OVID'S SATIRICAL SUCCESSORS IN THE EARLY IMPERIAL PERIOD

Anna Louise Goddard

A DISSERTATION

in

Classical Studies

Presented to the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania

in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2015

Supervisor of Dissertation

____

Joseph Farrell

Professor of Classical Studies

Graduate Group Chairperson

____

Emily Wilson

Associate Professor of Classical Studies

Dissertation Committee

James Ker, Associate Professor of Classical Studies

Emily Wilson, Associate Professor of Classical Studies

OVID'S SATIRICAL SUCCESSORS IN THE EARLY IMPERIAL PERIOD

COPYRIGHT

2015

Anna Louise Goddard

This work is licensed under the
Creative Commons Attribution-
NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0
License

To view a copy of this license, visit

http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-ny-sa/2.0/

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Trying to put into words my gratitude to all the family, friends and faculty without whose support I would not have completed this dissertation only serves to remind me of the depth of the debt I owe to so many people. While my expressions of thanks may be inadequate, they are truly heartfelt. Firstly, I am indebted to the members of my dissertation committee, Emily Wilson, James Ker and especially to my advisor, Joseph Farrell. I thank all three of them for their generosity in reading drafts and for their patience and continued encouragement when my own confidence was faltering. In particular, I cannot overstate Joe's contribution to this dissertation and my professional development. I have benefited enormously from his guidance, close reading of my writing and always insightful comments. I thank him especially for giving me the freedom to explore and for pushing me to take my arguments as far as I could.

It has been a privilege to be a part of the department of Classical Studies at Penn alongside such genuine, kind, and brilliant people. I have learnt more than I could possibly imagine from the faculty and my fellow graduate students. My thanks must go especially to my cohort – Joanna Kenty, Kate Wilson, and Heather Elomaa, with whom I was lucky enough to start and finish graduate school. I cannot adequately express how grateful I am that I got to experience the highs and lows of graduate school and dissertation writing in their company. Their friendship, support and example have been invaluable. Finally, I want to thank my family. I am beyond lucky to have my parents and sister as my foundation. Their unwavering belief in me has given me the confidence and determination to always persevere and finish what I started. Geographically we may have been distant but their love and support have truly carried me through every step.

ABSTRACT

OVID'S SATIRICAL SUCCESSORS IN THE EARLY IMPERIAL PERIOD

Anna Louise Goddard

Joseph Farrell

In this dissertation, I examine the early reception of Ovid in satirical authors from the time of Ovid's death in 17 AD through to the early years of Neronian rule. I argue that in this earliest period of Ovidian reception, writers of satire, broadly defined, were reading and engaging with Ovid in their own writings and treating him as an important predecessor in facing the problem of how to write under restrictive, imperial circumstances. In each chapter, I focus on a single text — Phaedrus' *Fables*, Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* and Persius' *Satires* — and consider how each author interacts with Ovid to develop his own position as social critic under imperial rule and to communicate ideas that are difficult or dangerous to express more openly. In the first chapter I argue that Phaedrus situates both the struggles of the animals in the world of the fable and poets writing under powerful regimes as post-Augustan and post-Ovidian. In the second chapter I examine how Seneca engages both with the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* as prequels for the action of the *Apocolocyntosis* to consider what kind of sequel the *Apocolocyntosis* is. In the final chapter I argue that in *Satire* One Persius provides a picture of contemporary poets who are trying hard to be like Ovid, but are failing to do it well, while also engaging himself with Ovid as a poet who had important insights about the difficulties of living and writing under empire that Persius makes applicable to his own situation as an imperial satirist. In each chapter I demonstrate how the author forges connections with Ovid in his own individual ways, but across the three authors I argue that Ovid's poetry provides a point of intersection at which two important issues for these

satirical authors meet, the theme of freedom of speech and the problem of how to face the pressures of the imperial discourse. The conjunction of these themes provides a shared basis for this strand of Ovidian reception at this time period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .... **iii**

ABSTRACT .... **iv**

INTRODUCTION: A Satirical Ovid **1**

CHAPTER ONE: Ovidian Identity Crises in Phaedrus' *Fables* **18**
- **Section One: Ovidian Deer in Phaedrus' *Fables*** **22**
  - 1.1 Fable 2.8 Home or the Wild? 23
  - 1.2 Mirror, Mirror 30
- **Section Two: Horns in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fables*** **43**
  - 2.1 Horns as a Marker of Special Status / Divinity 44
  - 2.2 Horns as a Marker of Leadership 48
  - 2.3 Standing Out in the World of the *Fables* 52
- **Section Three: The Specter of Ovid's Fate** **57**
- **Conclusion** **70**

CHAPTER TWO: Ovidian Prequels and Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* **73**
- **Section One: The *Metamorphoses* and the *Apocolocyntosis*** **75**
  - 1.1 The *Apocolocyntosis* as Sequel to the *Metamorphoses* 77
  - 1.2 The *Metamorphoses* as Prequel to the *Apocolocyntosis* 83
- **Section Two: The *fasti* and the *Apocolocyntosis*** **98**
  - 2.1 The Context of the *fasti* for Seneca 101
  - 2.2 Cyclical / Calendrical Moments in the *Apocolocyntosis* 104
- **Section Three: Ovid's *Fasti* and the *Apocolocyntosis*** **110**
  - 3.1 Ovid's *Fasti* as Prequel to the *Apocolocyntosis* 112
  - 3.2 The *Apocolocyntosis* as the Continuation of the *Fasti* 124
- **Conclusion** **134**

CHAPTER THREE: How to be an (Ovidian) Satirist in Persius *Satire* One **137**
- **Section One: The Ovidian Tenor of Persius' Literary Criticism** **140**
- **Section Two: Persius' Secret, an Ovidian Lens on a Satiric Problem** **161**
- **Section Three: Ovid, Persius and Ass' Ears** **178**
- **Conclusion** **192**

CONCLUSIONS **194**

BIBLIOGRAPHY **200**

Introduction: A Satirical Ovid

This dissertation will examine the early reception of Ovid in satirical authors from the time of Ovid's death in 17 AD through to the early years of Neronian rule. By focusing on this type of author in the early years following Ovid's death I address a conspicuous gap in the study of Ovid's reception and argue that Ovid was being read and looked to as an important predecessor for satirical authors in this time period.

The dynamics of Ovid's reception and scholarly study of the subject are complex, with good reason, as the two thousand years since Ovid composed his poetry offer ample scope for many different Ovids to arise and be studied. Ludwig Traube first coined the phrase *aetas Ovidiana* to characterize the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, a period in which he thought that Ovid surpassed other ancient authors as the most worthy of imitation.[1] Traube's focus was on metrical imitation and Ovidian elegiacs but since his designation of the period, others have broadened the scope of his term to explore the political, social and religious circumstances that made Ovid's presence pervasive in the medieval period in particular and beyond.[2] However, the recognition of the importance of Ovid from the twelfth century onwards did not translate easily into study of and appreciation of Ovid's reception in antiquity. In part, Traube's term itself, focused as it is on Ovid at a specific point in time later than antiquity, hindered such recognition, reinforcing a distinction between the later Ovidian popularity and the earlier so-called

[1] Traube was the chair of Medieval Latin Philology at the University of Munich, and coined the term for a series of lectures, given in 1902/3 and 1905/6, published in 1911.

[2] For a range of scholarship on post-classical Ovidian reception see Battaglia 1959, Alton and Wormell 1960, Munari 1961, Viarre 1966, Hexter 1986, Martindale 1988, Picone, Michelangel0 and Zimmermann 1994, Brown 1999, Hexter 2002 and Clark, Coulson and Mckinley 2011. Miller and Newlands recently published *A Handbook to the Reception of Ovid* (2014) that selectively spans the two thousand years of Ovid's reception.

aetas Virgiliana when Ovid's importance for classical authors was thought to be lacking. Ronconi in a study of Ovid's fortunes in antiquity concluded that there was no *aetas Ovidiana* in antiquity, Ovid always coming second to Virgil.[3]

A complicated mix of factors hampered study of the dynamics of Ovid's reception and obscured his influence on later authors in antiquity. These interlacing, mutually-reinforcing elements span: Ovid' guiding of his own reception in his poetry; his critical treatment in antiquity; and the trends of modern scholarship in their approaches to Ovid's poetry and classical literary history. Ovid's observations and gloomy perspective from exile on the quality of his exile poetry and expectations of reception set the tone.[4] He consistently makes gestures in the exile poetry that deflate any previous confidence in his poetic ability.[5] Regardless of the true quality of his exile poetry, Ovid's insistence on its failing quality resulted in the exile poetry being seen as "foundational texts of the age of decline", as Hinds puts it.[6]

Critical voices in the ancient world reinforce the woeful impression that Ovid left behind in his exile poetry. Seneca the Elder and Quintilian bookend the first century AD, two authors whose literary criticism provided witness to a dismissive approach to Ovid as an author in comparison to other canonical Latin poets.[7] Their criticism of Ovid is joined by the voice of Seneca the Younger in the mid first century who makes explicit his

---

[3] Ronconi 1984, especially 1-4 and 13-16.

[4] See Myers 2014 for Ovid's acts of self-reception in his exile poetry. See Newlands 1997 on Ovid's equation between his declining health in exile and the quality of his poetry and Williams 2002.238-39.

[5] Many passages in the exile poetry exemplify this trope of poetic decline. C.f. *Tr.* 4.6.39-44, 5.1.71-2, 5.13.3; *E. P* 1.5.17-18, 3.9.13-32, 4.2.15-16.

[6] Hinds 1998.89.

[7] For Seneca the Elder's opinion of Ovid see *Controv.* 2.29 and 2.2.12. For Quintilian on Ovid as an epic and elegiac poet see *Inst. Or.* 10.1.89 and 93.

critique of Ovid as a poet.[8] Between the three a similar strand of criticism emerges, centred on Ovid's frivolous approach to literary decorum, couched in the language of childishness.[9] From the evidence of these three authors concerning attitudes towards Ovid in the first century AD it is unsurprising that one would come to the conclusion that Ovid was not embraced as an important predecessor in poets and authors of the period as strongly as others whom the critics favored. The impact of their voices on Ovid's later reception was far-reaching as, for example, can be found in Dryden's continuation of the flavor of their critiques in his own comments on Ovid, that Ovid was "frequently witty out of season".[10]

The combination of Ovid's own voice on his future reception, and the general disparagement of Ovid by these critics, was taken at face value for some time as the basis for modern, critical assessment of Ovid and therefore his lack of influence on later authors.[11] Periodization on the part of modern scholars also added to Ovid's image problems. Ovid is unquestionably situated at a juncture in literary history, but the conceptualization of the changing literary landscape from Golden Age to Silver with Ovid viewed as the harbinger of the Silver Age, brought with it implicit critical

[8] In his *Natural Questions* (3.27) Seneca the Younger critiques Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and addresses him directly. However, while Seneca makes this criticism openly, and if it was taken at face value, one would assume Seneca had a poor opinion of Ovid as a poet, this explicit criticism is only the top of the iceberg for Seneca's implicit engagement with Ovid. This combination of implicit and explicit is noteworthy for Seneca in engaging with Ovid as I will discuss in Chapter Two concerning Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*.
[9] See Elliot 1985 who concludes that the critical consensus of Ovid labels his poetry as "schoolboy pyrotechnics (1985.10-11). See Morgan 2003 for full consideration of shared basis of criticism between the three authors. See also Todini 1995 and Estefania 1999.
[10] Dryden 1680 in the preface to *Ovid's Epistles*.
[11] For example, for derogatory opinions on Ovid's exile poetry see Fraenkel 1945, Wilkinson 1955 and Otis 1966.

judgments about Ovid, bound up in the act of periodization.[12] Ovid was the beginning of a decline in the quality of poetry. These modern assumptions and perspectives, while to an extent understandably derived from the evidence from antiquity, have shifted, leading to re-evaluation of Ovid on many fronts. His exile poetry is no longer written off as below-par on the basis of his own, repetitive statements about his declining poetic prowess; his position at a literary-historical point of transition is no longer seen as a disabling influence on later authors, but formative; and with these shifts in modern critical opinions, the potential that Ovid did influence later authors in antiquity has opened up.[13]

The impulse to look for and explore Ovid's influence on later authors has crept back from the medieval period to encompass the poets of late antiquity and classical authors.[14] The diverse nature of Ovid's corpus and how to approach it as the basis for his reception have still posed challenges. Ovid's corpus, large, diverse and generically innovative as it is, does not break down easily into conventional approaches to reception and literary succession. Scholars have taken several different approaches. Literary succession is often traced through generic lineage, and even though the generic status of Ovid's works are multi-faceted, as he pushed the generic boundaries of epic and elegy, scholars have followed generic lines of reception.[15] For example, Ovid's influence on

[12] See Duff 1960 on the Silver Age of Latin literature, Williams 1978 and Mayer 1999. Brink (1982.523-72) on Horace writes that the Silver age was kept at bay until the death of Horace in 8 BC, subsequently leaving Ovid alone as the Silver Age firmly began.

[13] Reevaluation of the exile poetry was begun by Nagle 1980, and continued by Evans 1983 and Williams 1994. For a critical evaluation of the damaging concepts of Silver and Golden Age and a reevaluation of Ovid's position see Hardie 2002b.

[14] I will discuss specifics shortly but two journal editions are notable for their focus on Ovid's reception in antiquity: *Arethusa* 2002 edited by Wheeler; and *Hermathena* 2004-5, edited by Nelis.

[15] For example, Hardie 1993 *The epic successors of Virgil*. Key scholarship on Ovid and genre are Knox 1986, Hinds 1987a, 1992a and b, Farrell 1992, Conte 1994, Hardie 1995 and Barchiesi 2001.

later epic is well documented.[16] Elegiac successors have been harder to find as it appeared to reach a generic dead-end with Ovid's exuberant deployment of the genre.[17] His influence on the elegiac poets of late antiquity when elegy resurfaces is noted, but scholars have looked for how the influence of Ovidian elegy did not follow a clear-cut line of generic lineage but fragmented across different genres whose concerns could repurpose Ovid's elegy within their own genres, such as Martial's epigrams and Statius' *Silvae*, an example of occasional poetry.[18] Ovid's poetry as rich, mythological source material, also provided a basis for Ovidian reception such as by Seneca in his tragedies.[19] Another approach outside the bounds of generic lineage has been to break Ovid's corpus down into thematic segments, such as an erotic Ovid, or an exilic Ovid, whose influence can then be traced.[20]

Much progress has been made then in the study of Ovid's reception in antiquity since the time of Traube, as a recently published handbook, edited by Miller and Newlands, on Ovid's reception also attests.[21] Any handbook must by its nature necessarily be selective and the editors do not claim to present an exhaustive account of Ovid's reception.[22] However, the broad brushstrokes of the receptions focused on in the chapters concerning antiquity do plot a conventional path that reflects the authors and genres which have proven to be the most fertile in exploring potential areas of Ovidian

[16] For Lucan and Ovid see Esposito 1995, Saylor 1999, Tarrant 2002, Wheeler 2002; Statius and Ovid see Lovatt 2002, Feeney 2004, Davis 2006, Parkes 2009; Valerius Flaccus and Ovid see Murgatroyed 2008; and even for Silius Italicus and Ovid see Bruere 1958 and Wilson 2004.
[17] See Fantham 2001 and Rosati 2005 for Ovid and the end of elegy. I discuss Ovid and the death of elegy in Chapter Three.
[18] For Ovid and late antiquity see Tissol 2002, Roberts 2002, Wheeler 2004-5 and Fielding 2014. For scholarship on Ovid, Martial and Statius see Pitcher 1998, Geyssen 1999, Hinds 2007, McNelis 2009 and Rosati 2014.
[19] See especially Hinds 2011, and also Jakobi 1988, Tarrant 2002, Schiesaro 2002 and Trinacty 2007.
[20] For example, see Ingleheart 2011.
[21] Miller and Newlands 2014.
[22] See the Introduction (2014.1-7) for the parameters of the handbook and criteria for inclusions.

reception. The early chapters in the handbook move from consideration of Ovid's self-reception in his own poetry to Ovidian myths in Pompeii, before following a conventional line of subject matter from Martial and Statius as examples of occasional poetry, to imperial epic and Apuleius before the material jumps to late antiquity and beyond.[23] There remains a conspicuous gap, that this handbook illustrates well and that is also present in general scholarship, which concerns Ovid's immediate afterlife. It is this gap which I address in this dissertation.

In this project I set out to search for evidence of the earliest reception of Ovid beyond the seemingly lone critical voice of Seneca the Elder and beyond the most obvious lines of generic lineage which are not applicable in the early years after Ovid's death as there simply are no surviving examples of Ovid's genres in the strictest sense. In doing so, I approach the question of Ovid's early reception from a literary-historical perspective, looking for the most salient evidence, and not from the perspective of study of a particular genre. The Tiberian period and eras that immediately follow from Ovid's death in 17 AD are sparsely represented in general for literary output, and poetry in particular. However, there are a grouping of texts produced in these years that are engaging with Ovid's poetry, and which share a satirical basis. In this thesis I argue that these satirical authors are reading and engaging with Ovid in their own writings as an important predecessor for how to be satirical authors writing under restrictive, imperial circumstances and hence provide a coherent strand of early Ovidian reception.

---

[23] The first chapters by Myers and Knox cover Ovid's self-reception in the exile poetry and modeling reception in the *Metamorphoses* respectively. Knox sketches in the presence of Ovidian myths in Pompeii in Chapter Three. The texts under discussion then move to Flavian occasional poetry, imperial epic, and Apuleius, chapters 4-6 by Rosati, Keith and Harrison, respectively.

The three focal texts of this dissertation are Phaedrus' *Fables,* Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* and Persius' *Satires*. A necessary preliminary is to address my grouping of these three texts under the category satirical. To begin with the final author, Persius provides a straight-forward example of satire proper, by which I mean the poetic genre of Roman verse satire, derived from the Latin term *satura*.[24] Persius strongly engages with the generic line of succession, associating himself with his satiric predecessors, Lucilius and Horace, with whom Quintilian places Persuis along with Juvenal to make up the traditional trajectory of Roman satire.[25] Persius is the latest author chronologically under consideration in this dissertation and the only example of a satirist in the strictest sense of the word.[26] There are no earlier surviving or known examples of Roman satire between Ovid's death and Persius. As such satire proper is too narrow a term for this grouping of texts.

However, while the other two texts that stand between Ovid's death and Persius cannot be covered by the label satire, they each in their own way can be termed satirical, providing a coherent picture of Ovidian reception by satirical authors in this time period.[27] The *Apocolocyntosis* is generally considered Menippean satire, a term that is not unrelated to satire, as Quintilian suggests by alluding to an *alterum… satirae genus* (another type of satire, *Inst. Or.* 10.1.95), which he associates with Varro.[28] Menippean

---

[24] Much has been written on the genre of satire in general and the ancient tradition of verse satire. For ancient definitions see Van Rooy 1965.1-29 and Coffey 1989.3-10. Broader surveys of satire as a genre can be found in Kernan 1959, Griffin 1994 and Bogel 2004.

[25] Quintilian *Inst. Or.* 10.1.93.

[26] We know little of Persius' life besides a brief *Vita Persii* that has come down in the manuscripts. He is known to have died young in 62 AD, born in 34 AD. See Dinter 2012.

[27] Rosen 2007, especially pages 17-23, is particularly helpful in thinking about what is at stake in the different but related terms of "satire", "satirical" and "satirist".

[28] See Relihan 1993 for consideration of the genre of ancient Menippean satire, especially pages 3-38 for the origins, ancient and modern, of the term Menippean satire. See Weinbrot 2005 for an overview of Menippean satire from the ancient to the modern.

satire by its nature draws in any and all genres, poetry and prose, as the *Apocolyntosis* exemplifies, to provide a particular satirical take on the world. The *Apocolocyntosis* is a text that is firmly attached to a specific point in time, the death of Claudius in 54 AD. It stands outside the tradition of verse satire that Persius is part of, but in the text Seneca aims a satirical lens at the world of the gods and the machinery of imperial apotheosis at the tipping point of imperial succession, from Claudius to Nero. The *Apocolocyntosis* is an example of a satirical text that looks back to Ovid to negotiate the contemporary imperial circumstances.

The earliest text that I explore in this dissertation, Phaedrus' *Fables*, perhaps raises the most questions as to why his poetry should be categorized as satirical.[29] Even though the term satire proper cannot and should not be applied to the fables, the genre of fable has close generic affiliations with iambic poetry and satire, affiliations that Phaedrus deliberately draws upon to conceptualize his fabular project. Phaedrus takes advantage of the potential inherent in his choice of genre to closely connect his fables with the satirical, and hence provide a shared basis for the coherent strand of Ovidian, satirical reception that these three authors, as I argue in this dissertation, come together to provide. The strong connections between fable, iambic poetry and satire make it unsurprising that Phaedrus, as the first author of stand-alone poetic books of fables, could connect his fables back to such a tradition. Prior to Phaedrus fable rarely occurs as a form unto itself but sits within other genres, especially satire and iambic poetry.[30] Fables

---

[29] Even less is known of Phaedrus, dated to the Tiberian / Claudian period. As with each of these authors and texts I will address critical matters and scholarship particular to each in their respective chapters.

