabulary (*rapio*, *nefas*, *gladios,* and *prohibeo*) and deification through a god. The length is the most obvious difference, along with elements like the choice of a different goddess to intervene.

Ovid composed multiple versions of stories (Ariadne, Callisto, Ino, Proserpina) in his poetry, and the same story is sometimes found in both *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*. Ovid's mythmaking about a mortal has literary precedents in Hellenistic poetry. In both Theocritus 15.106-111 and 17.45-50, Berenice is deified by Aphrodite ("snatched" in Theoc. 17.45-50) while Callimachus (fr. 228.5-7) has Arsinoë "snatched" and placed in the heavens by the Dioscuri. Ovid also had the Roman literary precedent of Romulus' apotheosis from which to benefit from for his treatment of Julius Caesar's deification (Liv. 1.16). This mixture of fact and fiction of Caesar's murder and deification makes one wonder how the contemporary readers in Augustan Rome would have responded to Ovid's two *different* mythopoetic inventions. As Williams (1978: 93-94) says, "the apotheosis of Julius Caesar was a poetic concept, but that was literature; in real life, deification meant a temple and a ritual, not a belief or a legend."

Appendix II: Julius Caesar In Augustan Poetry

References to Julius Caesar in Augustan poetry have always intrigued scholars. In the nineteenth century, the Horatian commentator Orelli noted that the Augustan poets appeared to avoid mentioning Caesar as if they feared that he would overshadow the accomplishments of Augustus.[168] Research in the first half of the twentieth century by Pichon, Plessis, Gundolf, Green and Spaeth explained the paucity of references by suggesting that Augustus took an active role in the treatment of his predecessor in literature.[169] More recently, Syme argued in several of his works (spanning almost fifty years) that the Augustan poets downplayed Caesar.[170] He relied chiefly on the works of Horace and Virgil to support his argument, and expressed surprise that Caesar is mentioned in a poem like the *Fasti* from so late in the principate.[171] Challenges to Syme's viewpoint have been few.

In 1985, Ramage's article, "Augustus' Treatment of Julius Caesar", argued that Augustus employed a "subtle program of propaganda designed to suppress Caesar and to put a distance between himself and his father"[172] and that "there is surprisingly little mention of the man and his accomplishments, and when he does appear, it is either with negative overtones or else with special emphasis on his divinity."[173] Soon after, White's article "Julius Caesar in Augustan Rome" considered Augustus' treatment of Caesar,[174] focusing on the portrayal of Caesar in both art and literature and including a table of

---

[168]White (1988: 334, note 1).
[169]Plessis (1909), Pichon (1917), Gundolf (1924), Green (1932), Spaeth (1933).
[170]Syme (1958: 432-433), see also Syme (1939: 317-318; 1959: 58-59; 1978: 140-141; 1979: 89, 212-214; 1986:443).
[171]Syme (1978: 191).
[172]Ramage (1985: 223).
[173]Ramage (1985: 230).
[174]White (1988: 334-356).

notable personalities and the references to them in Augustan poetry.[175] White says (1985: 348) that "references to [Caesar] begin in the forties and continue fairly steadily right down to the end of Augustus' reign. This is not true for [Pompey, Cato, Agrippa, Marcellus, Gaius and Lucius, Tiberius, Drusus, Livia and Julia]." White used Syme's argument as a framework to "offer a different assessesment of Caesar's public image in Rome."[176]

The following three sections will focus first on references to Julius Caesar in Augustan poetry apart from the *Fasti*. These literary references avoid loaded political terms used in Caesar's lifetime like *dictator*, but instead refer to his familial relationships (father; father-in-law; ancestry), his divinity (god; comet) and his assassination.

FAMILY

The most common reference is to Caesar as the father or parent of Augustus (Verg. *A.* 8.681, *patrium sidus*;[177] Prop. 4.6.59, *pater Caesar*; Ov. *Met.* 15.751, *pater*; 15.820, *parentis*; 15.852, *paternis*; Man. 1.8, *parentem*; 1.9, *patri*; 1.913, *patris*[178]). Augustus is also referred to as the father-in-law of Pompey (Verg. *A.* 6.830, *socer*; Prop. 3.11.38, *socer*); and as the descendant of a goddess or hero (Verg. *Ecl.* 9.47, *ecce Dionaei*[179] *processit Caesaris astrum*; *A.* 1.286-290, *nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar / imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris, / Iulius, a magno demissum nomen*

---

[175]White (1988: 346-347).
[176]White (1988: 385).
[177]Ramage (1985: 232) considers this to be an indirect reference to Caesar.
[178]Ramage (1985: 232 and note 32) calls Manilius' treatment of Caesar "anonymous".
[179]*Dionaei* creates a matronymic connection to Venus.

Iulo. Hunc tu olim caelo spoliis Orientis onustum / accipies secura; vocabitur hic quoque votes;[180] 6.792, *divi genus*;[181] 6.789-90, *omnis Iuli / progenies magnum caeli ventura sub axem*; Ov. *Met.* 15.750, *progenies*; 15.804, *Aeneaden*;[182] Man. 1.798-799, *Venerisque ab origine proles / Iulia*).

DEIFICATION

In this category, there are references to Caesar's deification: as a god and to the comet. Caesar is called either *deus* or referred to as divine by the Augustan poets (Verg. *A.* 6.792, *divi genus*; Prop. 4.6.60, *deus*;[183] Ov. *Met.* 15.746, *deus*; 15.761, *deus*; 15.818, *deus*; 15.842, *divus Iulius*; *Pont.* 2.2.84, *divus Iulius*; Man. 1.926, *cumque deum caelo* [sc. Roma] *dederit*; 2.594,[184] *deus Caesar*).[185]

References to Caesar's comet (or star) are frequent (Verg. *Ecl.* 9.47, *Caesaris astrum*; *A.* 1.286-290 (see above, pp. 86-87); 8.681 (see above, p. 86); 10.270, *ardet apex*

---

[180]West (1992: 16) calls this reference explicit and suggests that the readers of this poem would have recalled Caesar's deification and the star (comet) which some believed to be his soul.

[181]*Divi* refers to the deified Julius, *genus* to Augustus; see Simpson (1998: 419-437).

[182]This patronymic is unusual only in that it refers to Caesar here rather than Romans.

[183]This line has troubled scholars and Butrica (1997: 176-208) has emended *sum deus* to *cui deus*. With the emendation, the reference remains intact.

[184]I accept Goold's restoration of the text here. He says (1977: intro. P. cxi) that the "verses italicized in the text (as they also are in the translation) have no MS. authority; they are editorial supplements which attempt to restore the sense of a conjectured lacuna."

[185]Caesar's divinity (and Augustus') is implied in both Verg. *A.* 9.641-642, *macte nova virtute, puer* [Iulus], *sic itur ad astra, / dis genite et geniture deos* and Man. 4.934, *iam facit ipse deos mittisque ad sidera numen.*

capiti;[186] Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.47, *Iulium sidus*;[187] Prop. 3.18.34, *Caesar ab humana cessit in astra via*; Ov. *Met.* 15.749, *in sidus vertere novum, stellamque comantem*; 15.841, *iubar*; 15.846, *caelestibus intulit astris*; 15.850, *stella*).

ASSASSINATION

References to the assassination appear in Augustan poetry (Verg. *G.* 1.466, *ille etiam exstincto miseratus Caesare Romam*;[188] Ov. *Met.* 1.200-201, *sic, cum manus impia saevit /sanguine Caesareo Romanum exstinguere nomen*;[189] 15.820, *caesique parentis*;[190] 15.840, *caeso de corpore*; Man. 2.593-594, *sed fraude nefanda / ipse deus Caesar*

---

[186]Just as there was a star over Augustus' head in the previous reference, West (1992: 14) thinks that there can be no doubt that lines 270-271 refer to the same thing. He reminds us that the reader would have been familiar with the statues and coins that depicted Caesar with a star above his head; see above p. 37.