[30] Demetrius of Phalerum (ca. 350-280BC) most likely compiled the first collection of fables, but the exact nature of the collection is unclear. From his other literary pursuits it seems probable that he gathered together fables as a collection rather than writing fables for literary effect. As the only known collection of fables ascribed to Aesop prior to Phaedrus, Demetrius' collection is likely to have been available to

appear in the earliest Greek iambic poets, as well as being deployed by Callimachus in his *Iambi*.[31] Animal fable also has a substantial presence in the tradition of Roman satire, especially in Horace's *Satires.*[32] It is this lineage that is most significant in shaping Phaedrus' positioning of the fables within the constellation of literary genres. While the connections between Phaedrus' fabular project and fable deployed in the past as part of iambic poetry and satire are easy for us to see, we should also recognize Phaedrus' agency in capitalizing on the potential affinities between satire and fable, aligning his fabular project with satire. By comparing the approach of Babrius, another author of verse fables, with that of Phaedrus, Hawkins draws attention to the particularly satiric focus that Phaedrus brings to his fables that is lacking in Babrius.[33] Champlin also recognizes the primacy of Phaedrus' satirical leanings. He zeroes in on three specific aspects of Phaedrus' fables as satirical strategies, "the allegiance to Horace the satirist, the intrusion of the authorial persona, the resort to realism," to conclude that Phaedrus' goal was the "blending of the forms of popular fable and literary satire."[34]

We can push Champlin's conclusion further to consider why Phaedrus would embark upon writing fable with such a strong satirical perspective, as opposed to writing satire proper. While a definitive answer to such a question is unknowable, we should not underestimate Phaedrus' understanding of the possibilities that writing straight fable, as

---

Phaedrus as source material. In his first prologue Phaedrus refers to polishing the *materiam* of Aesop (1.prol.1-2). See Perry 1962 and Holzberg 2002a.22-25, 44.

[31] For fable in Greek literature see Van Dijk 1997. For fable in archaic Greek poets see Lasserre 1983, Correa 2007, Sampson 2012. For Callimachus and fable see Acosta-Hughes 2002.152-204.

[32] See Cozzoli 1995 for fable across the Roman satirists – Ennius, Lucilius and Horace; and Holzberg 2002a.31-35 for the connections between Roman satire and fable. For Horace's use of fable see Della Corte 1986, Sullivan 2007, Sondag 2011.

[33] Hawkins 2014.128-34: Hawkins concludes that Phaedrus brings a social awareness to his fables that is satiric as opposed to the focus on individual and personal transgressions that moves Babrius into the realm of iambic poetry.

[34] Champlin 2005.110: "Phaedrus wants himself to be taken seriously as a satirist".

opposed to satire itself, could offer him in the political and literary climate of the early imperial period. Writing animal fable, an ostensibly less serious, more homely genre than outspoken, aggressive satire, is a somewhat less precarious undertaking.[35] His foray into poetic animal fable, exploiting to the full its satirical potential, is in some ways an understandable trajectory for the genre of satire to follow, given the context of the contemporary political climate. Phaedrus may consciously cultivate and flirt with potential danger, but ultimately he has embedded himself within a comparatively safe genre.[36] In his fables Phaedrus mobilizes to the fullest degree the satirical and moralizing dynamics that lie latent within fable as a genre.

There are certainly other texts that could feasibly fall within the parameters of the study of Ovid's earliest reception, such as the examples of pseudepigrapha, Manilius' *Astronomica* or Petronius' *Satyricon*. But there are reasons why they are outside the bounds of this dissertation. While the pseudepigrapha and Manilius may fit chronologically, they are generically distinct from the category of satirical that joins Phaedrus, the *Apocolocyntosis* and Persius.[37] Any interaction with Ovid present in these works does not spring from the shared, satirical basis that is important for my focal authors. Petronius falls at the end of the time period I consider in this dissertation, the Neronian period proper. He does have satirical leanings. The *Satyricon* is categorized as Menippean satire by some, but its very uniqueness defies categorization and it is this

---

[35] Quintilian (*Inst.* 1.9.1-3) recommends fable as a genre fit for young children.

[36] I consider in greater detail Phaedrus' strategy of cultivating a sense of danger in relation to his writing and how Ovid plays a role in this aspect of Phaedrus' building of his authorial persona in Chapter One. Jennings 2009 explores this interplay between flirting with danger while also building in safety devices to protect his authorial culpability.

[37] For a recent approach to the pseudepigrapha see Peirano 2012. These types of "Ovidian" poems do enter my discussion of Persius and Ovid in Chapter Three. For scholarship on Manilius and his historical and literary context see Volk 2002 and 2009.

expansiveness of its genre and intertextual interactions that renders it an example of a different kind of Ovidian reception that does not fit in this dissertation.[38]

Unlike the three authors that are the focus of this dissertation Petronius has been studied to a greater degree in connection with his engagement with Ovid. There are a number of passages that scholars are widely alert to in which Ovid plays a part, often based on certain poems in the *Amores* or episodes from the *Metamorphoses* that contribute to the mechanics of the plot.[39] The consensus that emerges suggests that Petronius' engagement with Ovid has more in common with those such as Seneca in his tragedies who turn to Ovid for mythological material and later authors such as Statius and Martial for whom an amatory, elegiac Ovid is crucially important. This is different to the themes that are important to my three main authors and as such Petronius looks forward to later Ovidian reception rather than back to the satirical reception of Ovid under consideration in this dissertation.

Ovid's relevance for satirical authors may seem surprising given that Ovid did not write satire. One of Ovid's experiments in generic hybridity, a poem from the close of his poetic career, the *Ibis*, is a poem best described as elegiac invective, with its roots at least partially in iambic poetry.[40] But, rather than Ovid's relevance for satirical authors hinging on this one example of his poetry that touches most closely upon the generic categories of

[38] See Relihan 1993 for discussion of Petronius as Menippean satire. For broader discussion of categorization of Petronius and especially the connection to Apuleius and the genre of the ancient novel see Sullivan 1968, Walsh 1978, Schmeling 1996 and Christesen and Tolone 2002.

[39] For general accounts of Petronius in which Ovid appears see Sullivan 1968, Courtney 1991, Connors 1998, Courtney 2001. For Petronius' engagement with specific episodes of the *Metamorphoses* see Setaeioli 2010 and Mazzilli 2011. For Petronius and amatory Ovid see Rimell 2002, Mazzilli 2006, Schmeling and Setaioli 2011.471, Klein 2012, Antoniadis 2013.

[40] The *Ibis* was long underappreciated as a poem and is still a relative oddity. For early study of the *Ibis* see Williams 1996, although his final chapter tying the poem to Ovid's mental health in exile is a concerning psychological approach to the poem. For the *Ibis* and invective see Rosen 1988 and Masselli 2002. Williams 1992 and 2006 also tackle the *Ibis* and its contexts.

iambic poetry and satire, it is the presence of several important themes in Ovid that develop in significance across his corpus and lifetime, that overlap with the concerns of satirical authors writing under emperors. Ovid may seem to be an unlikely model for satirical authors but these themes made Ovid available in critical ways for the satirical authors under consideration. Each author engages with Ovid in their own particular ways, as I demonstrate in their respective chapters. However, two aspects of Ovid and his poetry in particular provide a shared basis for their Ovidian engagement that are worthwhile briefly focusing on here.

The first important quality of Ovid's poetry for satirical authors' concerns is his position at a literary and political juncture. While to a certain degree Ovid can be placed alongside Virgil, Horace, Tibullus and Propertius as an author of the "age of Augustus", increasingly scholars have placed emphasis on the degrees of difference within that act of periodization. Ovid has come to be viewed as a stand-alone figure in many respects, as much a precursor of the imperial authors who followed as a part of the poets who flourished under Augustus. Williams pinpointed the transitional nature of Ovid's position and his unique misfortune as "the first poet to fall a victim to the clash between Republican ideals and the imperial system".[41] Subsequently Hinds, Galinsky and Millar reoriented the way we approach Ovid and his position in literary and political history.[42] From these reorientations Ovid emerges distinct from the authors of the triumviral period of Augustan literature, those authors who were already established by 27 BC, to stand alone as perhaps the "most Augustan" poet of all.[43] Ovid is the first poet to address the

[41] Williams 1978.52.
[42] Hinds 1987b; Galinsky 1989; Millar 1993.
[43] Millar 1993.1; Galinsky 1989.71 labels the *Metamorphoses* as the "truest product of the Augustan age".

discourse of the imperial age, to process the interaction and relationship between poets, their poetry, and the increasingly heavy-handed imperial machinery. Ovid, as is well known, not only addressed the discourse in his poetry, but lived out the actuality of a clash between himself as poet and the imperial regime. With Ovid one cannot separate out life from poetry as the proximity of these two strands are closely bound up together. The contentious imperial setting of Ovid's life and poetry are an important aspect of Ovid's work that struck a chord with later satirical authors, who saw that such circumstances were in part shared in their own time periods, rendering Ovid a productive predecessor for them.

The second crucial aspect of Ovid's poetry for this project is the increasingly strong presence in his poetry of a characteristically satiric theme, namely freedom of speech. Concern surrounding the risks involved in free speech is a critical part of the genre of satire proper, based as it is on aggressive, threatening speech. The theme is present in the satires of Lucilius and Horace who came before Ovid, and subsequent satirists.[44] Such concerns are built into the genre of satire, part real and part satiric pose. Ovid may not have come to the theme of freedom of speech from the perspective of writing satire, but in his later poetry the theme is present, driven by and resonant with his imperial reality. The stakes of exercising free speech proved to be extraordinarily high for Ovid, living out the actuality of the risk involved. That this would be an important theme in his exile poetry may seem self-evident in light of the causes Ovid assigns to his exile,

[44] Freudenburg 2001.2-4 summarizes how the theme of freedom of speech runs through the generic line of satirists. See Braund 2004a for discussion of the tension between *libertas* and *licentia* which she places at the heart of Roman satire. Schlegel 2005 explores how Horace navigates satire's reputation as threatening speech. See Rosen 2012 for how the thematic concern of freedom of speech intensified in satire as political circumstances evolved from Republic to Principate to the imperial period proper. I discuss the importance of this theme for satire in greater detail in Chapter Three.

but Ovid was also greatly concerned with speech and the issues surrounding its deployment and restriction before exile, especially in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, as Denis Feeney's approach to the *Fasti* demonstrates.[45] The degree to which such concerns were present from conception and to what extent they were revised in exile is uncertain, but as we have them the theme of freedom of speech, the boundaries of what one can say in difficult circumstances and to powerful figures, and the consequences of violating such boundaries are essential aspects of the poems.

With the lens of free speech the *Ibis* as an elegiac poem of invective no longer seems separate from the rest of Ovid's poetry, but rather the culmination of these types of issues and concerns. In the *Ibis* Ovid undertakes veiled speech, explicitly problematizing what one can say openly and what one cannot.[46] The intensification of the theme of freedom of speech across Ovid's poetry provides the potential for Ovid to be a useful poetic predecessor for subsequent satirical authors, especially in the early imperial period when the connections between Ovid's circumstances and the authors' own were at their strongest. By drawing out these two aspects of his poetry and poetic standing we can see that Ovid provides a point of intersection at which two important issues for satirical authors of the early imperial period meet, the theme of freedom of speech and how to face the pressures of the imperial discourse. Each author in this dissertation engages with Ovid in their own particular ways but these aspects of Ovid provide the strong basis for why this grouping of satirical authors in the early imperial period was reading and looking to Ovid as an important predecessor for their own writings.

---

[45] Feeney 1992.

[46] Recent scholarship on the *Ibis* seeks to situate the poem in the context of themes present across Ovid's corpus, especially concerning the theme of the problematization of exercising free and open speech. See Schiesaro 2011, Krasne 2012 and Hawkins 2014.32-82.

As a study of Ovid's reception this dissertation is grounded in the concepts of allusion and intertextuality, well-established concepts central to the study of Latin literature.[47] There is a wide variety of ways in which an author can establish contact with another in a Latin text and engage with a predecessor in order to create meaning in their own texts. In contrast to traditional studies of verbal allusions I take a broad approach in my readings to allow for the different nuances and ways in which these authors are engaging with Ovid. While at times this includes close verbal allusions between the text under consideration and Ovid's text, or even explicit citation of an Ovidian poem as is the case in the *Apocolocyntosis*, most often the engagement with Ovid is more covert, falling into a range of categories and vocabulary for such interaction between authors, spanning allusions, correspondences, reminiscences, echoes, and imitations. Such connections between the authors and Ovid can be based on specific lines or phrases, key Ovidian vocabulary, or more broadly Ovidian characters, narratives and concepts to build up an Ovidian tone. By taking this broad approach, I show that in the case of each author the text gains significantly in meaning when the interaction with Ovid is recognized, both in relation to specific passages, and often in terms of the author's work as a whole. Because of this I am able to call these authors post-Ovidian, as authors writing not only after Ovid chronologically, but influenced by and oriented from the Ovidian texts that came before in varied and importants ways applicable to the particular author.

This dissertation has three chapters, each focused on a different author, following a chronological sequence. In Chapter One I focus on Phaedrus' *Fables* who makes no

[47] Hinds's 1998 monograph *Allusion and Intertext : dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry* is a foundational study of allusion and intertextuality that has been instrumental in shaping my approach. Other key studies of intertextuality and Latin literature include Ross 1975, Thomas 1986, Farrell 1991, Van Tress 2004.1-23.

explicit mention of or connection to Ovid. Instead Phaedrus is an author who engages carefully and indirectly, but unmistakably with Ovid. From initial close verbal allusion I argue that Phaedrus builds up an Ovidian tone around a particular animal in his fable, the deer, through Ovidian reminiscences and evoking Ovidian motifs. I also argue that Phaedrus builds an awareness of Ovid's exilic fate into his own poetic persona and presentation of powerful figures such as Augustus. In this way Phaedrus situates both the struggles of the animals in the world of the fable and poets writing under powerful regimes as post-Augustan and post-Ovidian. Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* is the focal text of Chapter Two. In this text Seneca explicitly cites Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, an openness in relation to Ovid that is not present in Phaedrus' *Fables*. The citation is the beginning of my readings but Seneca's engagement is not limited to the brief explicit mention of Ovid. Instead, I argue that Seneca engages both with the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* as prequels for the action of the *Apocolocyntosis* to consider what kind of sequel the *Apocolocyntosis* is. Seneca is able to make the complexities of imperial time and power apparent through subtle engagement with these two giants of Ovid's corpus. In the third chapter I explore Persius' engagement with Ovid in *Satire* 1. Persius does not cite Ovid explicitly, in contrast to openly referring to his satiric predecessors, but there is specific textual evidence at key moments that connects the satire to Ovid. In the chapter I argue that Persius engages with Ovid on two different levels. Persius provides a picture of contemporary poets who are trying hard to be like Ovid, but are failing to do it well, while also engaging himself with Ovid as a poet who had important insights about the difficulties of living and writing under empire that Persius makes applicable to his own situation as an imperial satirist. Across these three chapters and authors there emerges a

coherent strand of Ovidian reception, an Ovid whose poetry and life was useful to satirical authors to look to as a model to think about how to live and write under imperial power.

Chapter One: Ovidian Identity Crises in Phaedrus' *Fables*

On the surface it would be easy to set Phaedrus and his fables apart from Latin literary culture and accept as understandable his marginalization in the ancient world and his relative neglect in modern scholarship.[48] Nothing is known of the author himself outside of the few details one can pick up from the fables and his designation in the manuscript tradition as a freedman of the emperor Augustus, scant information that has nonetheless fuelled attempts to construct a full biography.[49] Phaedrus paints a picture in the fables of his close connections with the imperial environment, but he seems to have made little impact on his contemporaries and the ancient literary world. He appears to have been ignored by or unknown to authors such as Seneca and Quintilian, whose writings presented apposite occasions to discuss him as an author of fable. [50] Martial does make a fleeting reference to a Phaedrus, but it is only in the late antique fabulist, Avianus, that Phaedrus is firmly attested as an author of fables in Latin. [51] In general, his dating to the

[48] There was no book length study devoted to Phaedrus until Henderson in 2001. Notable scholarship on Phaedrus includes Currie 1984, Holzberg 1991b, Lamb 1995 (collected bibliography), Bloomer 1997, Blansdorf 2000, Oberg 2000 (commentary) Champlin 2005, and a spate of recent articles including Spahlinger 2008, Glauthier 2009, Jennings 2009, Libby 2010, Pieper 2010, the 2013 edition of *AU* devoted to Phaedrus. Phaedrus also enters into the remit of studies on the ancient fable: Nojgaard 1967, Adrados 1999-2003, Holzberg 2002a.

[49] Traditional biographies place Phaedrus in the time of Tiberius due to his designation in ms P as *Aug. lib.* and references in the fables themselves to Augustus, Tiberius and Sejanus (2.5.7; 3.*prol*.41; 3.10.39). See Della Corte 1939, de Lorenzi 1955, Duff 1960 and Currie 1984 who notes the difficulty of achieving sure interpretation from hints within the fables.

[50] Seneca *Ad Polyb.* 8.3: *fabellas quoque et Aesopeaos logos, intemptatum Romanis ingeniis opus*. Champlin (2005.101-2) uses this and a potential allusion to Phaedrus by the jurist Cassius Longus as evidence that Phaedrus' fables were not available before roughly AD 43 but were in circulation by 70 AD, moving Phaedrus' dates later to the era of Claudius and Nero. However, this does not account for the possibility that the earlier dating is correct but Seneca had not heard of Phaedrus or did not deign to mention him. Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* 1.9.1) advises that Aesopic fables should be part of the instruction of young children but also does not mention Phaedrus by name.

[51] Martial *Ep.* 3.20.5: *an aemulatur improbi iocos Phaedri?* It is questionable whether the designation *improbi* is likely to refer to Phaedrus the fabulist, or a different Phaedrus, perhaps a writer of mimes, as has been speculated. Avianus *Fables Praef: Phaedrus etiam partem aliquam quinque in libellos resoluit.* The reference to five books is taken as corroborating evidence for the overall structure of five books found in ms P.

regime of Tiberius places him in a fallow period in Latin literature as the traditional view of literary history portrays it. His choice to write animal fable in Latin verse was innovative, but it also left him outside the mainstream of Latin literary culture. All these circumstances provide grounds for minimizing Phaedrus' place in Latin literature and setting the fables apart from the web of intertextual connections at the core of Latin literary practice.

Yet, even though Phaedrus does not appear to be on the radar of his literary contemporaries in the ancient world, that does not mean that he was disengaged from the allusive habits of ancient literature. The first word of the opening prologue (*Aesopus,* 1 *prol.*1) sets out the lineage that Phaedrus understands himself to be writing in, namely animal fable in the manner of Aesop.[52] Phaedrus consciously engages with his Aesopic lineage, first developing and exploiting it and finally distancing himself as the five books of fable unfold.[53] But Aesopic fable is not the only predecessor with whom Phaedrus connects himself. Phaedrus creatively alludes to a range of poets, as scholars have explored, but Callimachus and Horace, as iambic poet and satirist respectively, stand out as predecessors of primary importance for Phaedrus' literary engagement and conception

[52] For the figure of Aesop and the traditions surrounding him see Lefkowitz 2009 and Kurke 2011.
[53] Our knowledge of the full structure and specifics of the original text of the fables is unavoidably limited. Our main source is ms. P, a 9th century codex that preserves a five-book structure but with disproportionate book lengths (Book 1 = 31 fables, 2 = 8, 3 = 19, 4 = 26 and 5 = 10). This is supplemented by a fifteenth century selection of fables collected together by Niccolo Perotti for his nephew, which comprises fables by Avianus, 32 fables known from Books 2-5 in the Mss P, and 32 other fables attributed to Phaedrus, now known as the Appendix Perottini (or *App.*). The original disposition of Perotti's fables in Phaedrus' 5 book structure is unknowable. There are also three collections of mediaeval prose paraphrases, some of fables known from P and the Appendix Perottini, and some additional fables unattested in other sources. See Henderson 1999 for discussion of the original corpus and textual history, and Holzberg 2002a.2-4, 39-40, 95-104. My readings are based primarily on fables within the five book structure attested in P. but I refer to fables from other sources for context as appropriate. I follow Perry 1965 for the text and note textual variants where necessary.

of his own poetic undertaking.[54] As I discussed in the Introduction, Phaedrus fully capitalizes on the satirical and moralizing dynamic of fable, strongly connecting himself with fables satiric connections.[55]

Yet, a satirical angle is not the only latent possibility in fable that Phaedrus builds upon. Ovid and the *Metamorphoses* are also potential predecessors with whom Phaedrus deliberately cultivates a connection for his own purposes of writing satirical fable in the early imperial period. In general, metamorphosis is a narrative possibility available to the fabulist, but even when the act of metamorphosis is absent from the narrative of a fable, metamorphosis and fable can still be understood as conceptually adjacent.[56] Both work to blur the boundaries between animal and human. Asker writes that “at the heart of the fable (metamorphic or other) lies impossible blendings (sic)”, that of the talking animal in particular.[57] Of course, the blending between human and animal that occurs in Phaedrus’ fables does not involve the drastic transformation that humans undergo in Ovid’s poem. However, both poets are clearly interested in mind-body dualism and the problems that arise from it, which is clear from the manner in which both exploit the relation between human and animals.

In Ovid outer form is often fluid, changing from human to animal, or vice versa, while inner consciousness frequently remains fixed. The Ovidian animal often thinks and

---

[54] Poets to whom Phadrus alludes include Homer, Ennius, Catullus and Virgil. For intertextual play in Phaedrus see Lamberti 1980, Massaro 1981, Hamm 2000, Gartner 2000, 2007a and 2007b, and Champlin 2005. For Phaedrus and the iambic tradition see Cavarzere 2001, for the role of Callimachus in the fables see Glauthier 2009, for the close relationship between Phaedrus and Horace see Galli 1983, Holzberg 1991a and especially Champlin 2005.109-110.

[55] See pages 7-9.

[56] In the introduction to a study of *Transformative Change in Western Thought* Gildenhard and Zissos 2013.1-87 bring together discussion of metamorphosis and Aesopic fable (51-54), as well as Ovidian metamorphosis (65-77). The overlaps in the concerns that the two types of text seek to explore and reflect upon are striking.

[57] Asker 2001.12.

behaves like the human it used to be, and it is the transitional moment of bodily change in conjunction with some degree of continuity from the previous form that Ovid is keen to explore.[58] In Phaedrus the animals appear to be firmly fixed in their bodies. There has been no moment of transitional change, no metamorphosis. Yet, Phaedrus' animals think as if they were humans, and at times these human-minded animals have difficulty interacting with the world around them in the instinctive manner we would expect of creatures who are, and have always been, in the same animal form.[59] At such moments, the animals in Phaedrus' fables seem to have mind-body problems not unlike those found in Ovid, but without the obvious explanation of having just undergone a drastic metamorphosis. Interest in a dichotomy between continuity in the mind in tandem with transformation of the body does not account for everything involved in Ovid's depiction and exploration of metamorphosis. Such an explanation would necessarily be as kaleidoscopic as the poem itself. But it is an important strand that recurs in the stories of a number of his most memorable metamorphic characters.