[187]For Syme (1939: 318) this line shows Augustus having Julius removed from earth and put in heaven as a way of dissociating the two men. Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 162-163) accept Syme's interpretation in their commentary and state that "a direct reference to Julius Caesar is unlikely; in the twenties Julius Caesar was long dead, and played down in official utterances. Even a reference to the Julian house as a whole is probably undesirable; it was Augustus himself who was pre-eminent, and everybody knew it". West (1992: 6-7), however, challenges the long-standing opinion of Syme, who interprets *Iulium sidus* as having a transitional effect on the poem by bridging the reference to Marcellus, Julia's first husband, in line 46 and that to Augustus in the next stanza. West (1992: 7) further adds that "the Julian star cannot be mentioned without alluding to Julius and in this context its brilliance is closely associated with the *fama Marcelli*". I too think that *Iulium* means that it can only be Julius. What is apparent, for White (1988: 352), is that Horace chose to exclude Caesar from his list of divinities and heroes and to place him instead with the memorable mortal Romans. Yet if we accept West's argument, then it is no surprise that Julius is excluded from the divinities and heroes and grouped instead with the Julians. Even if the position of Caesar is a slight by Horace, the line is still complimentary, especially to the Julian family. As White (1988: 353) puts it, Syme's interpretation "is simply anachronistic".

[188]For Virgil the sun (*ille*) is important since it will warn of all things ominous. This passage of course refers to the solar eclipse of November 44 B.C.

[189]Some scholars believe that this passage refers to one of the several conspiracies against Augustus, see above pp. 57-58.

[190]Ovid had Augustus' *Res Gestae* in mind here (Aug. *Anc.* 2).

cecidit;[191] 4.57-62, *ille etiam caelo genitus caeloque receptus, / cum bene composites victor civilibus armis / iura togae regeret, totiens praedicta cavere / vulnera non potuit: toto spectante senatu, / indicium dexta retinens nomenque, cruore / delevit proprio, possent ut vincere fata*).

Clearly references to Caesar in Augustan poetry are frequent. The poets focus on specific traits such as the divine Caesar or parent of Augustus and there is no evidence that the poets tried to avoid or downplay Caesar.

REFERENCES IN THE *FASTI*[192]

Earlier discussions of Julius Caesar in Augustan poetry tended to ignore the *Fasti*, but the recent increase in scholarship on the *Fasti* has contributed to greater discussion and understanding of the various elements of the work, including the references to Caesar.[193] Herbert-Brown (1994), includes a chapter on Julius Caesar[194] which concludes that he is mentioned often by Ovid "to enhance by comparsion the rule of his heir" and thus win Augustus' approval.[195]

There are references to Caesar as father and as ancestor to Augustus (1.533, *nepos natusque dei*; 2.144, *patrem*; 3.157, *tantaeque propaginis auctor*; 3.710, *patrem*; 4.22, *et*

---

[191]See note 178 above.
[192]There are four Ovidian works which not surprisingly do not mention Julius Caesar: *Medicamina Feminae Faciei*, *Remedia Amoris*, *Heroides*, and *Ibis*. In the other six works, some references are explicit while others are more ambiguous. In particular, the latter type appears in Ovid's *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria*, and *Tristia*. For instance at *Ars* 1.184, *Caesaribus* suggests both Augustus and Julius Caesar and possibly even Gaius and Lucius.
[193]Herbert-Brown (1994: 109-129).
[194]Ramage referred sparingly to the *Fasti,* while White, who did include references in the *Fasti* in his table of notable personalities, refrained from discussing them in his article.
[195]Herbert-Brown (1994: 128).

fit adoptive nobilitate tuus; 5.573, *pater*), and as father-in-law to Pompey (3.202, *tum primum generis intulit arma docer*).

He is also either called a god or referred to as a divinity (2.144, *caelestem fecit ... ille patrem*; 3.157, *deus*; 3.160, *deus*; 3.703-704, *ille quidem caelo positus Iovis atria vidit / et tenet in Magno templa dicata Foro*; 5.574, *numen*).

The only reference to Caesar's assassination is in the passage analysed in this thesis (3.697, *praeteriturus eram gladios in principe fixos*).

In addition, there are two kinds of reference that are found only in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, to Caesar as military leader[196] (*Fast.* 4.381, *dux*; *Met.* 15.752-757, *scilicet aequoreos plus est domuisse Britannos / perque papyriferi septemflua flumina Nili / victrices egisse rates Numidasque rebelles / Cinyphiumque Iubam Mithridateisque tumentem / nominibus Pontum populo adiecisse Quirini / et multos meruisse, aliquos egisse triumphos*) and as *pontifex maximus*[197] (*Fast.* 3.699, *meus sacerdos*, 706, *pontificale caput*; 5.573, *Vestaeque sacerdos*; *Met.* 15.763, *pontifici*, 778, *sacerdotis Vestae*).

CONCLUSION

Syme expressed surprise at the frequency of references to Julius Caesar in Augustan poetry. The references in Ovid in particular have been difficult to read confidently because of the ambiguous nature of his poetry,[198] yet it is especially in the *Fasti* that they are consistent in their favourable portrayal of him. The references avoid

[196] *Fast.* 1.604, implies Caesar's victory over Pompey, *sed qui te vicit, nomine maior erat.*
[197] As *Pontifex maximus*, Caesar reformed the calendar (*Fast.* 3.155-156, *donec / Caesaris in multis haec quoque cura fuit*).
[198] Wallace-Hadrill (1987: 228).

political titles and focus instead on familial relationships, deification and assassination as well as Caesar the military leader and *Pontifex Maximus*. Augustus himself in his *Res Gestae* refers to Caesar and emphasizes his parentage and divinity/deification. Ovid especially seems to be thinking of Julius Caesar much as Augustus did: murdered father to be avenged; murdered *pontifex maximus* to be avenged; god in a temple built by Augustus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following contains works both cited and used in the preparation of this study.

Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London.

Ahl, F. 1976. *Lucan*. London.

-----. 1985. *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. Ithaca, NY.

Allen, K. 1922. "The *Fasti* of Ovid and Augustan Propaganda." *AJP* 43: 250-266.

Alton, E. H. 1926. "The Zulichemianus, Mazarinianus, and other MSS. of the *Fasti* of Ovid." *Hermathena* 20: 101-118.

Alton, E. H., Wormell, D. E. W., and Courtney, E., eds. 1978. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*. Leipzig.

Anderson, W. S. ed. 1977. *Ovid. Metamorphoses*. Leipzig.

Austin, N. 1994. *Helen of Troy and Her Shamless Phantom*. Ithaca, NY.

Bailey, C. 1921. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum Liber III*. Oxford.

Barchiesi, A. 1997. *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

-----. 2001. *Speaking Volumes. Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*. London.

-----. 2002. "Martial Arts. Mars Ultor in the Forum Augustum: A Verbal Monument with A Vengeance." In G. Herbert-Brown ed. *Ovid's Fasti*. Oxford. 1-22.

Beard, M. 1980. "The Sexual Status of Vestal Virgins." *JRS* 70: 12-27.

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

-----. 1995. "Rereading Vestal Virginity." In R. Hawley and B. Levick eds. *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments* London. 166-177.

-----. North, J. and Price, S. 1998. *Religions of Rome*, Vol. I: *A History*; Vol. II: *A Sourcebook*. Cambridge.

Bellemore, J. 1984. *Nicolaus of Damascus: Life of Augustus*. Bristol.

-----. 1989. "When did Valerius Maximus write the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia?" *Antichthon* 23: 67-80.

Bloomer, W. M. 1992. *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*. Chapel Hill and London.

Bömer, F. 1952. "Über die Himmelserscheinung nach dem Tode Caesars." *Bonner Jahrbücher* 152: 27-40.

-----. ed. and trans. 1957-58. *P. Ovidius Naso. Die Fasten*. 2 Vols. Heidelberg.

-----. ed. and trans. 1969-86. *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen*. 7 Vols. Heidelberg.

-----. 1987. "Wie ist Augustus mit Vesta verwandt?" *Gymnasium* 94: 525-528.

-----. 1988. "Über das zeitliche Verhältnis zwischen den *Fasten* und den *Metamorphosen* Ovids." *Gymnasium* 95: 207-221.

Boyle, A. J. and Woodard, R. D. trans. 2000. *Ovid. Fasti*. Harmondsworth.

Brugnoli, G. 1992. "Anna Perenna." In G. Brugnoli and F. Stok eds. *Ovidius*. Pisa. 21-45.

Burmann, P. ed. 1727. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum libri sex cum notis variorum*. Amsterdam.

Butrica, J. L. 1997. "Editing Propertius." *CQ* 47: 176-208.