It is the stories of these characters and this strand of Ovid's exploration of metamorphosis that are the starting point of my readings of Phaedrus' fables and exploration of how Phaedrus engages with Ovid to reflect upon his circumstances of writing satirical fable in the early imperial period. I begin with close readings of two

---

[58] For ideas surrounding continuity amidst metamorphic change see Niklas 2002.11-12 and Ferzoco and Gill 2005.1-2 and Skulsky 1981, especially 30. Thumiger 2014.403-405 notes that Ovid played a crucial role "in establishing a new pattern of metamorphosis, in line with the Hellenistic taste for catalogues, but with much closer attention to the psychology of transformation and to the paradox of a new nature into which a former identity is inserted".

[59] See Lefkowitz 2014 for discussion of animals in Aesopic fable. Lefkowitz stresses the hybridity of Aesopic animals in that in endowing them with speech the animals are granted human faculty but they also retain the appearance and behavior etc of animals. While this tension is present across fables I will argue that Phaedrus exploits this tension with relation to the deer in order to position the deer as a "post-metamorphic" animal.

fables, 2.8 and 1.12, in which a particular animal, a deer, struggles with interpreting correctly, and hence surviving in, his physical world. Through these two fables I argue that Phaedrus builds up an Ovidian tone around this particular animal and his interactions with the world around him, creating connections between the metamorphic world and that of the fable. In Section Two I deepen my reading of one element that is crucial in both fables with respect to Ovid's poetry, namely the presence of horns, before broadening the scope of my reading of the appearance of horns in the fables. The potential for political readings of the fables is well-established.[60] In building up the Ovidian reminiscences and resonances around the figure of the deer, the motif of viewing in water and that of horns, I argue, Phaedrus adds another layer to his commentary on the reality of living in a post-Augustan, imperial world, one that can only be uncovered from the vantage point of Ovid's poetry. Phaedrus situates himself as a post-Ovidian poet and the world of the fables as a post-*Metamorphoses* reality in which the deer, and other animals, struggle to adapt and to survive. Finally in Section Three I consider how Phaedrus engages with Ovid's exilic fate for his own self-presentation as poet writing under an imperial power and to shape his portrayal of the figure of Augustus.

Section One: Ovidian Deer in Phaedrus' Fables

Deer are the main protagonists in two fables in Phaedrus, 2.8 and 1.12. In both fables the deer exhibit confusion surrounding their identity and place in the world, a confusion akin to that of Ovid's metamorphic creatures, but without having undergone the disorientating process of metamorphosis. This misunderstanding of self brings fatal

[60] See Bloomer 1997 for readings of the fables in connection with Phaedrus' social and cultural world, in particular in relation to freedmen. Henderson 2001 brings together readings of the most overtly contemporary and political fables. Lefkowitz 2014.18-20 comments on how Phaedrus' interest in anxieties relating to social position in Imperial Rome play out through "sociopolitical animals".

consequences when the deer come into contact with humans. Phaedrus develops the potential for a relationship between his deer and Ovid’s metamorphic creatures by building up verbal connections and motifs shared between Ovid’s stories of humans undergoing drastic transformations and the situations faced by his deer. The deers’ struggles to understand their nature in relation to their fabular world can then be read as the failure to undergo a transition, either of individual personal maturation, or to adjust to the transition of the world around them, because they are unable to harmonize their idea of self with the social hierarchy and (political) reality they must live in.

1.1 Fable 2.8: Home or the Wild?

cervus nemorosis excitatus latibulis,
ut venatorum effugeret instantem necem,
caeco timore proximam villam petit,
et opportuno se bovili condidit.
hic bos latenti 'quidnam voluisti tibi, 5
infelix, ultro qui ad necem cucurreris,
hominumque tecto spiritum commiseris?”
at ille supplex 'vos modo' inquit 'parcite:
occasione rursus erumpam data'.
spatium diei noctis excipiunt vices;
frondem bubulcus adfert, nil adeo videt: 10
eunt subinde et redeunt omnes rustici,
nemo animadvertit: transit etiam vilicus,
nec ille quicquam sentit. tum gaudens ferus
bubus quietis agere coepit gratias,
hospitium adverso quod praestiterint tempore. 15
respondit unus 'salvum te volumus quidem,
sed, ille qui oculos centum habet si venerit,
magno in periclo vita vertetur tua'.
haec inter ipse dominus a cena redit;
et, quia corruptos viderat nuper boves, 20
accedit ad praesaepe: 'cur frondis parum est?
stramenta desunt. tollere haec aranea
quantum est laboris?' dum scrutatur singula,
cervi quoque alta conspicatur cornua;
quem convocata iubet occidi familia, 25
praedamque tollit. haec significat fabula

dominum videre plurimum in rebus suis.

A stag, having been startled from his hiding-place in the woods, in order to avoid impending death at the hands of hunters, in blind fear sought out the nearest farm-house, and hid himself in a cow-stall close at hand. Here a cow said to him, as he concealed himself: "What on earth were you thinking of, (5) unhappy one, thus of your own accord to have rushed to your death, and trusted your life to the domain of men?" But the stag supplicated him, saying, "Only spare me and as soon as an opportunity presents itself I shall dash out again." The day lengthened and gave way to night in turn. A cowherd came bringing green boughs, but he saw nothing. (10) All the farmhands came and went from time to time and no-one noticed anything; the overseer also passed by and he too failed to perceive anything. Joyfully then the wild animal began to express his thanks to the cattle, who had remained quiet and given him hospitality in time of trouble. (15) One of them replied "Indeed we wish you well, but if he who has a hundred eyes comes here your life will be in great danger." Meanwhile the master himself returned from dinner; and since he had noticed of late that the cattle were in poor condition, (20) he went up to the manger. "Why isn't there enough fodder here?" he says. "You're short of bedding. How much trouble would it be to remove these spiders' webs? As he probes each little thing in turn, he catches sight of the stag's lofty horns; then having called together his servants, he orders the stag to be killed and (25) carries off the spoil. The point of this fable is that the master's eye sees more than any other where his own interest is at stake.[61]

In Fable 2.8 a stag chooses to seek refuge from hunters in the cattle-stall of a nearby farmhouse, entrusting his safety to the domestic sphere instead of to the wild.[62] At first this choice proves successful as various farm workers fail to notice the deer among the cattle. But the farmer, who is called the *dominus* (20), is more astute and, noticing the horns of the stag amongst the cattle, orders the stag killed.[63] He views the stag's body as *praedam* (27 spoils), the outcome which the stag feared when he was in the woods (1-3).

---

[61] Translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

[62] Fable 2.8 is one of 68 Phaedrian fables that have no parallel in the Aesopic tradition. See Hausrath 1936.72. Certainly some of the 68 "original" fables could have previously been told but are not attested in the surviving Aesopic material. However, certain of these fables have historical details that suggest conclusively that Phaedrus was inventing new fables (such as 2.5, 3.10, 5.7) and it is likely that even in fables where there is no definitive need for the fable to be connected specifically to Phaedrus and his time period, Phaedrus was creating new fables. See Holzberg 2002a.44-46.

[63] I use the term "horns" throughout as opposed to the idiomatic English "antlers" to render the Latin, *cornu*. Phaedrus uses the Latin, *cornu,* in relation to deer as well as for other horns in the fable. I use the same English term "horns" for all instances as it is important that *cornua* appear on the heads of other animals in the world of the fable.

Phaedrus quickly wraps up the fable with the explicit lesson that the master is the most eagle-eyed when it comes to his own affairs. This pithy lesson seems easy to grasp, but Ovidian characters lurk beneath the figures in the fable, adding depth to the predicament of the deer and his fate. In the world of the *Metamorphoses* the most prominent *cervus* and *bos* who distinguish themselves as individual personalities outside of their respective herds are Actaeon and Io.[64] Resonances of both these Ovidian animals are present in relation to the two types of animals in this fable, the deer and the cattle.

The fable opens with the dichotomy between secluded places in the woods (*nemorosis…latibulis,* 1) and a nearby farmstead (*proximam villam,* 3). In his blind fear (*caeco timore,* 3) the *cervus* makes a choice between these two environments, deeming the domestic, human environment to be safer. This appears to be an odd choice for a deer. In the Roman understanding of deer, the animal's prime characteristic is fearfulness and propensity to flight, which ensures their survival in the wild.[65] On this basis, the instinctive action of the deer should be to trust in his running to escape the hunter. However, the deer also seems to be an animal whose place in the world is fraught with confusion in the Roman literary imagination. Literary deer, such as Silvia's stag in the *Aeneid* and Cyparissus' stag in the *Metamorphoses,* both cross the divide from the wild into the human, becoming domesticated. But such boundary crossing is not

---

[64] Io episode: *Met.* 1.568-750; Actaeon episode: *Met.* 3.131-252. There are of course other stags and cattle in the poem, but these consist mostly of herds (for example, Mercury stealing Apollo's cattle 2.685ff), rather than individual characters.

[65] In defining animals by specific characteristics, Lucretius repeatedly associates deer with not only speed in running, but also their fearfulness and tendency to flee (*DRN* 3.301, 742-3; 5.863). The reference to deer in Book 5 appears in a discussion of wild versus domesticated animals (5.855-77). The potential utility of certain animals for humans means animals such as dogs and cattle were protected by humans and became domesticated. Wild animals offer no such utility and must survive by other means. Some survive by aggression such as lions, while the survival strategy of deer is flight, driven by fear. Pliny (*NH* 8.113) also marks out deer by their tendency to flee.

unproblematic, because it brings with it fatal consequences for the animal and the humans associated with it.[66] Phaedrus' deer fits well within this tradition, being a deer who enters the domestic sphere with dire consequences.

Yet animals in fables, and therefore Phaedrus' deer, occupy an especially peculiar position with regard to their status as literary versus real animals. Lefkowitz argues that, even though animals in fable have rarely been studied *qua* animals, there is a tension in fable between the anthropomorphism of the animals and their nature as real animals.[67] In the world of Phaedrus' fables animals are anthropomorphized, but they are also aware of the stereotypes associated with the innate nature at least of other animals. For example, in Fable 1.16 a sheep understands the nature of the deer as one who flees with a fast pace.[68] It is precisely this tension between what the typical deer ought to do instinctively and the quasi-rational behavior that the humanized deer in the fable exhibit that Phaedrus is able to make productive. In this respect, Phaedrus goes well beyond Vergil's and Ovid's treatments of Silvia's and Cyparissus' pet stags, whose domestication is enacted upon them by humans. He makes this tension, between instinctive and "rational," or animal and "human" behavior, productive specifically in relation to Ovidian metamorphic creatures such as Actaeon. Having been transformed from human to deer, Ovid's Actaeon is an active participant in the dilemma between wild and domestic, just like Phaedrus'

---

[66] Virgil *Aen.* 7.479-502; Ovid *Met.* 10.106-42. Both of these deer cross the divide from the wild and enter the domestic sphere. They are treated as pets, becoming accustomed to people (*Met.* 10.117 *metu vacuus naturalique pavore*) and allowing them to decorate their antlers and neck with jewelry (*Aen.* 7.488; *Met.* 10.112-13, 123). This blurring of wild and domestic seems to be a prelude to disaster for the animals and humans involved. In the *Aeneid* the killing of Silvia's stag by Ascanius is the catalyst for war between the Latins and the Trojans. In the *Metamorphoses* Cyparissus accidentally kills the stag, and in grieving immoderately is transformed into the cyparissus tree. See Vance 1981 for discussion of Silvia's stag.

[67] Lefkowitz 2014.7.

[68] Fable 1.16.5-6. The sheep refuses to loan wheat to the deer with a wolf as surety because it is the nature of the world to plunder and leave and the nature of the deer to flee with a fast pace.

deer; and the reader is given a glimpse into Actaeon's justifiably disorientated thought process.

Actaeon faces the same choice as Phaedrus' deer, with similar emotions, at the very moment of his transformation from human to animal (*Met.* 3.204-5):

quid faciat? repetatne domum et regalia tecta,
an lateat silvis? pudor hoc, timor impedit illud.

What should he do? Should he return to his home and the royal palace or hide in the woods? Shame prevents this one, fear that one.

For a newly transformed deer, confronting a choice between these two options is understandable. Fleeing to the woods to hide may befit his new form, but for the human part of himself that is still intact, his mind, the domestic sphere is still his home. The opposite should be true for Phaedrus' stag, who does not face the complicating circumstances of confusion following metamorphosis and should instinctively fear the human world; and yet he imagines himself as having the same choice as Actaeon. In the case of Actaeon and Phaedrus' deer, then, the reader is given an insight into the mind of the deer and his perception that he has a choice to make between the wild and domestic.

Phaedrus' stag appears to be one step ahead of Actaeon in that he reaches safety in the domestic setting, while Actaeon's hesitation between his two options brings about his gory fate at the mouths of his own hunting dogs. However, the cattle who belong in the domestic environment are aghast that a *cervus* would entrust his life to a place inhabited by humans.[69] This challenge from the cattle provides an opportunity to deepen

[69] 2.8.7 *hominumque tecto spiritum commiseris?* Lucretius (*DRN* 5.864-70) remarks on how cattle are one of the species, along with dogs and sheep who are afforded the protection of humans because of the services they offer. This is in contrast to deer as I discussed in Footnote 23. An interesting comparandum to consider in light of the Ovidian connections centered here on Actaeon in this scene is Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. In the course of his adventures the protagonist of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* is

the connection between Phaedrus' deer and Actaeon by aligning the reactions of the two stags when challenged by other animals. After the cattle question him, the *cervus* asks that they spare him. He is described at this point as a suppliant (*at ille supplex,* 8). The description of a stag in such human terms as these is striking, but it also evokes Actaeon's equally piteous plea.[70] As the hunting dogs surround Actaeon, he takes the only action available to his human mind, despite his animal form (*Met.* 3.240-1):

et genibus pronis supplex similisque roganti
circumfert tacitos tamquam sua bracchia vultus.

And on his knees, as a suppliant, akin to one begging, he turns his wordless face from side to side as if stretching out his arms.

Both animals employ the human act of supplication, and are described as suppliants in the text. A connection between the two deer, one freshly transformed, the other born a deer, but both thinking like humans, has been established.

In light of an animal acting as *supplex*, we must allow for resonances of Ovid's Io in relation to these cattle. Like Actaeon, Io also acts as a *supplex* while in her bovine form, and the ineffectual nature of this ac is similarly stressed (*Met.* 1.635-36):

illa etiam supplex Argo cum bracchia vellet
tendere, non habuit quae bracchia tenderet Argo…

---

transformed into an ass, the Ovidian intertextuality of which has already been explored (see Bandini 1986, Magnani 2003, Mazzoli 2007 and Harrison 2014.90-93). When Lucius as ass first enters the stables he expects to be welcomed by his fellow animals but instead is rudely abused by them in order to protect their own space (Apul. *Met.* 3.26). Given that Ovid's Actaeon also plays an important role in Lucius' journey (see Barchiesi and Hardie 2010-70.72 and Harrison 2014.95-97) it would be worth exploring how the Ovidian connections here in Phaedrus concerning how animals who think like humans interact with other animals in the bounded space of domesticated animals could shed light on additional Ovidian strands in the similar scene in Apuleius.

[70] Silvia's stag is also depicted in piteously human terms as one begging for help, but specifically in relation to the groaning of the animal: *questuque cruentus / atque imploranti similis tectum omne replebat* (*Aen.* 7.501-2).

When she would wish to stretch out her arms to Argus in supplication, she had no arms with which she could reach out to Argus…

Her instinct is to extend her arms as part of the act of supplication, but this illustrates the disjunction between her human instinct to supplicate and her animal body lacks the limbs to fulfill her instinct. Yet, there is a stronger link in this fable between the herd of cattle and the story of Io, a link which brings in the crucial figure of authority, the *dominus*, whose special status and abilities cause the death of the deer. The spectre of the *dominus* is introduced into the fable by a peculiarly oblique description of him by the cattle. The cattle warn the deer that he may be safe for the moment, but his life will be in danger if the one with a hundred eyes should come.[71] This description of their master is puzzling in its unnecessarily circuitous form, which is clearly hyperbolic and otherwise divorced from reality. The *dominus* obviously does not have one hundred eyes.

However, the riddling description can be solved when the resonances to Actaeon and Io in the fable are borne in mind. A creature who is known for his hundred eyes is Argus, the guard who watched over Io when she was in the form of a cow. It is precisely this feature of Argus, his hundred eyes, which is marked in Ovid's telling of the story.[72] While in the *Metamorphoses* Argus is slain by Mercury and Io is eventually returned to her human form, in Phaedrus' fable the opposite is the case, and it is the Argus-like quality of the *dominus* which assures the different outcome. Various other farm workers have passed through the stables and failed to notice the presence of the deer among the cattle.[73] These humans clearly stand in a higher position than the animals in the hierarchy

---

[71] 2.8.18-19: *sed ille qui oculos centum habet, si venerit, / magno in periclo vita vertetur tua* 18-19.
[72] *Met.* 1.625: *centum luminibus cinctum caput Argus habebat.*
[73] 2.8.10 *bubulcus…nil adeo videt*; 11-12 *rustici…nemo animadvertit*; 12-13 *vilicus / nec ille quicquam sentit.*

of the fable, yet they fail to perceive what is in front of them.[74] This is in clear contrast to the *dominus* who quickly notices the horns of the stag among his cattle.[75] I will consider the significance of the horns as the point of revelation more fully in Section Two, but for now it is this superiority of the single figure of the *dominus* from whose eyes there is no escape for the animals in this fable, to which we should pay attention. His superior position is then cemented as he exhibits how the animals are subject to his control, wielding the power of life or death over them, and deciding upon death for the deer, which his retinue then executes.

The triad of Actaeon, Io and Argus in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* inform the representation of the deer, cattle, and farmer whom Phaedrus is writing in Fable 2.8. Phaedrus' animals are not, of course, carbon copies of their predecessors from Ovid's poetry. But specific allusions within a broadly similar situation unquestionably bring to mind Ovid's characters. Once these similarities are noticed, the differences between Phaedrus's story and its Ovidian antecedents serve to underline the changed nature of Phaedrus' fabular world in comparison to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The deer's confusion about where he belongs places him within the control of the *dominus* leading to his death. To draw out the full potential of Phaedrus' engagement with Ovid in this fable, we should turn to another fable which features a deer who is fundamentally and fatally confused about his self and identity and which has Ovidian overtones.

1.2 Fable 1.12: Mirror, Mirror

[74] Oberg 2000.109 and Nojgaard 1967.41 comment on the social hierarchy set up in the fable from the animals as the lowest tier to the intermediate level of the other humans with the master at the top. The various farmhands are referred to as *familia* (26) which Phaedrus uses elsewhere to set up power structures of social dynamics between humans, master and servants (c.f. fables 3.19, 4.23).

[75] 2.8.24-25: *dum scrutatur singula, / cervi quoque alta conspicatur cornua.*

laudatis utiliora quae contempseris,
saepe inveniri testis haec narratio est.
ad fontem cervus, cum bibisset, restitit,
et in liquore vidit effigiem suam.
ibi dum ramosa mirans laudat cornua 5
crurumque nimiam tenuitatem vituperat,
venantum subito vocibus conterritus,
per campum fugere coepit, et cursu levi
canes elusit. silva tum excepit ferum;
in qua retentis inpeditus cornibus 10
lacerari coepit morsibus saevis canum.
tum moriens edidisse vocem hanc dicitur:
'O me infelicem, qui nunc demum intellego,
utilia mihi quam fuerint quae despexeram,
et, quae laudaram, quantum luctus habuerint'. 15

A thing disdained is often found in practice to be more valuable than one praised, as this story shows. A stag at a spring, after he had drunk, stood still and looked at his image in the water. While he stood there praising in admiration his branching horns (5) and disparaging his too slender legs, he was suddenly alarmed by the shouting of hunters and began to flee across the plain, and he eluded the dogs with his swift course. Then the wild beast entered the forest, in which, being entangled and caught by his horns, (10) he began to be torn apart by the cruel teeth of the dogs. While dying he is said to have uttered these words: “O unhappy me, that now too late I understand how useful to me were the things that I despised, and what sorrow those I praised have brought me.

In Fable 1.12 a stag, upon viewing his reflection in a fountain becomes greatly enamored of his horns, but critical of his spindly legs He is disturbed during these reflections by the arrival of some hunters with their dogs, so that he must flee. At first he is able to outrun the hunting party, but when he enters a wood, he is trapped by his horns and caught by the dogs. Before dying he realizes his folly in praising his horns, to the detriment of his legs.[76] One common element to bear in mind between this fable and 2.8

[76] Babrius 43 tells the same story, which suggests that the raw material for this fable was part of the Aesopic tradition. The differences between Phaedrus’ and Babrius’ versions, however, are instructive. In Babrius the lesson of the fable concerns excessive pride. The beauty of the deer’s horns is authorized by the text of the fable before the deer perceives them as such (43.43.1-2). While in Phaedrus the focus is on the deer’s perception of his attributes and inner understanding of self, in Babrius it is the external event which renders the deer’s pride excessive (43.16-19). Another difference concerns the capture of the deer. In Babrius the deer is also pursued by hunters and hunting dogs, but the deer is simply caught in the trees without elaboration, (43.11-12) as opposed to the hunting dogs catching the deer in Phaedrus. These points

is the importance of the deer's horns in their downfall. In both fables the horns are singled out for their distinguishing quality. In 2.8 the horns are described as high (*alta…cornua,* 25). They are the reason why the farmer is able to discern the presence of a different kind of animal among his cattle. The deer cannot blend into the crowd. Here in 1.12 the deer himself admires his branching horns (5) but it is this very quality that leads to his death when the horns become entangled in the wood (10). The deer cannot easily pass through this environment to reach safety, but is caught out by his horns.