Carter, J. 1982. "The Ides of March and Anna Perenna," *LCM* 7.6: 89.

Castiglioni, L. ed. 1960. *Fastorum libri VI*. Turin.

Crawford, M. H. 1974. *Roman Republican Coinage*. 2 Vols. London and New York.

Cressy, J. M. 1982. "Why the Ides of March?" *LCM* 7.4: 60.

Davies, G. A. 1894. "*Fasti*." In *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*. London.

Dazell, A. 1996. *The Criticism of Didactic Poetry*. Toronto.

Degrassi, A. 1963. *Inscriptiones Italiae*. 13.2: *Fasti Anni Numani et Iuliani*. Rome.

Due, O. S. 1977. *Changing Forms. Studies in the Metamorphoses of Ovid*. Copenhagen.

Dyck, A. R. 1996. *A Commentary on Cicero's de Officiis*. Ann Arbor, MI.

Fantham, E. 1983. "Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*: Sources and Motivation." *HSCP* 87: 185-216.

-----. 1986. "Ovid, Germanicus, and the Composition of the *Fasti*." *PLLS* 5: 243-281.

-----. 1995a. "Recent Readings of Ovid's *Fasti*." *CP* 90: 367-378.

-----. 1995b. "Rewriting and Rereading the *Fasti*: Augustus, Ovid and Recent Classical Scholarship." *Antichthon* 29: 42-59.

-----. 1996. *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius*. Baltimore and London.

-----. ed. 1998. *Ovid: Fasti Book IV*. Cambridge.

-----. 2002. "Ovid's *Fasti*: Politics, History, and Religion." In B. Weiden Boyd ed. *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. Leiden. 197-234.

Fauth, W. 1978. "Römische Religion im Spiegel der *Fasti* des Ovid." *ANRW* 2.16.1: 104-186.

Feeney, D. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford.

-----. 1992. "*Si licet et fas est*: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate." In A. Powell ed. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. London. 1-25.

-----. 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts and Beliefs*. Cambridge.

Fishwick, D. 1987. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*. Vol. I. Leiden.

-----. 2002. *The Imperial Cult the Latin West*. Vol. III. Leiden.

Frazel, T. D. 2003. "Priapus's Two Rapes in Ovid's *Fasti*." *Arethusa* 36: 61-97.

Frazer, J. G. ed. and trans. 1929. *P. Ovidius Naso Fastorum Libri Sex*. 5 Vols. London.

-----. ed. and trans. 1931. *Ovid's Fasti* Cambridge, MA and London.

Fraschetti, A. 1988. "*Cognata numina:* culta della Città e culti della Casa del Principe in epoca Augustea." *Studia Storici* 29: 941-965.

-----. 1990. *Il Principe e Roma*. Rome-Bari.

Fuller, J.F.C. 1954. *The Decisive Battles of the Western World*. Vol. I. London.

Gagé, J. 1930. "Romulus-Augustus." *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire: Ecole française de Rome* 47: 138-181.

Galinsky, K. 1975. *Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Oxford.

-----. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton.

Gee, E. R. 2000. *Ovid, Aratus, and Augustus: Astronomy in Ovid's Fasti*. Cambridge.

Gibson, R. 1998. "Didactic Poetry as 'Popular' Form: a Study of Imperatival Expressions in Latin Didactic Verse and Prose." In C. Atherton ed. *Form and Content in Didactic Poetry*. Bari. 67-98.

Goold, G. P. ed. 1977-1984. *Ovid. Metamorphoses*. Cambridge, MA and London.

-----. ed. and trans. 1985. *Manilius. Astronomica*. Cambridge, MA and London.

-----. ed. 1989. *Ovid. Fasti.* Cambridge, MA and London.

-----. ed. and trans. 1990. *Propertius. Elegies.* Cambridge, MA and London.

-----. ed. 1999. *Virgil.* Cambridge, MA and London.

Gow, A. S. F. ed. and trans. 1950. *Theocritus*. 2 Vols. Cambridge.

Green, W. M. 1932. "Julius Caesar in the Augustan Poets." *CJ* 27: 405-411.

Grueber, H.A. 1970. *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum*. 3 Vols. London.