In contrast to Fable 2.8 I do not argue that there are verbal allusions to Ovid's characters in this fable. However, I do contend that there are several significant Ovidian intertexts, whose importance hinges in part on the fact that one key ingredient of the story is strongly reminiscent of a recurring Ovidian motif. When Phaedrus' *cervus* views his image in water, he is struck by the appearance of his horns. Several of Ovid's characters also see their image in water, often following a metamorphosis; and in such cases their horns are a prominent feature of their changed appearance and so a focal point of their attention. This motif in Ovid also frequently results in some kind of confusion or misunderstanding over one's own self and identity. Viewing one's own image, and subsequent misunderstanding of self are frequently intertwined in the metamorphic world. Io is a good illustration of this.

When Io sees herself in the stream by which she was accustomed to play as a girl she is forcefully confronted with the changes wrought on her body, in particular the

---

of difference suggest that even thought the raw material of the fable is part of the Aesopic tradition, there was still space for Phaedrus to mold the fable according to his own agenda which I suggest concerns Ovid and metamorphic motifs and animal behavior.

presence of her horns.[77] Upon viewing her own image, Io still fails to make sense of her new form. Terrified, she flees from her own image.[78] The viewing of her horns in water becomes a marker for the disjunction between Io's physical reality, which she sees in her reflection in the water, and what she believes about her own physical form and personal identity in her mind. Io is unable to bridge that gap between her mental understanding of herself and the physical reality of her body. Her *cornua* are alien to her, hence she flees from her image, and yet they are also now a part of her.

Actaeon also experiences this moment of disjunction between his physical form and his personal identity upon viewing his horns in water.[79] Ovid paints the extreme difficulty of the situation in an especially evocative passage (3.200-203):

ut vero vultus et cornua vidit in unda,
me miserum dicturus erat: vox nulla secuta est
ingemuit: vox illa fuit, lacrimaeque per ora
non sua fluxerunt: mens tantum pristina mansit

But when he sees his head and horns in the water, he tries to say "wretched me!": no voice follows. He groans: that is his voice, and tears run down his face, not his own: only his mind remains unchanged.

There is a strong insistence on the disconnection between Actaeon's inner mind, which stays the same, and his changed physical form. The story of Actaeon as a whole is also a significant intertext.[80] The arc of the story in 1.12 follows a similar trajectory to that of Actaeon. Both deer view themselves in water, are subsequently chased by hunters and suffer death at the mouths of the chasing dogs.[81] It is true of course that Phaedrus' *cervus*

[77] *Met.* 1.640-41: *novaque ut conspexit in unda / cornua.*
[78] *Met.* 1.641: *pertimuit seque exsternata refugit*.
[79] See Salzman-Mitchell 2005.51 for the parallel experience sof Io and Actaeon.
[80] Noted by Oberg 2000.63.
[81] Ovid *Met.* 3.138-252.

does not react with horror to the sight of his horns, as his Ovidian counterparts frequently do. In fact, he is full of admiration for them. However, the misunderstanding of self, which stems from viewing his horns in water, is no less present. The *cervus* here may delight in his horns, but that delight demonstrates his lack of understanding about his fundamental nature. While he praises his horns, and denigrates his legs, in reality it is his horns that will cause him problems and his legs that are the key to his survival.[82] This motif of viewing oneself in water, focus on horns, and misunderstanding of self thus connect Phaedrus' *cervus* with Io and other Ovidian creatures who undergo a similar process.

Here we may turn to a third Ovidian intertext, the story of Narcissus, through which we are able to contextualize and consider the significance of the admiration the *cervus* feels towards the image of himself.[83] The foolish, misguided pride that Phaedrus' stag feels towards his mirror image is his point of contact with Narcissus. Narcissus views his mirror image as an entity separate from himself, and he falls in love with this separate being which is in fact himself, and this (self-)infatuation leads to his destruction.[84] The deer's folly is similar in that he mistakenly takes pride in one part of his appearance, the horns, due to their pleasing appearance, without taking into account their utility, or their lack of it. This misplaced admiration leads to his undoing. There are

[82] As I mentioned in Footnote 68 other animals in the world of the fable are able to recognize the essential characteristics of the deer, such as the sheep in Fable 1.16. The fact that other animals can understand the nature of the deer underlines the lack of understanding of his own nature and self which the *cervus* demonstrates upon viewing himself in the water.

[83] Studies of Narcissus are numerous, privileging different elements of the story. Treatments of the classical myth and Ovid's version include: Brenkman 1976, Borghini 1978, DiSalvo 1980, Rosati 1983, Hardie 1988 (philosophical background to Ovid's version), Nouvet 1991, Elsner 1996.

[84] Ovid *Met.* 3.402-510. Narcissus drinks from the fountain and is seized by the image of his reflected form: *dumque bibit, visae correptus imagine formae* 416; his reaction is one of astonishment at his appearance: *adstupet ipse sibi vultuque immotus eodem / haeret* 418-19); upon realizing the truth, Narcissus cannot bear it and finally nothing remains of him except flowers beside the water (486-90, 509-10).

several aspects of the connection between Narcissus' love for himself and the deer's admiration of his horns that can be expanded upon. Firstly, in admiring a part of himself, the deer is in effect imitating Narcissus's behavior. Ovid's Narcissus has already fallen in love with his own reflection, providing a model for Phaedrus' deer. By reacting to the image of himself in this manner, the reflection of the deer in the water provides a window through to Narcissus, to the world of the *Metamorphoses*. The deer is falling in love with himself as Narcissus, with being (intertextually) akin to Narcissus. By this connection Phaedrus sets up a metaliterary commentary on the intertextual connections he is making between the deer in his fable and an Ovidian, metamorphic creature, such as Narcissus.[85] The deer is only partly like Narcissus, as he has not undergone, nor will he undergo any kind of metamorphosis; but in falling in love with a part of himself to his own detriment, the deer is connected to the metamorphic consciousness.

Viewing the fable and the deer's behavior through the Ovidian intertext of Narcissus also greatly illuminates the issues of self and identity that are at the heart of the fable. Narcissus' tale has attracted substantial attention as being particularly emblematic of the themes of looking at and knowing oneself.[86] Bartsch sets Ovid's Narcissus within the context of her study of mirrors as a locus for the discourse of self-knowledge in the early Empire. She surveys different versions of the Narcissus myth to conclude that "in Ovid alone, the story of Narcissus has been transformed into a story of *coming to know*

---

[85] The story of Narcissus is especially apt as a vehicle for commenting on intertextual connections as Ovid saturates his version of the story with intertextual nods. See Hinds 1998.5-8. I discuss Narcissus and Echo and the hyper intertextual nature of Ovid's version of their story in Chapter Three on pages 141-3.

[86] Narcissus has frequently been studied with a focus on subjectivity and psychological readings. For example, see Pellizer 1988; Nicaise 1991, Milowicki 1996, and Tomkins 2011. Lacan is especially important as I will discuss shortly.

the self, of moving from the naïve Narcissus to the knowing Narcissus."[87] Bartsch also briefly connects Narcissus' moment of "specular recognition" to a different fable in Phaedrus, 3.8, in which a young boy delights in his appearance upon viewing himself in a mirror, lording it over his unattractive sister, who complains to their father.[88] Their father, in loving them both, urges them to each use the mirror daily to guard against their faults.[89] In this case the effect of the mirror-image pulls in two different directions. The conclusion of the fable is that the mirror can be used as a positive force, with daily contemplation of their reflections helping the two children on their path to being ethical adults.[90] Initially, however, the lure of the mirror-image has a negative effect on the boy, and it is only the intervention of an authority figure, the *paterfamilias*, that is able to redirect the boy's focus. The actual image looking back at the boy will remain the same, but the father seeks to reframe the boy's approach to his image, and hence to his own self. The intergenerational relationship between father and children in this fable also sets this within the context of maturing from child to adult as a natural stage of development. Narcissus and the deer both lack this outside figure of familial and community authority to redirect their misconceptions of their mirror images and reframe their understanding of

---

[87] Bartsch 2006.84-96, quoted from 86-87. Bömer 1969 and Manuwald 1975 also credit Ovid with reshaping the Narcissus story.

[88] Bartsch 2006.20 and 88.

[89] 3.8.14-16: "*cotidie", inquit, "speculo vos uti volo, / tu formam ne corrumpas nequitiae malis, / tu faciem ut istam moribus vincas bonis."* A third fable in Phaedrus should also be noted, 1.4, in which a dog sees his reflection in the river when carrying a piece of meat. The dog thinks that it is another dog carrying a prize and drops his own meat in order to snatch the food from his reflection, losing his own food in the process. The dog does separate himself from his reflection, making his image into a separate object as opposed to subject, a la Narcissus, but the consequences are not fatal. . Phaedrus makes the moral of the fable revolve around greed (*aviditas* 5). Oberg (2000.49) notes that Phaedrus is not concerned with the mysterious effects of a mirror image here, but with uncontrolled greed which leads to self-deception. This fable, together with 3.8 and 1.12, mobilizes a piece of the Narcissus myth, the misunderstanding of one's own mirror image as separate object.

[90] This fable also connects more broadly with the tradition in ancient literature of the mirror as a source of moral improvement such as Seneca's suggestion that the *De clementia* might serve as a mirror for the young Nero (*Clem.* 1.1-2). Apuleius (*Apol.* 15.1) also reports that Socrates gave similar advice that a mirror is useful for the ethical edification of both the handsome and the more homely.

self in relation to the wider world, but their stories could also be set within the context of the young progressing through a natural stage of development, one which in their cases they fail to pass through successfully.[91]

Lacan and his ideas concerning the "mirror-stage" of human development are a constructive, and necessary, tool to bring in at this point. Bartsch explicitly sets Lacan outside the remit of her study of mirrors and self-knowledge, but the invitation that Narcissus presents to read his story with a Lacanian perspective has been taken up by a number of scholars.[92] In thinking about the emergence of human subjectivity, Lacan identified the "mirror-stage" as a crucial point in an infant's development.[93] He theorizes that an infant becomes a subject by confronting an image of itself in the mirror, perceiving the image as whole but also as other. The infant is fascinated with its own image, making it an object of desire. This process is also one of misrecognition, perception of self through a specular illusion and subsequent alienation. The infant is alienated from this virtual, ideal self. The self-awareness of the infant is built on distance, on having the capacity to observe oneself at a distance. For Lacan, one's own subjectivity comes into being at this moment of alienation from and fascination with one's own

[91] Ovid frames Narcissus' story as one of coming of age. The scene is set when Narcissus is sixteen years old and seems both boy and young man (3.352 *puer iuvenisque videri*). This is in contrast to the fable in which there is no explicit grounds for explicating the confusion of the deer by his young age. No specific detail about his age is given and his horns are lofty, as opposed to the budding horns of a young deer. In Babrius' version of this story, the deer is described as a brocket, a young stag up to two years old (43.1 ἀχαΐνης). The deer's youth is available for readers to ascribe his faulty behavior, excessive pride according to the authority of the fable, to his age. In Phaedrus the intertextual connection to Ovid's Narcissus and the intratextual motif of viewing one's mirror image in Fable 3.8 may point us towards ascribing youth to the deer but there is no specific reason in the fable itself.

[92] See Bartsch 2006.12-13 for her explanation for leaving Lacan out of her study, although he does briefly intrude into her discussion of Ovid's Narcissus (page 89 footnote 96), where she notes that Ovid's Narcissus is "ripe for a Lacanian reading". For Lacanian readings of Narcissus see Kochhar-Lindgren 1993.39-56, 123-30; Fabre-Serris 1995.185-89; Toohey 2004.271-76; Janan 2007 and 2009.120-53.

[93] Lacan 1978 and 2004. For an accessible summary of Lacan see Benvenuto and Kennedy 1986. Lindheim 2003.83-135 provides a useful example of reading Ovidian poetry, the *Heroides*, with a Lacanian lens.

image, the mirror-stage from which the self emerges to take its place in relation to the community, family and culture.

We can map this mirror-stage onto the stories of Narcissus and Phaedrus' deer. Both of them seem to have become stuck in the mirror-stage, having encountered a mirror-image of themselves, becoming fascinated with that image and alienated from themselves, but then failing to move forward. There are fatal consequences for each of them in being unable then to emerge from this fundamental stage of development. They both fail to take the place that is expected of them in the wider world. If the deer had been able to move past this childhood stage and come to understand his own subjectivity, he might have been able to survive his environment. If he had trusted in the speed of his legs, he may have escaped the hunters on the plain, as he was initially doing (8-9), rather than then becoming caught in the woods due to his horns. However, neither Narcissus, nor the deer, is able to move past this stage, to reach the correct understanding of their mirror-images and their own subjectivity.

This reading of the deer with the twin perspective of Narcissus and Lacan suggests that the deer is in a process of transition but that he has become stuck in a stage of arrested development. It also suggests that the nature of the transition is one of personal maturation. His misprision of self, is a sign of immaturity, a failure to grow up. The fact that the fatal consequences are not self-inflicted, as in the case of Narcissus, but enacted by hunters and hunting dogs also suggests that what is at stake is the deer's understanding of himself in the wider environment, physical and social. He has failed to make sense of himself in relation to the hierarchy of the community in which he must live and seek to survive.

This reading privileges one Ovidian character and metamorphic narrative. But there are elements of the actual fable and other Ovidian intertexts that challenge the Lacanian reading. There is no firm basis in the fable itself for treating the deer as an infantile self. While the lack of such specification does not render valueless this interpretation, other Ovidian intertexts and their interaction with metamorphic mirrors pull us in a different direction. The dynamics of viewing the self in a mirror image in the stories of Io and Actaeon suggests that the nature of the transition that the deer is undergoing does not stem from a fault within the individual. Instead metamorphic mirrors can suggest that the problem stems from the clash that results when the deer meets the system of the wider world that cannot bend to accommodate it. On this reading, it may be that the individual is not flawed, but the system and society are.

To take Actaeon as an example, his confusion at seeing his mirror image is a consequence of the transformation that he has already suffered, not an internal, developmental fault. The metamorphosis alienates him from himself, separating him as subject from the image he sees in the mirror as object. The metamorphosis creates the tension between form and identity, body and mind, a tension that is unresolvable, or at least a tension that we cannot fault Actaeon for failing to resolve in the brief moment of time he has before the outside world imposes its view of his identity on him in accordance with the form that he can see in the water. There is an essential difference here from the situation of Narcissus. The tension between identity and form and the resulting misunderstanding of self are genuine, stemming from a legitimate cause. Barkan writes that “the mirror image…has a metamorphic relation to its subject: both exist simultaneously, just as the different forms of a creature in the midst of metamorphosis

exist simultaneously."[94] From this perspective, neither the mirror image nor the identity of self that exists within Actaeon, blots out the other. Both are essential parts of oneself, one original, one metamorphic, one old, one new. The difficulty for Actaeon then arises because there is no time for Actaeon to harmonize these two versions of himself that are at odds in that moment of perceiving his new metamorphic self in the water.

The elements of Actaeon's story do not line up perfectly with the case of Phaedrus' deer, just as the model of Narcissus did not. In the fable, tension does not arise from a split between a new, metamorphic version of self and the original version of self that now only exists within the mind of the viewer. However, this model of metamorphic mirror-images can be applied to the fable. Rather than dismissing the deer's misunderstanding of self as individual immaturity, instead we can allow for the possibility that the deer is viewing a true version of himself, but one that *no longer* fits the reality of the wider world. The version of himself that the deer sees in the water is one in which his horns are more valuable than his legs. That identity then proves to be at odds with the world, as his horns lead to his death. But does that mean that the deer's version of his identity is wrong? Or is the outside world simply strong enough to impose its perception of his identity onto him? The deer is wrong about his identity in the context of this reality, but that does not mean that he is entirely wrong. Instead of locating the failure to mature within the deer as individual, the transition that is needed is in relation to the surrounding world, which requires something of the fundamental nature of the deer's self to adjust to fit within it.

[94] Barkan 1986.46.

Another fable in which an animal faces a choice about the fundamental nature of self is apposite to bring in to the discussion of the deer in 1.12. In Fable 3.7 a hungry wolf meets a well-fed dog and asks how the weaker animal is able to feed himself so well. The subsequent interaction between the two animals, one wild and free, the other domesticated, can easily be read in the context of the contemporary imperial world in which Phaedrus was writing. The dog explains that the same lot could fall to the wolf if he provided the same service to a master (*domino,* 8). At first the wolf is eager for the material comforts that such service brings to the dog but when he realizes that the trade-off is that the dog is chained up during the day, his neck worn down by a chain, the wolf thinks better of it.[95] Phaedrus frames this fable in the context of *libertas*, opening with the observation (1): *quam dulcis sit libertas breviter proloquar* - I will briefly declare how sweet liberty is. He closes the fable with the wolf rejecting the life of the dog (27): *regnare nolo, liber ut non sim mihi* – I do not want to be king if I am not free to please myself.[96] The language of the fable is that of the human, political sphere (*libertas,* 1, *condicio,* 7, *domino,* 8, *officium,* 8, *familia,* 22). The dog lays out that there is a reciprocal interaction between the animal and master, but the power differential and hierarchical relationship becomes clear. The dog has a made a choice to subordinate himself to the need of a ruler in order to access the material comforts of civilization. The wolf sees this as a bad bargain, that he would have to give up his freedom, something essential to his true nature, in order to fit into the structure of the hierarchy. The bargain costs too much for the wolf, cherishing his *libertas* more than the comfort and safety that subordinating

[95] 3.7.15-16: *aspicit / lupus a catena collum detritum cani.*

[96] Phaedrus is making some kind of pointed joke here as in the first line he say he will briefly (*breviter*) tell of the sweetness of liberty, but at 27 lines in length the fable is one of his longest.

himself to the will of another would afford him. The wolf decides to stay true to his own nature, on his own terms.[97]

The wolf displays a high level of awareness concerning his own nature and the structure of the realm under the power of the *dominus*. The deer in 1.12 is perhaps aware of one version of himself but he lacks the understanding of how that identity may, or as the case proves, may not successfully fit into the wider world in which there is a power structure and hierarchy. If the deer had questioned the world around him, recognizing that the speed from his legs worked best on the plain, he would have stood a better chance of surviving on his own terms, remaining true to his nature, as the wolf intends to. The deer in 2.8, also comes into the sphere of a *dominus*, unaware of the danger that this will bring. This time, as we have seen, the deer unthinkingly tries to fit into the hierarchy of the realm of the *dominus*, to pass as one of the cattle. The deer is akin to the dog, appearing to want to make the opposite choice of the wolf. But he is no less able to fit into the hierarchical structure of this environment than the deer in 1.12 is able to survive. In 2.8 it is not the case that there is the option of giving up an essential part of himself in order to adjust to and fit into the world of the *dominus* as the dog does and the wolf refuses to do. The difference between the deer and the cattle is permanent. There is no

[97] Some have seen reminiscences of the exchange between dog and wolf in the dialogue concerning freedom between two brothers in Tacitus, Arminius and Flavus, (*Annals* 2.9-10). Flavus serves in the Roman army and is *insignis fide*, while Arminius fights against the Romans. Upon meeting (Arminius greets his brother, *salutatur*, as the dog and wolf greet each other, *salutati invicem* 3) Arminius inquires about Flavus' facial disfigurement, wounded in the service of his Roman master. Flavus is happy with the rewards he has been given by the Romans, a la the dog, while Arminius scoffs at the *vilia servitii pretia*, clearly aligned with the wolf in rejecting material rewards because the personal cost is too high. The potential lines of transference here are murky. Havet (1921) who originally published on this hypothesized a separate originary source for both Phaedrus and Tacitus. See also Blaensdorf 2000. However, regardless of whether one can imagine Tacitus reading Phaedrus' fable for its political import, even without such speculation, it is evidence for the political interpretations that are possible for the exchange between the two animals.

way for the deer to adapt to the sphere of the *dominus*, to become the same as the cattle. He unavoidably stands out.

In moving from Ovidian intertexts for the deer in 1.12 such as Io and Actaeon who suggest that the interaction with the mirror image can be a true version of self and that the crux of the deer's problem should be located at the point of the individual coming into conflict with the surrounding environment, to the fable of the wolf and the dog, I have begun to touch upon the idea that Phaedrus is commenting on the political realities of living under a hierarchical power structure, subject to the absolute power of another. Such a political reading is easy to see for the wolf and the dog in 3.7. The presence of the *dominus* in 2.8 also points us towards such a historical reading. On the surface the case is less strong for the deer in 1.12 if one considers this fable alone. However, there is an element of 1.12 and 2.8 that is critical in the downfall of the deer that can also have greater meaning in the context of Ovidian intertexts, namely the horns. As horns are a prominent element in the motif of viewing oneself in water and have a significant role to play in the downfall of the deer in both Fables 2.8 and 1.12 in the next section I will trace the different shades of meaning that horns have in relevant stories of Ovidian metamorphosis. These additional nuances of meaning that horns can represent provide support for reading through a political lens the deers' difficulties in harmonizing their ideas of self with the wider environment. Specifically, such a reading would regard Phaedrus as commenting on the struggles of adjusting to living in a post-Augustan, post-metamorphic political reality in which the potential to stand out and to lead cannot be tolerated.

Section Two: Horns in the *Metamorphoses* and Phaedrus' *Fables*

I have already discussed in relation to the fables above how horns in conjunction with the motif of viewing in water can be a locus for confusion and a marker of alienation from self in the traumatic process of metamorphosis in the case of Actaeon and Io. The presence of horns due to the metamorphosis is a clear, visual marker of the physical change, which then provokes a reaction of confusion, or even fear, illustrating the disjunction between the new physical form and the old self and understanding of one's identity. This association surrounding horns can also be applied to Phaedrus' deer who fail to understand how their horns make them stand out with fatal consequences, underlining the extent of their failure to understand their own identity. There are two further, inter-connected resonances to horns in Ovid's stories of metamorphosis that build on this aspect and are important for understanding the connections that Phaedrus is making between his fabular animals and their Ovidian, metamorphic counterparts. These are: the presence of horns as a marker of divinity or special status; and secondly horns as a marker of leadership, particularly in the quasi-historical story of Cipus. In this section I will first explore these facets of horns in Ovid before I expand upon the significance of these Ovidian resonances for horns in the fables.

2.1 Horns as a Marker of Special Status / Divinity

Horns in the *Metamorphoses* are not only prominent on the heads of freshly metamorphic creatures as a marker of alienation from the new corporeal self, but they also frequently appear as a marker of divinity or other special status. Horns are part of the iconography of certain deities in the Greek and Roman world, such as Jupiter Ammon,

which informs Ovid's depiction of some divine figures.[98] Ovid refers in passing to several different deities, whom he marks out by the presence of horns. For example, Ovid refers to Jupiter as *corniger Ammon* (horned Ammon, *Met.* 5.17). The river-god Numicius makes two appearances in Ovid's corpus: in *Metamorphoses* Book Fourteen when Venus bids him purge Aeneas of his mortality; and in *Fasti* Three when he appears to rescue Anna from her difficulties caught between Aeneas and Lavinia. In both Numicius has the epithet *corniger*.[99] Bacchus is another deity who is depicted with horns and is frequently described with reference to this part of his anatomy.[100] The story of Achelous and Hercules amplifies the connotations of horns in relation to a god and suggests that the horns may not simply be an incidental part of the deity but that the horns themselves carry resonances of power and strength and have an innate aura of divinity. Equally the breaking of horns may then symbolize the loss of power and status.

At the end of *Metamorphoses* Book Eight the narrative is about to transition into the story of Achelous' defeat by Hercules, as told by Achelous himself. The book ends with Achelous lamenting his fate by commenting on his ability to change forms. He remarks (8.881-5):

nam modo, qui nunc sum, videor, modo flector in anguem,
armenti modo dux vires in cornua sumo,—
cornua, dum potui. nunc pars caret altera telo
frontis, ut ipse vides.' gemitus sunt verba secuti.

---

[98] Ammon was an Egyptian deity, depicted with ram's horns, who came to be identified with Zeus / Jupiter. Alexander claimed to be the son of Ammon and allegedly sported horns to cultivate the connection. Through him horns came to be associated with divinity and power for subsequent Hellenistic rulers. See Anderson 1927, Friedricksmeyer 1991, Lucas 2005. River gods were also originally associated with bulls and hence with the iconography of horns. See Gais 1978.

[99] *Met* 14.602; *Fasti* 3.647.

[100] *Her.* 15.24 *accedant capiti cornua – Bacchus eris!; AA* 3.348 *insignis cornu Bacche; Fasti* 3.789 Addressing Bacchus: *mite caput, pater, huc placataque cornua vertas*.

> Sometimes I am seen just as I am now, sometimes I become a snake, or sometimes the lead bull of the herd, my power residing in my horns – horns, when I had them. Now one side of my head is missing its weapon, as you can see for yourself." His words were followed by a groan.

The phrase *vires in cornua sumo* is telling. The horns are a manifestation of Achelous' strength when he was in the form of a bull, and the loss of those horns is hence a sign of his defeat. Achelous' recounting of the fight with Hercules bears out that the breaking of his horns was the crucial point at which he was defeated. When Achelous takes on the form of the bull, it is his horns that Hercules seeks to disarm and then to break completely (9.83-86). During Hercules' death-throes as he addresses his body and remembers all the challenges it has overcome, it is the breaking of Achelous' horns which he mentions as the encapsulation of his success in that encounter (9.186).

Horns can also be a marker of divinity for characters who have gained a new divine status. This combines the divine connotations of horns with the process of metamorphosis but without the anguish and confusion, which the new presence of horns brought in the case of Actaeon and Io. Acis is one example of this. Acis first appears as a young man, the offspring of Faunus and a nymph (*Met.* 13.750ff.) with whom Galatea has fallen in love. The love triangle between Acis, Galatea and the Cyclops means that their love is doomed to failure. However, when the Cyclops smashes Acis with a boulder, Galatea intercedes to save Acis from death and change him into a river-god, a divine being whose divinity is in part manifested by the presence of horns (13.893-6).

Surprisingly, Io's horns are also an example of this type, not in the case of her original metamorphosis from maiden into a cow, but in relation to her final transformation into a goddess. In book 1, Juno agrees to return Io to her original form and

her reverse metamorphosis is described, including the disappearance of her horns (1.740). The story of Io closes with her new status as a goddess worshipped by many.[101] In this passage it appears that as she has been returned to her original form, her horns are gone and the anguish that they had caused her as a cow. However, Io appears again in book 9 during the story of Iphis. She first appears to Iphis' mother, Telephusa, when she is pregnant. Io is now fully established as a goddess, Isis, and identified with Egyptian divinities but she still retains her personal history as Io, Inachus' daughter, *Inachis* (9.687).[102] The description of her appearance now as fully-fledged goddess once again includes horns.[103] Horns are an integral part of her appearance when she returns again to secure Iphis' transformation.[104]

When Io's horns were a marker of alienation from self and of anguish over personal identity, they disappeared once she was returned to human form. However, Io's final form was not as a human maiden, but as a goddess. In her appearances after this final transformation, horns are once again present, now as a marker of both her divine status and power. This suggests that in the process of metamorphosis horns do not have to signify only alienation and difference between external, physical form and interior self, but they can also reveal and represent part of that inner identity.[105] If we understand Io's

---

[101] *Met.* 1.747. See Herodotus 2.41 for the association of Io with Isis.
[102] *Met.* 9.690-4: *cum qua latrator Anubis / sancataque Bubastis variusque coloribus Apis… sistraque errant numquamque satis quaesitus Osiris.*
[103] *Met.* 9.689-90: *inerrant lunaria fronti / cornua cum spicis nitido flaventibus auro / et regale decus..*
[104] *Met.* 9-782-84: *visa dea est movisse suas (et moverat) aras, / et templi tremuere fores imitataque lunam / cornua fulserunt crepuitque sonabile sistrum.* In both this description and the lines quoted in footnote 61 above the horns could be understood as part of the goddess' decorative accessories as opposed to anatomical. However, in either case the presence of horns is an marked aspect of her divine appearance.
[105] This is often the case with Ovid's treatment of metamorphosis. The new external form seems to reveal and insist upon a deeper continuity of inner identity. Lycaon, the first and paradigmatic metamorphosis is a prime example of this. Anderson (1989.97) observes that Lycaon becomes the "literal beast which most closely fitted the bestiality of his character". The process of metamorphosis reveals something about the

identity as goddess to be the result of a final transformation, and therefore indicative of her true nature, the horns, by marking her as divine, reveal a true element of herself that had been absent in her human and bovine forms. From these examples we can add horns as a physical manifestation of some inner quality, or aspect of identity, often divinity, to the significance of horns as a locus for confusion about self and identity.

2.2 Horns as a Marker of Leadership

The final resonance of horns in the *Metamorphoses* that is important to consider for their presence in the fables centers on the story of Cipus. The significance of horns in his story draws on elements already discussed, but Cipus is worth considering as a case apart. The story of Cipus is known to us only from two main sources, Ovid and Valerius Maximus.[106] Such a story provides the raw material which Ovid can mold to his own specifications. Ovid is able to draw on the range of connotations he has previously invoked in relation to horns to create a new layer of meaning that is politically charged.

The story of Cipus is the last of three stories introduced by a connection with Virbius' astonishment at Egeria's transformation into a spring (*Met.* 15.552-621). The first is a comparison with the astonishment of a ploughman when he saw Tages born from the earth (15.551-59); the second with the astonishment of Romulus upon seeing his

original, continuing identity of the person. See also Thumiger 2014.402-05 for this aspect of Ovid's metamorphoses.

[106] Valerius Maximus 5.6.3. Pliny (*NH* 11.45.123) also briefly refers to Cipus. In keeping with the agenda of his work, Valerius focuses on Cipus as an example of *pietas erga patriam*, who voluntarily goes into exile to avoid being king. *Pietas* is not the focus for Ovid. The metamorphosis in the form of the horns is Ovid's focus, as one would expect in the poem, but Ovid also creates a deliberately ambiguous portrayal of Cipus' actions. For example, he goes to Rome even though it is made clear to him by the oracle that unless he wants to be king he should not go to Rome. See Marks 2004.113-115 for comparison of the two stories and Galinsky 1967.184 who also notes that Ovid leaves open to question whether Cipus' exile is voluntary or forced. As the two versions of Cipus' story differ in their focus and intention it is unclear whether Valerius is relying on Ovid for the story or an independent source.

spear turned into a tree (15.560-564). Both of these are short. It is Cipus' story which is expanded into a fuller narrative. The point of contact is the astonishment Cipus felt when he saw his own horns in water (15.552-53, 65-68):

Et nymphas tetigit nova res, et Amazone natus
haud aliter stupuit quam cum……
aut sua fluminea cum vidit Cipus in unda
cornua (vidit enim) falsamque in imagine credens
esse fidem, digitis ad frontem saepe relatis,
quae vidit tetigit, nec iam sua lumina damnans

This strange event amazed the nymphs and the Amazon's son was no less astounded than when…. or when Cipus saw his own horns in river's water (for he truly saw them) and thinking that it was a false likeness of his image, lifting his hands repeatedly to his forehead, he touched what he saw, no longer condemning the evidence of his own eyes.

Ovid presents Cipus in the tradition of his metamorphic animals, such as Io and Actaeon, who are astonished by their appearance upon viewing themselves in water. In this case Cipus' physical shape has not undergone the process of metamorphosis in its entirety, but despite this he is no less a metamorphic creature. He is astonished at the change in his appearance and struggles to make sense of it in relation to his self, distrusting the image in the water. The *cornua* are described as *sua* but Cipus experiences an initial, disorienting disjunction between the image of himself in the water and the reality of his own identity. The horns are the point of confusion.

As Cipus is able to touch the horns, he quickly accepts their reality but he questions the significance of this change to his appearance and seeks help from an *haruspex*, who responds thus (15.581-82):

"rex", ait "o salve! tibi enim, tibi, Cipe, tuisque
hic locus et Latiae parebunt cornibus arces.

"Hail, o king!" he said "You, even you, Cipus and your horns, this place and Latium's citadels will obey.

The words of the *haruspex* integrate the horns into Cipus' identity and being. The horns are no longer something apart from Cipus, but rather they reveal a part of Cipus' identity which had been hidden, in similar fashion to my examples discussed above in relation to horns as a marker of divinity or special status. The *haruspex* identifies the horns as revealing an important quality, which up to now had presumably been latent within Cipus but has now become physically manifested. However, rather than horns physically embodying divinity as in the case of Achelous or Io, Ovid adds another layer of significance to the appearance of horns. Here the horns reveal the future potential innate in Cipus to be a leader. Even though Cipus does not ostensibly wish to realize this potential, the appearance of the horns becomes synonymous with his capacity to lead and to be king, as he himself emphasizes when he addresses the Roman people.[107]

It is important to note here that by tying together the physical appearance of horns on Cipus' head with this potential for leadership, Ovid is able to forcefully underline the fundamental nature of this revelation for Cipus' identity. The potential, whether he wishes to realize it or not, is an inescapable part of who he is. There has been discussion of the inter-changeability in the story between the *cornua* and other adornments, which are indicative of special status. Before Cipus addresses the Roman people he covers up

[107] *Met.* 15.594-96: *"est" ait "hic unus, quem vos nisi pellitis urbe, / rex erit. is qui sit signo, non nomine, dicam; / cornua fronte gerit.* The episode has elicited differing opinions on whether Cipus does want to avoid being king or not, but all see some kind of political commentary in the story: Frankel 1945.226, Galinsky 1967.181-91, Lundstrom 1980.73-79, Schmitzer 1990.262-72, Barchiesi 1997. 251-52, Fabre-Serris 1995.166-69, Wheeler 2000.128-30. Marks 2004 most recently puts forward the interpretation that avoiding kingship is not a moral dilemma, but an historical one, whether anyone at Rome can avoid kingship given the foundational legacy of Romulus.

his horns with laurel, which is described as peaceful (*pacali….lauro,* 15.591).[108] Once he has explained the danger of the one bearing horns, Cipus removes this laurel, now described as a *corona* (15.608) to reveal the horns on his own head. The horns are then covered up again when the people place a *festam…coronam* (15.615) on his head. Marks comments on the word play between *corona* and *cornua*, that they are barely distinguishable as words and inter-changeable as symbols.[109] Galinsky also draws out the differing connotations of laurel crowns and wreaths, relating them to Etruscan kings and the practices of Julius Caesar and Augustus.[110] However, this misleadingly elides the difference between *cornua* and *corona*. Cipus' horns may be covered by a laurel wreath but they are not being exchanged one for the other. His horns may be obscured, but they cannot be removed as a festal crown may. This potential to be leader, to be a king, is a fundamental part of who and what Cipus is. If we understand the horns as providing a physical embodiment of Cipus' future leadership potential, then through the process of metamorphosis his outer physical appearance has become more in keeping with his inner identity. The horns cannot be removed. This part of himself cannot be denied.

Ovid's placement of Cipus' story in the midst of the climactic book of his epic, charged with historical and political significance, magnifies the issues of power and leadership embodied in Cipus' horns. In the final books of the poem Ovid has reached the early history of Rome. The book brings together a parade of exemplary individuals amongst whom Cipus is embedded; among them are Numa, Pythagoras, Virbius (Hippolytus), Cipus, Asclepius, Julius Caesar, and Augustus. Cipus and his horns,

[108] In book 1 laurel has made an appearance when Apollo transforms the fleeing Daphne into the tree. He marks out laurel as a sign of triumph and therefore the peace that follows military victory (1.553-67).
[109] Marks 2004.129.
[110] Galinsky 1967.187.

appearing shortly before Ovid reaches his own time, are unavoidably enmeshed in the question of contemporary power and the individuals who wield it.[111] Hardie reads Book 15 as "profoundly engaged with the issues of the *unus homo*" and the sprouting of Cipus' horns as the catalyst that threatens to "make of him another kind of *unus homo*, a *rex.*"[112] Cipus uses precisely this language of singularity to warn the Roman people that "there is one man here, who will be king, unless you cast him out of the city" (15.594-5, *"est" ait "hic unus quem vos nisi pellitis urbe / rex erit"*), echoing the language that Mars employs when canvassing on behalf of Romulus to remind Jupiter of his promise to elevate him to the divine (*unus erit quem…* - "there will be one whom…", 14.814).[113] In these final books of the *Metamorphoses* there seem to a multitude of these men who stand out and have the potential to wield great, or even absolute, power. Cipus' story results in his turning away from such a position, but his relationship with wider society is still uneasy. That unease surrounding the figures who carry the potential to wield such great power only increases as Ovid moves from Cipus to Julius Caesar and Augustus, and to whoever will come after Augustus in the world that continues beyond the end of the *Metamorphoses*.

2.3 Standing Out in the World of the Fables

To return to the world of Phaedrus' fables, the role of horns in Ovid as embodying the potential to stand out physically and socially-politically adds another layer to Phaedrus' interaction with Ovid and a new way of reading Phaedrus' deer and their

---

[111] But the exact relationship between *exemplum* and comparadum is always unclear.
[112] Hardie 2002c.207-09.
[113] Hardie 1993.3-10 discusses the *unus homo* theme in epic poetry and comments on these passages in Ovid. Hardie 1993.6 also notes that Mars' line in Book 14 is Ennian in origin (Ennius *Ann.* 54-5 Skutsch). I discuss the dynamics of the theme of *unus homo* in Ovid in relation to apotheosis and imperial power successions in Chapter Two (see pages 76-78).

identity problems in relation to their metamorphic counterparts. Phaedrus makes the horns of the deer an essential ingredient in the narrative of 1.12 and 2.8. The horns, by their natural, conspicuous nature, precipitate the fate of the deer. The deer cannot blend in to the world around them but unavoidably stand out. Yet in each of the fables, this failure is compounded by the deers' misunderstanding of self and how their identity fits with the wider world. In Fable 1.12, after successfully avoiding the chasing dogs due to the speed of his legs on the plain, the deer is then unable to blend into his surroundings when he enters a wood because of his horns. The deer is caught out by his horns, marked out for the hunters. In Fable 2.8 the deer attempts to blend in to the domestic sphere, amongst the cattle, but again his horns render him unable to blend into the crowd of animals. The danger that the horns pose to the deer, the danger of standing out, is compounded by the deers' lack of understanding of their own natures and of how they fit into the world around them. Horns are an inherent, prominent aspect of themselves, an innate part of their identity, the significance of which both deer fail to comprehend, and then apply to their surroundings.

In Ovid's metamorphic stories we have seen that horns can be a marker of special status, and in the story of Cipus they are a marker of leadership, a quality which is an integral part of Cipus, physically manifested by the appearance of his horns. With this meaning attached to his horns, Cipus is aware of the danger his horns can pose, and accordingly he carefully negotiates the revelation of his horns and their potential consequences for himself and other people, showing a degree of caution that Phaedrus' deer would have done well to emulate. The need to negotiate this aspect of their identity as carefully as Cipus does and the socio-political ramifications of the horns is especially

present in Fable 2.8. In this fable the deer seems at first to be going to hide successfully among the cattle as the various members of the household, the *familia*, fail to notice the odd animal out. It is the figure of the *dominus* who quickly sees to the truth of the matter. The *dominus* is the *unus homo* of this mini-world, his household and kingdom. The deer has entrusted himself to an environment in which he is subject to the power of one man. There is no space in the hierarchy for another creature to stand out, for a potential leader. The deer cannot fit into the post-Augustan, post metamorphic political reality and the hierarchical structure of power. The deer has mistakenly placed himself in a position where his horns betray him. The *dominus* sees him for what he truly is, a creature who could potentially be a threat, but a threat which he, as the *unus homo* of his household, can easily remove, with fatal consequences for the deer.

Horns appear in a handful of Phaedrus' other fables, and these do not necessarily foreground the same Ovidian issues of metamorphic identity and socio-political overtones.[114] However, one instance of Phaedrus' deployment of horns appears in a fable with a seemingly strong socio-political agenda. It is worth considering how the resonances of horns that I have been discussing in relation to Ovid and Phaedrus' deer may also be at play in relation to these animals and their horns in the fabular world. In Fable 4.6 mice are engaged in battle against the weasels. The mice are being routed, crowding into narrow holes to escape, but most of them manage to escape death (3-4). Their leaders are not as lucky (5-8):

---

[114] 1.21.7: An old lion is attacked by different animals whom he once wronged, including a bull who gores the lion with hostile horns (*infestis…cornibus*). 4.9.11: A fox is stuck in a well and tricks a goat into coming down into the well for a refreshing drink and the fox is then able to escape by climbing up the lofty horns of the goat (*celsis cornibus*). 5.9.1: A bull struggles with his horns in a narrow spot and a calf tries to tell him how to escape (*angusto in aditu taurus luctans cornibus*).

duces eorum, qui capitibus cornua
suis ligarant ut conspicuum in proelio
haberent signum quod sequerentur milites,
haesere in portis suntque capti ab hostibus;

Their leaders who had fastened horns onto their heads in order to have a conspicuous sign in battle for solders to follow, got stuck in the entrances and were captured by the enemy.

The mice have deliberately chosen to make themselves stand out as leaders with the appearance of horns. Phaedrus relates the outcome of the fable specifically to the political sphere, closing the fable with the following lines (11-13):

Quemcumque populum tristis eventus premit,
periclitatur magnitudo principum,
minuta plebes facili praesidio latet.

Whenever a grim event befalls a people, the lofty position of the leadership is in danger, the common people easily find safety in obscurity.

Henderson underlines the potential for reading fables such as this one, in which Phaedrus deploys specifically Romanized political terms, in relation to contemporary political realities. He connects this fable closely with 1.30, and says that "it would leap to any post-Augustan mind that 1.30 and 4.6 interlock as rival conclusions to be drawn from the series of civil wars which handed Rome its Caesars."[115] Henderson notes that the horns are presented as fatal military insignia, "a warped version of Roman standard".[116] I would suggest that Phaedrus' choice of horns as the means by which the leaders of the mice are marked as different would also be significant to a post-Ovidian, post-Augustan mind. A longer version of this fable is found in Babrius, but he does not portray the leaders'

[115] Henderson 2001.168. Fable 1.30 relates how a frog explains to another frog that when two bulls compete to be the ruler (1.30.5 *de principatu cum illi certarent gregis*) it affects them because the loser will stampede through their marsh. The lesson is that the *humiles* suffer when the *potentes* disagree. In this fable, however, while the actions of the rulers can impact upon the *humiles*, the rulers are divided into a separate sphere. The attempted upward movement from one of the crowd to leader is not present as it is in Fable 4.6.
[116] Henderson 2001.169.

insignia as horns. Instead he gives an expanded description of the generals using chips from the mud walls to attach to their foreheads and mark them out as the most visible in the crowd.[117] Phaedrus' choice of vocabulary, depicting the leaders specifically as wearing *cornua,* seems deliberate. The mice choose to elevate themselves to the level of leaders, to stand out physically and politically, and the physical manifestation of their status as leaders is embodied in the horns that they voluntarily add to their foreheads. In this fable the horns embody the meaning that I argue that Phaedrus is attaching to the horns of the deer through his engagement with Ovid and the struggles with identity that his metamorphic creatures face.