Guarducci, M. 1964. "Vesta sul Palatino." *MDAI (R)* 71: 158-169.

-----. 1971. "Enea e Vesta." *MDAI (R)* 78: 73-118.

Gundolf, F. 1924. *Cesar: Geschichte seines Ruhms*. Berlin.

Hallam, G. H. 1886. *The Fasti of Ovid*. London and New York.

Hannah, R. 1997. "The Temple of Mars Ultor and 12 May." *MDAI (R)* 104: 527-36.

Hardie, P. 1998. "Questions of Authority: The Invention of Tradition in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 15." In T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro eds. *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge. 182-198.

-----. ed. 2002a. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. Cambridge.

-----. 2002b. *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge.

Harries, B. 1989. "Causation and the Authority of the Poet in Ovid's Fasti." *CQ* 39: 164-85.

Herbert-Brown, G. 1994. *Ovid and the Fasti: A Historical Study*. Oxford.

-----. ed. 2002. *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*. Oxford.

Hill, D. E. ed. and trans. 1985. *Metamorphoses I-IV*. Oak Park, IL.

-----. ed. and trans. 2000. *Metamorphoses XIII-XV*. Warminister, Wiltshire.

Hinds, S. J. 1987a. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse*. Cambridge.

-----. 1987b. "Generalising about Ovid." *Ramus* 16: 4-31.

-----. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.

Holleman, A. W. J. 1983. "Ovid and the Lupercalia." *Historia* 22: 260-68.

Holmes, T. R. 1928. *The Architect of the Roman Empire*. Oxford.

Horsfall, N. M. 1974. "The Ides of March." *Greece & Rome* 21: 191-98.

Johnson, W. R. 1992. "The Desolation of the Fasti." *CJ* 74: 7-18.

Kennedy, D. 1992. ""Augustan" and "Anti-Augustan": Reflection on Terms of Reference." In A. Powell ed. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. London. 26-58.

Kenney, E. J. 1982. "Ovid." In *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol. 2. eds. E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen. Cambridge. 420-457.

Kötzle, M. 1991. *Weibliche Gottheiten in Ovids "Fasten."* Frankfurt am Main.

Kovacs, D. ed. and trans. 1998. *Euripides: Suppliant Women, Electra, Heracles*. Cambridge, MA and London.

-----. ed. and trans. 2002. *Euripides: Helen, Phoenician Women, Orestes*. Cambridge, MA and London .

Lanham, R. A. 1991. *A Handbook of Rhetorical Terms*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford.

Le Bonniec, H. 1958. *Etudes ovidiennes: introduction aux Fastes d'Ovide*. Frankfurt am Main.

-----. ed. and trans. 1969-70. *Ovide: Les Fastes*. 2 Vols. Catania and Bologna.

Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. 1979. *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*. Oxford.

Little, D. A. 1972. "The non-Augustanism of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Mnemosyne* 25: 389-401.

Littlewood, R. J. 1980. "Ovid and the Ides of March *Fasti* 3.523-710: A Further Study In the Artistry of the *Fasti*." In C. Deroux ed. *Studies in Latin Literature II.* Brussels. 301-321.

-----. 1981. "Poetic Artistry and Dynastic Politics: Ovid at the Ludi Megalenses *Fasti* 4. 179-372." *CQ* 31: 381-395.

Lowrie, M. 1997. *Horace's Narrative Odes*. Oxford.

Maltby, R. 1991. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Leeds.

Martin, C. 1985. "A Reconsideration of Ovid's Fasti." *ICS* 10: 261-274.

McKeown, J. C. 1984. "*Fabula proposito nulla tegenda meo*: Ovid's *Fasti* and Augustan Politics." In T. Woodman and D. West eds. *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge. 169-187.

Merkel, R. ed. 1884. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum libri sex*. Leipzig.

Michels, A. 1967. *The Calendar of the Roman Republic*. Princeton.

Millar, F. and E. Segal. 1984. *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*. Oxford and New York.

Millar, F. 1993. "Ovid and the *Domus Augusta*: Rome Seen from Tomoi." *JRS* 83: 1 -17.

Miller, F. J. ed. and trans. 1916. *Metamorphoses. Ovid.* Cambridge, MA and London.