Sadly for the deer, horns are not a removable part of their identity. They are stuck with their horns and the potential to stand out, the potential to be a leader and pose a threat to the hierarchy of power under which they must live. Across the fables and animals that I have discussed there are different models of how to interact with the world. The dog has chosen to subordinate himself into the hierarchical power structure, accepting the cost of doing so, his *libertas,* for the benefits it brings him. The wolf is aware of the power dynamics and chooses to stay true to himself, outside the sphere of the *dominus*, even though it makes his life more difficult. The mice choose to mark themselves out as leaders, to stand out physically and politically, and they suffer the consequences. The deer, however, are in the most challenging and untenable position. They lack an awareness and understanding of self, and of how then to fit into themselves into reality, that would give them the choice to subordinate themselves as the dog does, or survive apart on their own terms as the wolf chooses to do. But by making the horns

[117] C.f. Babrius 31.13-15: οἵ τε στρατηγοὶ λεπτὰ πηλίνων τοίχων / κάρφη μετώποις ἁρμόσαντες ἀκραίοις /ἡγοῦντο, παντὸς ἐκφανέστατοι πλήθους.

the trigger of their downfall, Phaedrus also suggests that the deer are perhaps inescapably trapped between their true nature and the reality they live in. The awareness that Cipus displays and the caution in negotiating the potential embodied in his horns would help the deer to avoid putting themselves in a position where they are caught out by the prominence of their horns. But their horns are permanent and the potential to stand out, to threaten the hierarchical order is an inescapable part of their nature. Phaedrus' deer certainly lack self-awareness to understand their place in the wider world and the hierarchy of power, but they also, by their very nature, stand out in ways that the post-Augustan, post-metamorphic world cannot sustain.

Section Three: The Specter of Ovid's Fate

My argument thus far has focused on animals in the fables, the deer in particular, and certain motifs and elements that I argue should be read as Ovidian and metamorphic. The close relation between metamorphic animals and animals in fable provided the scope for Phaedrus to interact with Ovid to reflect upon the changed nature of the political reality in the Augustan and early Julio-Claudian periods. In the final section of this chapter, my readings shift from these primarily metamorphic concerns focused on animals to Phaedrus' construction of his authorial persona and narrative. Over the course of prologues and epilogues, which are spoken in the first person, Phaedrus provides his perspective on the origin of fable and his goals in writing fable. In the process he crafts a dramatic narrative about himself as a persecuted poet.[118] His satirical lineage is on display here as he expresses concern for the potential repercussions of offending readers

[118] Key passages includes: 1*prol* 3-4: fable has the dual task of provoking laughter and providing wise council. 3 *prol* 33-37: origin of fable in slave speech, cloaking speech in fable to avoid punishment. 3 *prol* 40-44: writing fable led to disaster due to Sejanus. 3 *prol.* 49-50: the intention is not to brand individuals but display the habits of men.

with his writing, and makes defensive moves against such acts of alleged misreading. Broad overlaps between Phaedrus' construction of himself as imperial fabulist and Ovid as exiled poet have also been observed.[119]

Most notably, Phaedrus presents himself as an author who has fallen afoul of the misreading of one particularly powerful, imperial individual. As a result he has experienced some kind of *calamitas*, possibly even exile, the type of situation in which Ovid found himself and which he then exploited in his exile poetry.[120] The reality of such claims has been recognized as dubious, as Phaedrus embeds them in conditionals with future verbs, but regardless of the reality, Phaedrus makes this performance of the threat of personal disaster integral to the construction of his authorial persona and narrative.[121] Phaedrus flirts with the danger of writing fable, encouraging readers to search out hidden meanings in his fables, a readerly prerogative that Ovid also sanctions.[122] The safety devices Phaedrus employs, to use Jennings' term, are also reminiscent of the strategies of Ovid's exile poetry.[123]

In playing with these dynamics of flirting with danger, and providing escape clauses for his own safety, Phaedrus is an imperial poet who broadly falls in line with Ovid's fate and the atmosphere of his exile poetry. But Phaedrus can also be placed in the

---

[119] Jennings 2009.239; Glauthier 2009.255, 263. Bloomer 1997.105; Bajoni 1997.289; Gartner 2007b.444.

[120] Phaedrus hints at exile as a consequence if his fables are ill-received at the end the end of book two (2 *ep.* 15-19). In the prologue to book three Phaedrus then suggests that his choice of fabular subject matter brought him some kind of personal disaster, *calamitas,* (3 *prol* 40). It is left up to the reader to make a connection between the previous reference to exile and the unspecified disaster here.

[121] See Champlin 100-101 for succinct analysis of this passage and its literariness.

[122] 4.2.5-7: *non semper ea sunt quae videntur: decipit / frons prima multos, rara mens intellegit / quod interior condidit cura angulo.* C.f. Ovid *Tr.* 1.1.21: *quarenti plura legendus*. Ovid grants the reader permission to read more into his text than first meets the eye. The presence of this dynamic in Ovid's exile poetry is well documented in scholarship. For example, see Casali 1997.

[123] Jennings 2010.239: avoidance of naming, general atmosphere of fear, protestation of innocence, appeals to third parties.

context of the wider imperial literary and political situation. Jennings suggests that "perhaps he presents here a "prestige" model of exile. Exile befalls prominent people – Roman citizens who provoke the wrong reader / observer."[124] Sailor's analysis of Tacitus' presentation of the infamous episode involving Cremutius Cordus is instructive here. Sailor relates how Tacitus' protestations of danger have often been taken at face value but cautions that his statements should be questioned. These rhetorical moves are useful for Tacitus in "creating the impression of consequence". Insinuating a hostile reception by the regime is a method of building prestige.[125] In attempting to deflect authorial culpability while also distorting the level of danger that proceeds from writing, Phaedrus achieves a similar rhetorical goal. His fables become more alluring to the reader because of the implication that reading them is scandalous. The question with which Phaedrus closes the prologue to book three in which he most explicitly spins his "hard luck story", perhaps belies this strategy (3 *prol* 62): *induxi te ad legendum?* – "have I persuaded you to read?"[126]

It is worth pausing briefly to consider how these dynamics of the construction of Phaedrus' authorial narrative connect to the wider landscape of imperial writers. While there are broad overlaps between Ovid's fate and his strategies in writing from exile, on the one hand, and Phaedrus' construction of his authorial persona as an imperial fabulist, on the other, they should not be pushed to suggest that Phaedrus is closely modeling his authorial persona on that of Ovid on a grand-scale, chalking up much of the atmosphere of the fables to Ovid and his exile poetry. However, there are two passages that are worth

---

[124] Jennings 2009.238-40.
[125] Sailor 2008.250-52.
[126] Henderson 2001.57-94 labels the prologue to book three "another hard luck story".

focusing on more closely that offer verbal connections with Ovid's exile poetry as grounds for arguing that Ovid's fate and his construction of it in his exile poetry did play a role in Phaedrus' thinking about his own authorial persona and also his portrayal of Augustus. The first passage is one spoken by Phaedrus *qua* author in an epilogue and the second is embedded in an "historical" fable guest-starring Augustus. In these passages the Ovidian connections are tighter, and are not simply based on broad similarities, with the result that Phaedrus does appear to be aware of and alluding to Ovid's fate.

In the epilogue to Book Two Phaedrus speaks in his own voice to hypothesize the varying receptions of his fables by the reading public and to imagine his reaction to positive and negative reviews. He closes the epilogue with consideration of what may happen if his fables do not find a welcoming audience (2 *prol* 18-19):

fatale exilium corde durato feram,
donec Fortunam criminis pudeat sui.

With a hardened heart I shall endure the banishment ordained by fate until Fortune becomes ashamed of her indictment.

Phaedrus' prospective reference to *exilium* is tantalizing when thinking about Phaedrus' engagement with Ovid.[127] Ovid is *the* recent, paradigmatic, exilic poet and by holding out the possibility that he could suffer such grievous consequences for his writings if his fables should offend the wrong reader, Phaedrus plots out a potential authorial career path for himself that follows Ovid's fate. Alone, *exilium* is shaky evidence for reading an allusion to Ovid's exile into the epilogue, particularly as it is an emendation on the part of Gruner for *exitium*. Gruner did not edit the text himself but in 1745 he published observations on key moments in the text of books one and two, certain of which, such as

[127] Glauthier 2009.255 is tempted to see an allusion to Ovid's exile here.

exilium for *exitium*, subsequently entered the tradition of the text of the fables itsel.[128] But, quite apart from its being a conjecture, even if it is correct (having been accepted as such by a number of later editors), on its own *exilium* would simply join the realm of general overlaps between the fables and Ovid.[129] However, there are other words in these lines that point us in an Ovidian direction and provide a strong foundation that Phaedrus is engaging with Ovid's career path in these lines.

Phaedrus does not admit that through his writing he would have committed an act worthy of punishment. Instead he suggests that *Fortuna* would eventually regret her fault (*criminis…sui*, 19) implying that Fortune had a crucial part to play in the fate of exile, and also that she would eventually be ashamed of inflicting an unjust punishment upon him, perhaps recanting it. Phaedrus' choice of the word *crimen* in relation to *Fortuna* here is noteworthy. *Crimen* most often has the sense of an accusation or reproach, without necessarily implying that such an indictment has merit, but it can also have the meaning of an actual misdeed or crime, as is the case in this example in Phaedrus.[130] Phaedrus is not at fault, even though he is (prospectively) being punished. Instead the fault lies with Fortune. The connection of Fortune with *crimen* in the case of unjust punishment recalls Ovid's formulation of the unjust nature of the fate of one of his metamorphic creatures prominent in Phaedrus' engagement with Ovid in the deer fables,

---

[128] Gruner 1745 *Spicilegium obseruationum ad Phaedri priores libros II*

[129] Gruner 1745.24-26. Most prominently Guaglianone 1969 reverts to the reading of *exitium*. His critical edition has garnered praise as a reliable text of Phaedrus. However, he admits himself that his text is conservative (*Praefatio xxiii*) and has been criticized on those grounds. For example, Marshall 1972.507 review: "his conservatism constantly leads him into not even mentioning excellent emendations and it is this which renders his edition untrustworthy."

[130] See *OLD* entry for *crimen*: 4 = misdeed or crime, 1-3 = varying meanings of indictment, charge, accusation. See also *TLL* entry for *crimen*: 4.0.119375.

namely Actaeon. When Ovid moves from the story of Cadmus to that of his grandson, he introduces the story of Actaeon with the following lines (*Met.* 3.138-42):

prima nepos inter tot res tibi, Cadme, secundas
causa fuit luctus alienaque cornua fronti
addita vosque, canes, satiatae sanguine erili.
at bene si quaeras, Fortunae crimen in illo,
non scelus invenies; quod enim scelus error habebat?

Your grandson was the first cause of grief among so many favorable circumstances, Cadmus, and the strange horns added to his forehead, and you dogs, sated on the blood of your master. But if you look carefully, you will find in it the fault of Fortune, not wickedness; for what wickedness was there in error? *Met.* 3.138-42.

Ovid tips his hand as to where he thinks the blame should lie for Actaeon's fate, and it is not with Actaeon himself. The fault is to be laid with Fortune instead of ill intent on the part of Actaeon, as Phaedrus also lays the blame for his imagined punishment of exile upon Fortune.[131] Phaedrus' exile would be no more justified by his personal actions than Actaeon's was. It is also worth noting that prior to the specific reference to *Fortunae crimen*, Ovid gives a summary of Actaeon's story, picking out the most striking elements, the strange horns on his head and violent death at the mouths of the dogs, the narrative arc that Phaedrus mirrors in the case of the deer in Fable 1.12.

In addition to this, this vocabulary at the close of the epilogue in Phaedrus not only connects back to Actaeon in Ovid in relation to a metamorphic animal, but also points us towards Ovid himself in exile and his exilic poetry. *Crimen* is one of the key words that Ovid uses repeatedly in his exile poetry in relation to the charges against him

---

[131] Cremona (1980.97-98) notes the comparison between 2 *ep.* 19 and *Met.* 3.141 in the entry for *crimen* in his *Lexicon Phaedrianum*.

and the cause of his exile.[132] In doing so, he performs a careful balancing act. He refuses to reveal the details of the true reasons for exile, famously ascribing his punishment instead to *duo crimina, carmen et error* (*Tr.* 2.207). Ovid walks a careful line between approaching Augustus, the judge who has the final say in his fate, with respect in his poetry, while also strongly defending himself and seeking a reversal of his punishment.[133] The unspecified nature of *crimen* leveled against him is one aspect of his strategy that he works to his full advantage. For example, in *Tristia* 2, *crimen* surfaces repeatedly: in relation to poetry as the source of the charges (*deme mihi studium, vitae quoque crimina demes* – "take away from my pursuit, and you will also take away the charges from my life", 2.1.9); denying that Augustus would find any *crimen* in his poetry if only he had read it (*at si, quod mallem, vacuum tibi forte fuisset, / nullum legisses crimen in Arte mea* – "but if, as I would prefer, you perhaps had the leisure, you would have read of no crime in my *Ars*", 2.1.239-40); and concerning other poetry that could be equally harmful to the reader (*non tamen idcirco crimen liber omnis habebit* – yet not for that reason will every book possess a charge", 2.1.265).

In the exile poetry Ovid makes connections between himself and the fate of different metamorphic characters; specifically in *Tristia* 2 he exploits the potential for

[132] Ovid uses a range of words to variously refer to the charges against him and the cause of his exile, including *crimen, delictum, peccatum, stultitia*. McGowan (2009.43) counts 59 instances of *crimen* across the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*. See also Ingleheart 2006 and Fulkerson 2013.140-44 for discussion of Ovid's portrayal of the cause of his exile.

[133] Ovid's addressee necessarily changes after the death of Augustus when other imperial figures hold his fate in their hands.

drawing parallels between his exile and Actaeon's fate, which is especially notable for the passage in Phaedrus (*Tr.* 2.1.103-10):[134]

Cur aliquid vidi? Cur noxia lumina feci?
  Cur imprudenti cognita culpa mihi?
Inscius Actaeon vidit sine veste Dianam;
  Pradeo fuit canibus non minus ille suis.
Scilicet in superis etiam fortuna luenda est,
  Nec veniam laeso numine casus habet.
Illa nostra die, quae me malus abstulit error,
  Parva quidem periit, sed sine labe domus…

Why did I see anything? Why did I make my eyes guilty? Why was a mischief unwittingly known to me? Unaware, Actaeon saw Diana without her clothes; nevertheless he became prey for his own dogs. To be sure even chance must be atoned for among the gods, to a wounded deity chance is no excuse. On that day when my unlucky error led me astray, my humble house, without stain, was destroyed.

Ovid suggests that it is possible to equate his own unwitting mistake and subsequent punishment to Actaeon. The parallels are concentrated around the role of *Fortuna*, on unwitting participation in something subsequently deemed worthy of blame, the act of seeing, and the unreasonable anger of a deity.[135] By drawing out the parallel with Actaeon Ovid does not have to mention Augustus explicitly, but can allow his portrayal of Diana in the *Metamorphoses* speak his criticism of Augustus. There is speculation that the story of Actaeon in the *Metamorphoses* is an example of Ovid's revision of his epic poem from exile to fit his exilic agenda.[136] However, regardless of whether Ovid exploited the connections that were already present, or created the coincidences himself from exile, the connection between Actaeon and Ovid, between Actaeon's unjust death at

[134] For example, at *Tr.* 1.1.79-80 Ovid compares him to Phaethon (*Met.* 1.747ff); at *Tr.* 1.7.15-20 he likens his burning of the *Metamorphoses* to the story of Altaea and Meleager (*Met.* 8.445ff); Ovid also reopens the *Metamorphoses* to append his own fate to the end of the poem (*Tr.* 1.1.118-21).
[135] For discussion of this passage in the exile poetry see Williams 1994.174-76 and Ingleheart 2006.71-76.
[136] For Ovid as editor of his own texts see Martelli 2013. Also, see pages 111-12, 148 and 154 in Chapters 2 and 3 for further discussion of Ovid's rewriting of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* post-exile.

the mouths of his dogs and Ovid's exile at the hands of an angry Augustus, is available for Phaedrus, who at the close of book two joins together the possibility of *exilium* because of an offended readership, and the vocabulary of *crimen* in connection with *Fortuna*. The concentration in these lines of these elements that also connect Actaeon's fate and Ovid's exile seems far from coincidental, especially given the importance of Actaeon to Phaedrus elsewhere in the fables.

The vocabulary of *error* in relation to the unspecified *crimen* is also an important connection between Actaeon in the *Metamorphoses* (3.142, quoted above) and Ovid's spin on the causes of his exile.[137] Ovid often intertwines the shadowy *crimen* with his unintentional *error* in the exile poetry.[138] The vocabulary of *error* is absent from the epilogue in Phaedrus but surfaces with *crimen* at an important moment in an allegedly historical fable in which Augustus as judge and his powers of discernment have the starring role. Fable 3.10 is a lengthy, convoluted tale that Phaedrus introduces as an event that happened within his own memory in order to illustrate the dangers of believing and distrusting evidence.[139] The fable involves an allegedly historical court-case in which a husband suspects his wife of adultery because of the lies of a freedman.[140] When the husband tries to catch his wife in the act, he ends up killing their son and then taking his own life when he realized his mistake (9-34). The innocent wife is then brought in front

---

[137] See Rosiello 2002 for Ovid's use of *error* across his oeuvre and its significance in the exile poetry.
[138] Examples include *Tr.* 2.1.207, 3.5.49 and 52, 3.6.26 and 35, 3.11.33-4; *E.P.* 2.3.91-2, 3.3.70 and 75.
[139] 3.10.8: *narrabo tibi memoria quod factum est mea*. 3.10.1:*periculosum est credere et non credere.* See Libby 2010.552-53 for a more detailed summary of the fable.
[140] Phaedrus may claim that there is historical reality underlying the narrative of this fable, it is more likely that he is constructing the story himself. Henderson 2001.45-49 points out the similarities between the convoluted narrative of the fable and narratives found in declamation exercises and the Greek novels. He also notes (2001.38) the omniscient *deus ex machine* quality of Augustus' intervention, "the genie who watches over the narrativity of Rome". Augustus' appearance in the fable is more about "learning to love a dead Caesar, or finding a use for one", than in relaying any historically accurate pronouncement of a living Augustus.

of the Centumviral court (*ad centumviros,* 35) to decide whether she is implicated in her husband's death since she benefits from his inheritance. It is at this point that divine Augustus makes an appearance as the judges are too perplexed by the case to reach a verdict (39-43):

a divo Augusto tum petiere iudices
ut adiuvaret iuris iurandi fidem,
quod ipsos error implicuiset criminis.
qui postquam tenebras dispulist calumniate
certumque fontem veritatis repperit….

Then the judges sought divine Augustus that he would help them fulfill the obligation of their oaths, since the *error* of the *criminis* had perplexed them. After he cleared away the shadows of the trickery, and found a sure source of truth…..

Augustus is elevated above the normal judges, defined by his divine status, and his ability to see through to the truth of the matter, with the crucial act of perspicacity based on the difficulty of discerning when *error* and *criminis* are entwined together. The role of Augustus in the fable is generally interpreted as positive. Libby addresses the discrepancy between the portrayal of Augustus here (and Tiberius in Fable 2.5) as "good emperors" and the negative depiction of the wielders of *imperium* in other fables, especially the power structure in the animal fables.[141] She argues that Phaedrus aligns his portrayal of the imperial authority of Augustus and Tiberius with his own poetic authority, as the emperors and Phaedrus as fabulist have the ability to see through deception to the truth at the heart of various matters. She concludes that there is a double-edged valence to the positive portrait of the emperors and that we should at least allow for some level of sincerity in Phaedrus' praise of the emperors' hermeneutic abilities.

[141] Libby 2010, especially 546-48 and 552.555. See also Henderson 2001.33-55 for discussion of Fable 3.10.

However, an Ovidian reading of Augustus in this fable suggests an underlying gibe at his acuity in light of his failure to disentangle these same issues in the case of Ovid's exile.

As I previously noted, in the exile poetry *crimen* and *error* are thematic vocabulary for talking about the causes of his exile and part of Ovid's strategy for defending himself without explicitly stating the specific details of the case against him. Augustus is also integral to Ovid's case as the injured party whose anger originally caused Ovid's punishment and as the one who sits in judgment over Ovid's case, and could reverse or lighten Ovid's punishment if he reconsidered the charges.[142] There are several passages in the exile poetry that illustrate how Ovid entwines the unwitting nature of his misdeed (*error*) with the charges brought against him (*crimen*) and the role of Augustus as judge. For example in *Tristia* 3.5 Ovid summarizes the situation and hopes for a better outcome (49-54):

<u>inscia</u> quod crimen viderunt <u>lumina</u>, plector,
peccatumque oculos est habuisse meum.
non equidem tota possum defendere culpam,
sed partem nostri <u>criminis error</u> habet.
spes igitur superset facturum ut molliat ipse
mutati poenam condicione loci.

I am punished because my unknowing eyes saw an offence, my sin is that of possessing sight. True I cannot defend myself from blame entirely but an error holds part of my offence. Therefore hope remains that he may lighten my punishment by changing the terms of its location.

Ovid calls his eyes *inscia*, the same word he used to describe Actaeon in *Tristia* 2 (105, quoted above). He is deferential in his defensiveness, admitting that he cannot fully exculpate himself, but he also puts forward his grounds for an appeal based on the fact

[142] For example, see *Tr* 1.5.84 and 2.1.123-24 for Augustus as the injured, angry party and *E. P.* 1.744 fo Augustus as all-seeing judge of the charges against Ovid. Ingleheart (2006.77-79) analyzes the theme of sight in *Tristia* 2 and how Ovid associates Augustus with a failure of sight.

that *error* was involved. His strategy is similar in the following poem addressed to a loyal friend asking for help in seeking a lighter punishment (*Tr.* 3.6.21-26):

…et siquas fecit tibi gratia vires,
   illas pro nobis experiare, rogo,
numinis ut laesi fiat mansuetior ira,
   mutatoque minor sit mea poena loco,
idque ita si nullum scelus est in pectore nostro,
   principiumque mei criminis error habet.

And if favor gives you any power, prove it on my behalf, I beg, that the anger of the god should be softened and lighten my punishment with a change of place, and this because there is no wickedness in my heart and an error was the cause of my offence.

Again, Ovid's defense is based on his unwitting mistake as the beginning of the charges against him, not actual criminal intent or a criminal act. On this basis he hopes for a reconsideration of his sentence, implying that the complicated nexus of *crimen* and *error* has led to a mistake in the original judgment. In *Ex Ponto* 3.3, in which Ovid converses with Cupid in a dream about his exile, Ovid seems to reveal that this has been his strategy (73-76):

Quicquid id est (neque enim debet dolor ipse referri,
   Nec potes a culpa dicere abesse tua)
Tu licet erroris sub imagine crimen obumbres,
   Non gravior merito iudicis ira fuit.

Whatever it is (for the painful thing ought not to be told, nor are you able to say that you are free from blame), while you may hide the offence beneath the guise of error, the anger of the judge was no heavier than you deserved.

Even though Cupid does stand behind the original judgment of Augustus, taking the view that there is only the guise of error, the combination of *error* and *crimen* still appears to complicate the issue and provide a basis for implying that the original judgment was not necessarily sound or just.

In these passages, as well as across the exile poetry, Ovid subtly establishes a defense for himself based on the complexity of the case against him due to the entanglement of *error* and *crimen*. As Augustus is also placed in the role of judge, the implication is that even if his original sentencing of Ovid to exile was justified due to imperial (divine) anger, a reconsideration of the matter would be warranted, even leading ultimately to a reversal of that decision. Augustus has failed in his powers of judgment to disentangle *error* and *crimen*, precisely the task that the divine Augustus in Phaedrus is able to accomplish. If Ovid's case is placed alongside the court-case in Fable 3.10, it seems that Phaedrus' Augustus, post-Augustan deified Augustus, has improved in his perceptive abilities but previously he was not always up to the complex task that is now set before him. If Phaedrus' Augustus had judged Ovid's case, would he have seen through to the *fontem veritatis* (a source of truth, 43) and come to a different judgment, more favorable to Ovid? Or would his judgment have still been clouded by his anger, undermining the portrayal of Augustus in the fable as an omniscient interpreter who can see through complications to the heart of cases?

In the closing lines of the epilogue to book 2 and Augustus' discerning judgment in Fable 3.10, Phaedrus brings together thematic elements and specific vocabulary that are significant for Ovid's fate as he portrays it in his exile poetry. The vocabulary of *Fortuna*, *error* and *crimen*, together with the prospect of exile, and then the figure of Augustus as eagle-eyed judge, provide an Ovidian context for Phaedrus' construction of his (imaginary) dangerous career path as poet. The connections to Ovid's exile poetry in these passages strengthen and comment on the general overlaps that have been seen in Phaedrus' suggestion that he suffered from the misreading of a powerful imperial figure,

Sejanus, whom he implies was accuser, witness and judge (*accusator, testis, iudex,* 3 *prol.* 41-42) due to an unspecified offence caused by his writing. Ovid's exploitation of the parallels between his own exilic punishment and Actaeon's fate, which is based on the very elements and vocabulary that Phaedrus employs in these passages also adds further nuance to Phaedrus' engagement with Ovidian metamorphic animals. It is not only the Ovidian animals who struggle in the world of the fable but also author.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have explored Phaedrus' subtle engagement with Ovid, firstly in animal figures, concentrated upon the figure of the deer and the elements of horns, and then in Phaedrus' own authorial persona and portrayal of powerful figures. While my arguments surrounding animals and then authors and humans may seem far afield from each other, Phaedrus is grappling with similar issues in these different aspects of his fables. In Sections One and Two I argued that Phaedrus builds up an Ovidian tone around certain elements in the animal fables through which Phaedrus explores the difficulties of adjusting to imperial realities and the danger of standing out. In Section Three Phaedrus is also concerned with the perils of standing out, but this time for the author. The confluence of Ovid and exile with Actaeon, in Ovid's poetry, and then as part of Phaedrus' interaction with Ovid in relation to his own fate as poet, especially connects to the issues that the deer are grappling with because of the significance of Actaeon for both readings.

Adjusting to imperial realities and not standing out when the consequences of doing so can be fatal are not only difficulties that Phaedrus is witness to and exploring in

the animals fables, but ones that as author he must also learn how to navigate himself. His understated approach to writing satire through the medium of fables is one critical way in which Phaedrus is perhaps learning to adjust and not stand out. However, he also still portrays himself as a potentially exiled poet, at risk of standing out and eliciting a negative reaction because of what he writes. His understated engagement with Ovid, which indicates an awareness of Ovid's exilic fate and takes advantage of concepts and vocabulary at the heart of Ovid's portrayal of his exile, as well as through metamorphic animals, concentrated on the deer and horns, allow Phaedrus to think about what living in a post-Augustan, imperial reality means, for the human versions of the deer, and for those who choose to take up the potentially precarious position of poet.

The readings I have focused on in this chapter and the issues that Phaedrus highlights through his engagement with Ovid are also consonant with the world of the fables that Phaedrus constructs as a whole. Phaedrus' interaction with Ovid is a means by which he can question and grapple with the difficulties of living in hierarchical, imperial realities, as he also approaches these types of issues from different angles and perspectives across the fables. In light of the conclusions that can be drawn from this chapter a next step in reading Phaedrus' corpus with an Ovidian lens would be to explore potential connections between other Ovidian, metamorphic animals and Phaedrus' animals in the world of the fables. Adding further specific evidence to the general overlaps between Ovid's poetic persona and career and Phaedrus' would also be illuminating, if the degree to which Phaedrus was orienting his own persona from Ovid could be strengthened. The final fable in the collection as we have it (5.10), portrays an old hunting dog, once a fast and loyal servant, now failing his master in his old age. As it

closes the books of the fables, the dog's failing strength is often read as the final episode in the narrative of Phaedrus' authorial persona, whose power has waned across the books, a narrative of poetic decline that is reminiscent of Ovid's. The dog's closing words to his master that recognize that he has failed the figure who has power over him, "praise me for what I once was, even if you condemn me for what I am now" (*quod fuimus laudas, si iam damnas quod sumus*, 5.10.9), close the fables and Phaedrus' poetic career with a plaintive cry that Ovid, stuck in exile, knew well at the end of his own life and career.

Chapter Two: Ovidian Prequels and Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*

In the previous chapter I focused on an author of a single work of poetry whose influence on later authors outside of the Aesopic tradition appears non-existent. As such Ovid's influence reaches the focal author of this chapter, Seneca the Younger, without obvious mediation by Phaedrus. In contrast to Phaedrus, the *Apocolocyntosis* is one of many texts authored by Seneca, texts that span a range of genres. As such, we should briefly consider how Seneca interacts with Ovid in his other writings in order to contextualize his Ovidian engagement in this satirical work. Seneca does make explicit mention of Ovid outside of the *Apocolocyntosis*. In fact, if we accepted at face value Seneca's comments on Ovid and the caliber of his poetry, it would be easy to dismiss the influence of Ovid on Seneca at all as an author and to conclude that Seneca's opinion of Ovid simply fits into the trend of first century Ovidian literary criticism, beginning with his uncle, Seneca the Elder, and closing with Quintilian. In his fullest explicit citation and commentary on Ovid in his *Natural Questions* Seneca couches his praise and criticism of Ovid's poetry in the same language and terms as Seneca the Elder and Quintilian.[143] However, Seneca's brief explicit words of literary criticism are only the shallows of his engagement with Ovid and the dismissive tone by no means foreshadows an absence of Ovidian allusion and intertextual engagement in Seneca's writings. The explicit criticism in the *Natural Questions* is only the tip of a much broader allusive engagement with Ovid in the surrounding text.[144]

[143]Mazzoli 1970.238-47 Morgan 2003.6-70. See Introduction pages 2-3.

[144] Degli'Innocenti Pierini 1984; De Vivo 1995, Williams 2012.

Much scholarship documents how Ovid surfaces and resurfaces with varying degrees of openness across the different genres in which Seneca wrote. Seneca engages selectively and creatively with Ovid, in a form that fits his own ends in the particular genre in which he is writing.[145] What does this mean for Seneca's only satirical work, the *Apocolocyntosis*? The *Apocolocyntosis* is unique in many ways. In it Seneca concocts a true mélange of literary modes, moving between prose and poetry, replicating the markers of different genres in order to parody them, and dropping in quotes in Latin and Greek.[146] Through these various interactions Seneca is continually positioning his satire in relation to many other genres and authors. Amongst all these moments of implicit citation and generic interplay, Ovid stands out as one of only three authors to be named explicitly.[147] On initial reading the brief moment of explicit mention could be dismissed as a throw away comment, distanced from the authorial voice of the text, spoken by a character, whose argument is ultimately rejected by the action of the text. However, as is the case elsewhere in Seneca' corpus, this brief moment of explicit mention is only the tip of Seneca's creative engagement with Ovid in the *Apocolocyntosis*.

In this chapter I will show that Seneca is engaging with Ovid, both with the explicitly mentioned text of the *Metamorphoses*, and allusively with the unmentioned, perhaps unmentionable, text of the *Fasti*. Seneca sets up the potential for both of these

[145] For the presence of Ovid in Seneca's philosophical writings see: Esposito 1989; De Vivo 1995, Degli-Innocenti Pierini 2005, Williams 2012. For the intertextual relationship with Ovid in Seneca's tragedies see: Jakobi 1988; Putnam 1995.246-85; Tarrant 2002; Schiesaro 2003; Trinacty 2007. For the allusive relationship Seneca creates between his own exile and Ovid's exilic writing see: Charlier 1954-5 Degli'Innocenti Pierini,1980; Gahan 1985; Dunn 1989 Claasen 1999. Tarrant 2006 gives a good overview of who Seneca quotes and how in his different writings.

[146] Blaensdorf 1986 divides the satire into five acts, each imitating and parodying a different literary genre; see Damon 2010 on the satire's interaction with history and poetry; see O'Gorman 2006 on citation and Bonandini 2010 for an in depth discussion of Seneca's use of citation in the satire, especially p. 205-10 for a table summarizing moments of citation.

[147] The two other authors named are Varro (8.1) and Horace (13.3). They are named in reference to a specific citation (*ut ait Varro; ut ait Horatius*) and in these instances there does not appear to be any implication of a broader connection between the satire and the particular authors and their texts.

Ovidian poems to be situated as prequels to the action of the *Apocolocyntosis*. In doing so, Seneca simultaneously allows for the conditions of the earlier text to creep into his own writing and change the way of reading it, as well as situating the *Apocolocyntosis* as a sequel or continuation of the earlier Ovidian text, raising the question of what kind of sequel the *Apocolocyntosis* is. This draws attention to the gaps that exist between the Ovidian text, and Senecan satire, gaps that then highlight and address the changed nature of Seneca's imperial world. In Section One the explicit citation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* will be my starting point to explore the layers of Seneca's positioning of himself in relation to Ovid's epic. My focus will then move to Ovid's *Fasti*. In Section Two I will establish the presence and importance of the historical *fasti* in the satire as necessary background before I argue for Seneca's engagement with Ovid's *Fasti* as a predecessor for the subject matter and themes of the *Apocolocyntosis* in Section Three.

Section One: The *Metamorphoses* and the *Apocolocyntosis*

In a trio of speeches on the contested matter of Claudius' apotheosis, Ovid and his *Metamorphoses* are mentioned by Diespiter, the middle of the three speakers.[148] Diespiter closes his argument in favor of Claudius' deification with the following words (9.5):

Censeo uti divus Claudius ex hac die deus sit ita uti ante eum quis optimo iure factus sit, eam que rem ad Metamorphosis Ovidi adiciendam.

I move that from this day the divine Claudius should be a god just as anyone before him who became one with the best justification and that this event be added to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

Diespiter names Ovid in conjunction with one particular text of his, and together author and text are presented, in the opinion of Diespiter, as the appropriate,

[148] The identity of Diespiter has proven challenging. Seneca provides an otherwise unattested biography for the god, a native Italian deity who was often identified with Jupiter. I will return to the question of Diespiter's identity at the end of this section.

authoritative, literary predecessor to which the subject matter of the satire is connected. This reference to Ovid has been discussed from the perspective of the satire and the role of citation therein, and from the viewpoint of Seneca's treatment of Ovid. Commentators have viewed the reference as both fitting and understandable for Diespiter to make, but also unexpected.[149] McNelis and Bonandini in particular make important observations that invite further exploration. In this section I will focus on the relationship between the satire and the *Metamorphoses* as the poem explicitly referred to by Diespiter. My goal is to answer two related, but distinct questions: What work is Seneca making this particular reference to Ovid and the *Metamorphoses* do in the context of Diespiter's, in which he aims to persuade his audience to deify Claudius? What work does Seneca want the reference to achieve in the broader context of the satire and its treatment of imperial apotheosis?

To answer the former I will first draw out the assumptions concerning Ovid's poem which must be in play in order for Diespiter to connect it with Claudius' potential apotheosis. I will argue that presenting Claudius' apotheosis as a sequel to the *Metamorphoses* is a rhetorically savvy move on the speaker's part. Then moving from Diespiter's to Seneca's view of Ovid's poem, I will suggest that a gap exists between Diespiter's construction of any relationship with Ovid's poem and the issues which Seneca, as the author of the satire as a whole, wishes to bring to the forefront of the reader's mind by making explicit mention of Ovid. If the events of the *Apocolocyntosis* are in some way a sequel to Ovid's poem, then the stories Ovid tells in the *Metamorphoses* can be viewed as the prequel. Diespiter attempts to control the reading of

---

[149] Lund 1994.100 comments that it is "vor dem Hintergrund verstandlich"; Eden 1984.144 views it as "an unexpectedly comic substitution for the aridly official *fasti*".

Ovid by foregrounding certain elements of the earlier text, which are of the greatest importance only to Diespiter from his limited perspective of sequel. However, Diespiter's tendentious reading is his own and does not limit the reader. He (and Seneca) have made available another viewpoint, that of the whole of the *Metamorphoses*. The vantage point of the *Metamorphoses* as a prequel to the events of the *Apocolocyntosis* is open to a reader beyond Diespiter's reductive view.[150] I will explore the broader thematic resonances between the two texts which this perspective of prequel / sequel bring into focus to argue that by dropping in Ovid's poem at this moment in the text Seneca brings into question not only Claudius' candidacy for apotheosis but also the wider practices of imperial apotheosis and divine identity.

1.1 The *Apocolocyntosis* as Sequel to the *Metamorphoses*

There are two key assumptions under which Diespiter is working in order for his reference to Ovid to be comprehensible in the context of his speech.[151] The first concerns the structure of Ovid's epic. By saying that Claudius' apotheosis should be added (*adiciendam*) to the *Metamorphoses,* Diespiter assumes this this recent historical event can be easily appended to the poem as written by Ovid about half a century before. This is possible because of the linear chronological structure that informs the *Metamorphoses* as a whole. In his opening lines Ovid famously sets out a linear progression for the epic from the beginning of time down to his own times.[152] Diespiter picks up on this idea to

---

[150] Ideas on allusive reading habits and the power dynamics involved in tendentious reading developed by Hinds (1995) in *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* have been instrumental in my understanding of the split prequel / sequel perspective at the heart of Diespiter and Seneca's citation of Ovid.

[151] In this section I am focusing on Diespiter's viewpoint, but it should be noted that Diespiter's understanding of Ovid's poem is of course also in some way Seneca's. I wish to focus first on Diespiter's understanding as a segment of Seneca's perspective on the possible ways to read Ovid before expanding to the broader viewpoint of authorial Seneca.

[152] Ovid *Met.* 1.3-4: *primus ab origine mundi / ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen!*

imagine that Ovid's destination might now be extended down to *his* own times or to those of Claudius or of Seneca.[153]

It is highly note-worthy that this procedure is consonant with the manner in which Ovid treats his own body of poetry, especially, but not only, the *Metamorphoses*. Ovid's *modus operandi* towards all of his earlier poetry was to treat it as innately unstable and open to change, growth and improvement.[154] This is especially true of the *Metamorphoses* whose mutability Ovid cultivates from the later perspective of his exile poetry. In *Tristia* 1.7 he orders that his own fate be added into the poem's catalogue of bodies changed by fortune, and also offers the reader a preface that he might place, at his own discretion, before the poem's opening lines.[155] Even those three crucial words, *ad mea tempora* (to my time, *Met.* 1.4), are open to revision when needs must, evolving into *in tua tempora* (to your time, *Tr.* 2.1.560), when Ovid addresses Augustus. The word *tempora* also links the beginning and end of the *Metamorphoses* with the opening word of the *Fasti*, suggesting that the *Metamorphoses* will break off at the point at which the *Fasti* can and will pick up.[156] The idea that Ovid's poetry was open to continuation and adjustment depending on who was reading is built into the reception that he envisions and constructs for it. Seneca's Diespiter then takes up this invitation, which Ovid has extended, to treat the *Metamorphoses* as open and malleable in this way.

Yet it is not simply the temporal structure of the *Metamorphoses* and Ovid's own treatment of his poetic corpus that allows for Diespiter's positioning of Claudius'

---

[153] McNelis 2009.405 touches on the importance of Ovid's temporal structure.

[154] Some examples: the opening lines of the *Amores* attest to its changing from five books to a slimmed down version of three books; the idea of a third book of the *Ars Amatoria* focused on the female perspective appears to be spontaneously conceived as Ovid closes the second book; the *Fasti* is broken off mid way through the calendar.

[155] *Tristia* 1.1.119-20 *his mando dicas, inter mutata referri / fortunae vultum copora posse meae;* 1.7.33-4 *hos quoque sex versus, in primi fronte libelli / si praeponendos esse putabis, habe.*

[156] See Barchiesi 1991.6-7, 1997.187-8; Holzberg 2002b.152 and Green 2004.28-9.

apotheosis as a sequel to the poem, but also the prominence of one particular strand of stories within it. Diespiter's suggested addition to the poem is not justified by the numerous tales of transformation with their varied aims, concerns and emphases that the poem contains. Rather, it hinges on the particular kind of metamorphosis that he hopes Claudius will undergo, namely an apotheosis. Out of all the fluctuating tales in the *Metamorphoses* the rising crescendo of apotheoses in the second half of the poem, and especially near its very end, are what most impress Diespiter. This crescendo begins with Hercules (9.89-272); continues with Achilles (12.579-628), Aeneas (14.581-608) and Romulus (14.804-28); and culminates in Julius Caesar (15.745-842) and the prediction of Augustus' apotheosis (15.843-70). Among these, Bonandini rightly emphasizes the apotheosis of Julius Caesar, and the anticipation of Augustus' deification in the final book. Other examples of the apotheosis of mortals would not on their own be as effective in supporting Claudius' cause. The familial connection to the recent apotheosized members of the Julio-Claudians is the necessary link to provide weight to Diespiter's argument. Bonandini writes "attraverso il richiamo alle *Metamorfosi,* dunque, Claudio viene inserito alla fine di una linea genealogica che, attraverso Augusto e Cesare, rimonta fino ad Enea e a Venere."[157] If Claudius cannot be deemed worthy of apotheosis on his own merits, Diespiter makes a rhetorically savvy move by embedding Claudius within the contest of his Julio-Claudian ancestors.

Diespiter has already signaled his strategy when he explicitly mentions the blood kinship between Claudius, Augustus and Livia, and stresses that these ancestors of

[157] Bonandini 2010.187.

Claudius have already become gods.[158] The familial connection is already in place. The reference to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* draws attention again to that familial line but it also adds a different type of authority and endorsement to the argument, a specifically literary one. Bonandini is again illuminating when she refers to the "istituzionalizzazione" of Claudius' divine genealogy in Ovid's poem and she observes that by citing Ovid Diespiter "sembra delegare ad un'opera letteraria la ratifica della natura divinia dei nuovi dei."[159] Diespiter could have cited a variety of literary predecessors in various genres or he could have referred to the official form of record-keeping at Rome for such imperial achievements, the *fasti*.[160] However, he chooses to cite Ovid's epic poem as the official repository of cultural authority with regard to imperial apotheoses, and so as the most appropriate and authoritative venue for recording such events.

By assuming that Ovid's poem can be re-opened and continued down to the current time, and by treating the *Metamorphoses* as the culturally authoritative record of imperial apotheoses, Diespiter creates an implicit endorsement for Claudius' apotheosis, which hinges on the linear temporal connection to his predecessors in the Julio-Claudian family. On his own merits Claudius may not appear to be worthy of deification, but through his connection with this particular literary past Diespiter raises Claudius to the same level as those who went before him. This is a persuasive move on Diespiter's part

---

[158] 9.5 *cum divus Claudius et divum Augustum sanguine contingat nec minus divam Augustam aviam suam…*

[159] Bonandini 2010.186.

[160] In part Diespiter's reference to Ovid's poem balances Janus' citation of homer in his speech against the apotheosis of humans (9.3). McNelis 2009.405 discusses the significance of Ovid's epic as a response to Homer versus Virgil. Eden 1984.114 comments on the *Metamorphoses* as being an unexpectedly comic substitution for the official *fasti.* This is a point I will return to in sections two and three.

as at least initially his speech appears to have been convincing to the audience within the text.[161]

Thus far I have been considering the dynamics of the reference to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* within the immediate context of Diespiter's speech and Diespiter's motivations. Although it is necessary to have this foundation in place, it is not enough only to consider Diespiter's perspective and to take the comment at face-value, especially in such a satirically motivated work. McNelis has suggested that one way of expanding the mention of Ovid that seeks to puncture any support for Claudius' apotheosis. Diespiter may treat the poem as culturally authoritative, but in fact, in McNelis' reading, the epic poem shares the satirical agenda of the current text. Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is full of incredible tales of metamorphoses, some of them rivaling the absurdity inherent in the idea of Claudius' becoming a god.[162] The *Metamorphoses* is therefore the appropriate venue for the recording of Claudius' apotheosis because his deification would be a worthy successor to those accounts of fantastical change, not because it inaugurates a solemn tradition of recording imperial apotheoses. Bonandini follows a different reading when she moves beyond Diespiter's perspective, but she also views the underlying motive of referring Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as further emphasizing Claudius' innate flaws and unsuitability as a candidate for apotheosis. By drawing attention to Claudius' kinship, not only with Augustus, whom the senate deified immediately upon his death, but also with Livia, who was deified thirteen years after her death shortly after the succession of Claudius himself, Bonandini argues that Diespiter's speech unintentionally underlines the progressive inflation of divinity produced by the habit of deifying members of the

[161] 9.6 *variae erant sententiae, et videbatur Claudius sententiam vincere.*
[162] McNelis 2009.405.

imperial family.[163] This suggests that Claudius' case for divinity is based not on his own merits and that only his blood kinship makes him a candidate for apotheosis.