Miller, J. F. 1983. "Ovid's Divine Interlocutors in the *Fasti*." In C. Deroux ed. *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History III*. Brussels. 156-192.

-----. 1991. *Ovid's Elegiac Festivals*. Frankfurt.

-----. 2002. "The *Fasti*: Style, Structure, and Time." In B. Weiden Boyd ed. *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. Leiden. 167-196.

Moles, J.L. 1982. "The Ides of March and Anna Perenna." *LCM* 7.6: 89-90.

Murgatroyd, P. 2002. "The Rape Attempts on Lotis and Vesta." *CQ* 52: 622-624.

Nagle, B.R. trans. 1995. *Ovid: The Fasti*. Bloomington, IN.

Nash, E. 1961. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. London.

Newlands, C. E. 1995. *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti*. Ithaca, NY.

-----. 1996. "Transgressive Acts: Ovid's Treatment of the Ides of March." *CP* 91: 320 -338.

Nisard, D. 1850. *Ovide: Oeuvres complètes*. Paris.

Nisbet, R. G. M., and Hubbard, M. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1*. Oxford.

Otis, B. 1970. *Ovid as an Epic Poet*. Cambridge.

Paley, F. A. 1881. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum libri sex*. London.

Pascoe-Pranger, M. 2002. "Added Days: Calendrical Poetics and the Julio-Claudian Holidays." In G. Herbert-Brown ed. *Ovid's Fasti*. Oxford. 251-274.

Pease, A. S. ed. 1935. *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*. Cambridge, MA.

Peter, H. ed. 1907. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum libri sex*. Leipzig.

Pfeiffer, R. 1922. *Kallimachosstudien: Untersuchungen zur Arsinoë und zu den Aitia des Kallimachos*. München.

-----. 1949-53. *Callimachus*, 2 Vols. Oxford.

Phillips, C. R. 1992. "Roman Religion and Literary Studies of Ovid's Fasti." *Arethusa* 25: 55-80.

Pichon, R. 1917. "Virgile et César." *REA* 19: 193-198.

Platner, S. B., and Ashby, T. 1929. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Oxford.

Plessis, F. 1909. *La poésie latine*. Paris.

Porte, D. 1985. *L' étioligie religieuse dans les Fastes d'Ovide*. Paris.

-----. 2003. "*Pia arma* (Ovide, *Fast.* V. 545-598)." In *Hommages à Carl Deroux.* Vol. 4. P. Defosse ed. Bruxelles. 513-532.

Powell, A. ed. 1992. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. London.

Quinn, K. ed. and trans. 1992. *Horace: The Odes*. 2nd edn. Scarborough, ON.

Raaflaub, K. A. and Toher, M. eds. 1990. *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*. Berkeley-Oxford.

Raditsa, L. F. 1980. "Augustus' Legislation Concerning Marriage, Procreation, Love Affairs and Adultery." *ANRW* 2.13.1: 278-339

Ramsay, J.T. and Licht, A. L. 1997. *The Comet of 44 B.C. and Caesar's Funeral Games*. Atlanta, GA.

Rawson, E. 1986. "Cassius and Brutus: The Memory of the Liberators." In *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*. Moxon, I.S., Smart, J. D. and A. J. Woodman eds. Cambridge. 101-119.

Richardson, N. J. 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome.* Baltimore, MD.

Richlin, A. ed. 1992. "Reading Ovid's Rapes." In *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. Oxford and New York. 158-179.

Riedl, R. 1989. *Mars Ultor in Ovids "Fasten"*. Amsterdam.

Rubincam, C. 1990. "The Terminology of Power in the Early Roman Empire." *Cahier des Études Anciennes* 26: 155-171.

-----. 1992. "The Nomenclature of Julius Caesar and the Later Augustus in the Triumviral Period." *Historia* 41: 88-103.

Rutledge, E. S. 1980. "Ovid's Informants in *Fasti*." In C. Deroux ed. *Studies in Latin Literature II.* Brussels. 322-331.

Salzman, M.R. 1998. "Deification in the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*." In C. Deroux ed. *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IX*. Brussels. 313-346.

Scheid, J. 1992. "Myth, Cult and Reality in Ovid's *Fasti*." *PCPS* 38: 118-129.

Schilling, R. ed. and trans. 1993. *Ovide: Les Fastes*, 2 Vols. Paris.

Scott, K. 1930. "Emperor Worship in Ovid." *TAPA* 105: 347-91.

-----. 1941. "The *Sidus Iulium* and the apotheosis of Caesar." *CP* 39: 257-272.

Simpson, C.J. 1977. "The Date of Dedication of the Temple of Mars Ultor." *JRS* 67: 91-94.

-----. 1998. "IMP.CAESAR DIVI FILIUS. His second imperatorial acclamation and the evolution of an allegedly "exorbitant" name." *Athenaeum* 86: 419-437.

Spaeth, J. W. 1933. "Caesar's Friends and Enemies among the Poets." *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 64: 60.

Steinby, E. M. ed. 1993. *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*. 6 Vols. Rome.

Sydenham, E.A. 1952. *The Roman Republican Coinage*. London.

Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford.

-----. 1958. *Tacitus*. Oxford.

-----. 1978. *History in Ovid*. Oxford.

-----. 1986. *The Augustan Aristocracy*. Oxford.

Taylor, L. R. 1931. *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Middletown, CT.

Thomas, R. F. ed. 1988. *Vergil's Georgics*, 2 Vols. Cambridge.

Trypanis, C.A. ed. and trans. 1958. *Callimachus: Aetia, Iambi, Lyric Poems, Hecale, Minor Epic and Elegiac poems, Fragments of Epigrams, and Fragments of Uncertain Location*. Cambridge, MA and London.

Valentini, R. and G. Zucchetti. 1940. *Codice Topografico della Città di Roma*. Rome.

Voit, L. 1985. "Caesars Apotheose in der Darstellung Ovids." F. Maier and W. Suerbaum eds. *Festschrift fur Karl Bayer*. Munich. 49-56.

Von Albrecht, M. 1999. *Roman Epic: An Interpretive Introduction*. Leiden.

Wagenwoort, H. 1980. *Pietas: Selected Studies in Roman Religion*. Leiden.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1985. "Propaganda and Dissent? Augustan Moral Legislation and the Love-Poets." *Klio* 67: 180-184.

-----. 1987. "Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus and the Fasti." In M. Whitby, P. Hardie, and M. Whitby eds. *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*. Bristol. 221-230.

Warde-Fowler, W. 1908. *The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic*. London.

Wardle, D. 1997. ""The Sainted Julius": Valerius Maximus and the Dictator." *CP* 92: 323-345.

-----. 2000. "Valerius Maximus on the *Domus Augusta*, Augustus, and Tiberius." *CQ* 50: 479-493.

Weiden-Boyd, B. ed. 2002. *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. Leiden.

Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford.

West, D. 2002. *Horace Odes III*. Oxford.

White, P. 1988. "Julius Caesar in Augustan Rome." *Phoenix* 42: 334-356.

-----. 1993. *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge, MA.

Wiedemann, T. E. J. 1992. *Emperors and Gladiators*. London.

Wildfang, R. L. 2003. "Why were the Vestals Virgin?" In *Hommages à Carl Deroux*. Vol. 4. P. Defosse ed. Bruxelles. 513-532.

Williams, G. 1962. "Poetry in the Moral Climate of Augustan Rome." *JRS* 52: 28-46.

Williams, G. D. 1991. "Vocal Variations and Narrative Complexity in Ovid's Vestalia: *Fasti* 6. 249-468." *Ramus* 20: 183-204.

Williams, G. W. 1978. *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Williams, M.F. 2003. "The *Sidus Iulium*, the Divinity of Men, and the Golden Age in Virgil's *Aeneid*." *Leeds International Classical Studies* 2: 1-29.

Willis, J. 1990. *Repetition in Latin Poetry. Figures of Allusion*. Oxford.

Wissowa, G. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. 2nd edn. Munich.

Woodman, A. J. 1983. *Velleius Paterculus: The Caesarean and Augustan Narrative.* Cambridge.

-----. and West, D. eds. 1984. *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge.

Wyatt, W. F. ed. 1999. *Iliad. Homer*. Cambridge, MA and London.

Zanker, P. 1990. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor, MI.