Both of these readings fit with the next stage of the satire, when Augustus is roused to address the gods for the first time to stop Claudius from joining their ranks (10.1). Augustus succeeds in stopping Claudius from securing a place among the gods, repeatedly emphasizing Claudius' innate worthlessness and breaking the connection between him and his Julio-Claudian predecessors. These readings acknowledge a gap between the manner in which Diespiter is employing the reference to Ovid's poem and Seneca's satirical goals on a broader level. The *Metamorphoses* can be read as a source of authority for Claudius apotheosis by Diespiter, and simultaneously as an argument against his apotheosis. Diespiter may wish to raise Claudius to the level of his imperial ancestors who were deified, but ultimately, despite his kinship with the Julio-Claudians, Claudius fails to live up to those familial ties thanks to his own personal failings. This way of reading suggests that Claudius is the weak link in this scenario and leaves the value of his predecessors, such as Augustus, intact.

However, I think that Seneca intends the reference to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* to do more than focus our attention on Claudius' flaws, marking him as different and worse than the others who have undergone apotheosis before him, and therefore sullying the institution. On the contrary, the *Metamorphoses* provides a much broader perspective on the practice of apotheosis and closer scrutiny of the connections and thematic resonances between these two texts shows that those mortals who have undergone apotheosis in the past were just as compromised as Claudius. Diespiter may not be able to raise Claudius to the level of Augustus et al, but Ovid's poem can certainly bring these supposedly

[163] Bonandini 2010.187.

reputable figures down to Claudius' level. One might therefore conclude not that Claudius is unique in being unworthy to rise to the level of a god, but that all of them were compromised to some extent.

1.2 The *Metamorphoses* as Prequel to the *Apocolocyntosis*

We know that the *Metamorphoses* contains several stories of the apotheosis of mortals, thus providing a basis for Diespiter to position Claudius' potential deification as a sequel to the epic poem. But if we are to understand the contemporary events of the *Apocolocyntosis* as a sequel to the *Metamorphoses*, then the *Metamorphoses* must necessarily be available as a prequel. Diespiter cannot limit the reader's understanding of the *Metamorphoses* to the elements he wishes to foreground. He shines the spotlight on the *Metamorphoses* from his perspective of the *Apocolocyntosis* as a sequel, but with the result that the rest of the poem that he wishes to remain in the shadows is now available for the reader to bring in to their reading of the *Apocolocyntosis*. The whole of the *Metamorphoses* is available as a prequel. The result is that we must now ask the question what type of prequel does the *Metamorphoses* actually provide? How does the poem present the process of apotheosis and divine identity? The different stories of apotheosis contained in the *Metamorphoses* are frequently rattled off in list form as commentary on this passage in the satire. But, rather than bundling them altogether as one mass, if we separate out the tales of apotheosis in order to consider whose divine origins are contained in the poem and how these stories are presented, a different perspective on the process of apotheosis emerges, one that is deeply relevant to the characters in the *Apocolocyntosis* and the themes of the satire.

Firstly, let's consider exactly whose experience of apotheosis is recorded in the *Metamorphoses* and hence who is presented as exemplary for Claudius. The stories that come to mind immediately when Diespiter mentions the *Metamorphoses* include the apotheoses of Hercules (*M.* 9.211-272), Aeneas (*M.* 14.581-608), Romulus (*M.* 14.816-828), Julius Caesar (*M.* 15.745-851) and the forecast of Augustus' deification (*M.* 15.861-870). From this list of five, three are named in the *Apocolocyntosis* (Hercules, Romulus and Augustus), and two of those three (Hercules and Augustus) take part in the debate over Claudius' fate.[164] The previous examples of apotheosis, which Diespiter is alluding to in Ovid's poem, are thus not distant examples for a far-off past. Ovid's *Metamorphoses* provides an account of an event in the personal history of these characters in the satire. For this particular audience of divinities Diespiter's reference to Ovid's poem is not simply an academic one, disconnected from their own lives. The predecessor to whom Diespiter wishes to connect current events speaks personally to his audience, as it contains the stories either of how they themselves came to be in such a privileged position among the gods, or of how their fellow gods came to be beside them. Perhaps Diespiter wishes to remind them of their humble origins and gain leniency for Claudius. If so he was unsuccessful, as Augustus' speech thoroughly outstrips Diespiter's and wins over the audience within the text. However, that does not stop the external reader from thinking further about the personal histories of these characters and the details of their transformation from mortal to divine, the stage through which Claudius currently wishes to pass.

[164] Aeneas and Julius Caesar are not mentioned in the *Apocolocyntosis.* Although it is difficult to extrapolate an argument from absence, it is possible that the dominance of Augustus and the subsequent members of the imperial family accounts for their absence. The satire is going to turn out to be Augustus' show and the presence of Aeneas and Julius Caesar as his closest predecessors and ideological basis would have complicated Augustus' status here.

One aspect, which is prominent through the accounts of apotheosis within the *Metamorphoses* and relevant to contemporary events in the satire, is that there is a common thread of contested paths to apotheosis. In none of the stories told by Ovid is there a simple movement from human to divine. The transition is contested in some way, leaving an overall impression of uncertainty and doubt surrounding the process. For example, all the candidates for apotheosis are sponsored by various gods with whom they have a special relationship with varying degrees of acceptance or reluctance on the part of the rest of the gods. Many advocates also rely on blood ties between the mortals and themselves, or with Jove, in order to make the case for deification. In the case of Hercules, as he is burning, Jove addresses the gods. He stresses his paternal relationship with Hercules, and he is happy that the other gods are showing favor to this offspring. [165] He also appears to anticipate and abruptly cut off any disapproval for Hercules' apotheosis, in particular from Juno.[166] In Book 14 the story of Aeneas' apotheosis is told first. Venus seeks the approval of the gods, working her charms on Jove and underlining Aeneas' genealogical connection to Jove through herself.[167] Before the end of the same book Ovid also recounts the apotheosis of Romulus. This time it is Mars who advocates for apotheosis of a family member. Again blood ties are stressed, but here Mars seems especially concerned to hold Jove to his original promise to deify Romulus.[168] Mars quotes back to Jove the words he spoke to Mars in front of a council of the gods (*M.*

---

[165] *M.* 9.244-246: *totoque libens mihi pectore grator, / quod… mea progenies vestro quoque tuta favore est.*

[166] *M.* 9.256- 261: *siquis tamen Hercule, siquis / forte deo doliturus erit, data praemia nolet, / sed meruisse dari sciet, invitusque probabit.' / adsensere dei. coniunx quoque regia visa est / cetera non duro, duro tamen ultima vultu / dicta tulisse Iovis, seque indoluisse notatam*.

[167] *M.* 14.585-590: *ambieratque Venus superos colloque parentis / circumfusa sui…dixerat / Aeneaeque meo, qui te de sanguine nostro / fecit avum, quamvis parvum des, optime, numen, / dummodo des aliquod!*

[168] 14.808-815: *tempus adest, genitor… / praemia, (sunt promissa mihi dignoque nepoti) / solvere et ablatum terris inponere caelo. / tu mihi concilio quondam praesente deorum / (nam memoro memorique animo pia verba notavi) / "unus erit, quem tu tolles in caerula caeli" / dixisti: rata sit verborum summa tuorum!'*

14.814): *unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli* – "there will be one whom you will raise up into the blue heave".[169] The sentence may concern Mars' involvement in an apotheosis, but the focus on *unus* is still jarring. As we are seeing, the process of apotheosis has not happened to only one individual, but to several, even occurring twice within Book 14 alone.

Finally we come to the culmination of these apotheoses and the cases of Julius Caesar and Augustus, the most recent additions to the pantheon of the gods as recorded in the *Metamorphoses*, and the point to which Claudius' apotheosis could be joined. The divinity of Julius Caesar and Augustus are oddly bound together in Ovid's version of their divine origins. There is a circular argument in Ovid's presentation of the case for Caesar's divinity. Although he may have many achievements to his name, the driving force behind his deification is not his own merits but his familial connection to Augustus. After listing Augustus' achievements, Ovid says that "in order that this man (Augustus) should not be born from mortal seed, that one (Julius Caesar) had to have been made a god" (*ne foret hic igitur mortali semine cretus, / ille deus faciendus erat, M.* 15.760-61). Kinship is the primary reason for Caesar's apotheosis, even if the familial tie is working backwards here. Venus then takes up Caesar's cause, voicing her complaints to any of the gods who will listen, until finally Jove answers her (*M.* 15.765-842). Jove's speech again reveals the kinship ties which will enable Caesar to become a god, when he says that Venus and Caesar's son will ensure that he ascends to heaven and is worshipped in the temples.[170]

---

[169] This line is an intertextual moment between Ovid and Ennius as Mars quotes the "original" words of Ennius' Jupiter (54-5 Sk.), as I discussed in Chapter One (page 46) in relation to Cipus and the *unus homo* theme. See Hinds 1998.14-16, c.f. Conte 1986.57-9.

[170] *Met.* 15.818-19: *ut deus accedat caelo templisque colatur, / tu facies natusque suus.*

Across these stories of apotheosis told in the *Metamorphoses* then, there are two common threads: a current divinity must advocate for the mortal who hopes to become a god, often forestalling displeasure from other deities; and kinship with those who are already divine (or who need to become divine) is often the crux of the argument made by the advocate. Partiality always seems to be in play. In essence this is not wholly dissimilar from contemporary events among the gods concerning Claudius in the *Apocolocyntosis*. Diespiter stresses Claudius' blood kinship with Augustus and Livia (*sanguine contingat* – "connected by blood", 9.5) and also Claudius' own role in deifying family members such as Livia (*quam ipse deam esse iussit* – "whom he himself ordered to be a goddess", 9.5). This is the same foundation upon which the apotheoses in the *Metamorphoses* also depend. The fact that someone must speak on behalf of Claudius' bid for deification, and the personal bias involved in that advocacy is also in keeping with the examples in the *Metamorphoses*. It is therefore not at all surprising when, immediately following Diespiter's reference to the *Metamorphoses* as the appropriate venue for recording apotheosis, Hercules realizes he has a chance at winning and runs to and fro among the gods, attempting to close the deal.[171] His behavior is reminiscent of Venus' solicitation of the gods in her bid to win apotheosis for Julius Caesar.[172]

When we take a closer look at the examples of apotheosis in the *Metamorphoses* to which Diespiter draws our attention, there are points of contact between the process of apotheosis in each text. The world of the *Metamorphoses* does not look too different from the contemporary world in the *Apocolocyntosis*, so far as the process of apotheosis is

---

[171] 9.6 *Hercules enim, qui videret ferrum suum in igne esse, modo huc modo illuc cursabat et aiebat: "noli mihi invidere, mea res agitur; deine tu si quid volveris in vicem faciam: manus manum lavat."*

[172] Damon 2010.58-59 comments on the parallel between Hercules' attempt to rustle up votes and Venus in the *Metamorphoses* as well as the earlier scene in the *Apocolocyntosis* in which Mercury persuades Clotho to show favor to Claudius (3).

concerned. This may appear to be an obvious point, since the similarity and connection between the two texts is precisely what Diespiter wishes to call attention to. However, as I discussed above, the immediate goal of Diespiter's reference to Ovid is to add the authoritative endorsement of his epic poem to Claudius' bid for deification. Diespiter wishes to draw on the cultural authority of the *Metamorphoses* to raise Claudius up to the level of the mortals who were deified before him. My argument is that when we think about how the process of apotheosis is depicted in the *Metamorphoses*, we do not find exemplary stories of deification to which level Claudius must be raised. Instead the details of Ovid's stories reveal that all of the previous candidates are no more obviously deserving than Claudius. The lobbying for support where the particular favorite of a god is concerned is a theme that runs through all of the stories. The fact that the *Metamorphoses* does not present accounts of disinterested individuals unconnected with contemporary events in the satire drives home the similarity between Claudius and those who are now either arguing for or against him or judging him. These gods, Hercules, Romulus, Augustus, are personally implicated in the past recorded in the *Metamorphoses* as they attempt to negotiate and influence the deification of another mortal in the present. The world of the *Metamorphoses* and that of the *Apocolocyntosis* are contiguous and consecutive, but not in the stable, authoritative way which Diespiter implies in order to bolster his own argument. The path to apotheosis has always been contested and uncertain, has always depended on personal favor and kinship ties.

If we take a broader view of apotheosis, the *Metamorphoses* is also thematically resonant and relevant to the issues at the heart of the *Apocolocyntosis* in another significant respect. Within these stories of apotheosis, there is the fundamental question

of divine identity, of who is a god and who is worthy of becoming a god. This immediately sets up the fact that divinity is not simply a permanent status. In the speech preceding Diespiter's, Janus laments the decline in the quality of divinities and wishes the process of deification to be outlawed altogether (*multa dixit de magnitudine deorum: non debere hunc vulgo dari honorem* – "he said many things concerning the greatness of the gods: this honor ought not to be given to the common crowd", 9.3). Not everyone is worthy of being made a god. This suggests that there is a line to be drawn between the long established, traditional gods, and the upstart newcomers, the latter having a shaky claim to divinity, muddying the divine pool, the former secure in their divine identity.[173] However, with the *Metamorphoses* in mind as a prequel, this dichotomy does not stand firm, either in Ovid's epic, or in the satire. Thus far I have focused on the stories of apotheosis in the *Metamorphoses* as the point of connection between the two texts. But Diespiter does not single out that aspect of the poem alone, he gives the title of the poem as whole (*Metamorphosis Ovidi* – Ovid's Metamorphoses", 9.5), and within the poem, there are frequent slippages and shifts in identity not only for mortals, but also for the traditional gods. Even those we might expect to be secure in their divinity, have an identity problem in the world Ovid has created.

One example of this is the slippage between the identity of Apollo and the sun-god.[174] Apollo's first prominent appearance is in Book One when he kills the Python and attempts to rape Daphne (*M.* 1.438-567). Book Two opens with the story of Phaethon, seeking the Palace of the Sun in order to learn the identity of his father (*M.* 2.1-366).

[173] This motif can be found in Lucilius' *concilium deorum* in which Apollo is the upstart newcomer (Fr. 19-32 W). For the connections between the Lucilian and Ovidian *concilium deorum* see Ahl 1985.95-7 and Degl'Innocenti Pierini 1987.
[174] Fontenrose 1940 looks at how Ovid describes the two in the *Metamorphoses*.

Phaethon's story is already one of contested divine identity, but there is the additional uncertainty of whether Apollo and the Sun-god are the same or not. In some traditions Apollo and Helios are differentiated, in others they are one and the same. Ovid employs the name Phoebus for both.[175] When reading the stories concerning them in the *Metamorphoses*, it would be hard to say definitively that the two gods are the same or different. The slippage is built into the stories.

Jupiter is perhaps one of the most important examples in this respect as in the *Metamorphoses* Ovid plays with the parallels between Jupiter and Augustus. Jupiter is prominent in Book One, overseeing a council of the gods, deciding on the fate of the human race (*M.* 1.177-210). Ovid's presentation of the *concilium deorum* as a meeting of the Senate is well established.[176] The divine establishment has strong overtones of a meeting of human senators, and in this scenario Jupiter takes on the role of Augustus. Ovid draws a parallel between the Jupiter / Lycaon assassination attempt and Augustus / impious plotter of contemporary events.[177] At the close of the poem, Ovid again creates parallels between the position of Augustus and that of Jupiter.[178] Jupiter and Augustus are clearly separate entities in the poem, but Ovid cultivates the parallels between the two, blurring the lines between the divine and the mortal.[179]

---

[175] For example at *M.* 3.151-2 Actaeon refers to Phoebus as the sun at noontime. The slippage between Apollo and the sun-god is also present in the *Apocolocyntosis*. When Seneca resorts to a poetic register in order to express the time of year and day on which Claudius died, the name he gives the deity is Phoebus (*iam Phoebus breviore via contraxerat arcum / lucis..* 2.1; *iam medium curru Phoebus diviserat orbem* 2.4). Phoebus appears again in the infamous *laudes neroniae,* named as Phoebus in the lines of poetry (*Phoebus adest* 4.15; *Phoebus ait* 4.12) and then as Apollo when Seneca switches back to prose (*haec Apollo* 4.2). Despite the different names, Seneca appears to identify the Sun-god and Apollo.

[176] See Bömer 1969 on *Met.* 1.177-81; Bretzigheimer 1993.26-31; Wheeler 1999.172-4.

[177] Anderson 1997.172.

[178] *Met.* 15.858-60: *Iuppiter arces / temperat aetherias et mundi regna triformis, / terra sub Augusto est; pater est et rector uterque*.

[179] Buchheit 1966.82; Müller 1987.270-88; Bretzigheimer 1993.19-74; Segal 2001-2002.78-99. The equation of a ruler with Zeus / Jupiter continues a motif of Hellenistic poetry and panegyric, for example in Theocritus' encomium of Ptolemy II Philadelphus in *Idyll* 17. For discussion see Strootman 2010.40-45.

In the *Apocolocyntosis* Claudius' fate as mortal or divine may be the case under review, but when we read with the lens of the *Metamorphoses* it becomes clear that the deities in the *Apocolocyntosis* also do not have permanent, stable divine identities. I have already argued that Diespiter's reference to the *Metamorphoses* highlights the mortal origins of certain characters in the *Apocolocyntosis*, such as Hercules, Romulus and Augustus. They exemplify one type of identity instability prominent in both texts, having undergone a transformation from mortal to divine. However, just as in the *Metamorphoses*, in the *Apocolocyntosis* it is not only the newer gods who were subject to slippages and shifts in relation to their divine status and identity. Those deities whose divine identity appears to be firmly established also can be understood as having evolved from a different, earlier form.

We do not have to move too far from the reference to the *Metamorphoses* to find divinities whose identity is questionable. As it is Diespiter who voices the explicit reference to Ovid, it is worth scrutinizing who exactly he is meant to be, especially as this is not a simple question to answer.[180] Seneca gives us a few details in the text itself. Diespiter is the son of Vica Pota; he was consul elect; a small time moneylender, who used to maintain a livelihood by this pursuit; he was accustomed to selling citizenship benefits; and he is persuaded when Hercules touches his ear-lobe to speak in support of Claudius.[181] If taken at face value, there are varied ways in which these details can be contextualized and understood within the broader themes of the satire. For example, Diespiter's alleged mother, Vica Pota, was an obscure deity whose temple was positioned

---

[180] This question was most fully addressed, although with no definitive answers, in scholarship of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. See Schenkl 1863.23; Bucheler 1864-67.466; Gertz 1888.843; Ball 1902; Hoering 1903. For a more recent summary of pertinent contexts see Eden 1984.112.

[181] *Proximus interrogator sententiam Diespiter, Vicae Potae filius, et ipse designates consul, nummulariolus. Hoc quaestu se sustinebat: vendere civitatulas solebat. ad hunc belle accessit Hercule et auriculam illi tetigit.* 9.4.

at the bottom of the Palatine, adjacent to the money-changers' booths, a prime location for a son who made his living as a *nummulariolus* (money-lender).[182] His occupation of selling citizenship rights could fit an agenda for satirizing Claudius, who was notorious for being involved in the trafficking of citizenship.[183] Claudius' antiquarian interests could also be a target as he revived the traditional formula of the Fetial priests, which included the name, Diespiter, in striking treaties with foreign princes.[184] The few pieces of information provided in the text do provide grounds for Diespiter to speak on behalf of Claudius.

However, if we focus only on these details given in the text, we blind ourselves to a significant piece of the puzzle surrounding the question of Diespiter's identity, which most crucially would have been part of an ancient reader's reaction to his name. It is important to note that Seneca in the text of the *Apocolocyntosis* is the only author to connect the name Diespiter with Vica Pota and to provide this particular lineage and background. It would not necessarily have been an association already familiar to an ancient audience. Instead what would most likely have come to mind for an ancient reader would be the association between Diespiter and the supreme ruler of the gods, Jupiter. Ancient etymological and scholarly writings firmly connect Diespiter, resolved into *dies pater* – "father of the daylight" – with the etymologically cognate group of names for Jupiter / Zeus.[185] Literary usages of Diespiter across a range of genres and time periods also suggest a clear identification of the name with Jupiter in the Roman

[182] Livy 2.7.12.
[183] Dio 60.17.5.
[184] Suet. *Claud.* 25.
[185] Varro *LL.* 5.66.2; Gellius 5.12.5; Servius *Aen.* 9.570, repeated at *Mythog. Vat.* 3.3.1. c.f. Brill's New Pauly entry for Iuppiter.

imagination.[186] One example of especial relevance to the Claudian context of the *Apocolocyntosis* is Livy's account of a treaty sworn between the Romans and the Albans, sealed by the traditional formula of the fetial oath, which Suetonius records that Claudius revived. In the oath, which Livy maintains is the formula handed down by tradition, the god addressed is first named as Jupiter, and subsequently as Diespiter.[187] It is clear that Diespiter is simply another name for Jupiter, and that is equivalency was familiar in antiquity.[188]

So we have two different strands to follow in order to contextualize the name Diespiter, one relying solely on the details given within the text, the other taking into account the broader historical and literary context for the name. One could claim that the second is unnecessary because Jupiter is clearly a separate character distinct from Diespiter within the text.[189] However, given the weight of the evidence for the name Diespiter in other Latin texts, from Plautus to Sulpicia, including poetic, historical and linguistic texts, I do not think that we can assume that Seneca had the latitude to construct his version of Diespiter within a vacuum or that he lacked awareness of the close association with Jupiter which the name would conjure up for an ancient audience. Even though the text provides an apparent coherence to the picture of Diespiter, Seneca does

[186]Examples of the name used on its own include Plautus *Poenulus* 739 and 869; Plautus *Capt.* 909; Horace *Carmina* 3.2.29. In these examples the name most likely refers to Jupiter but there is no specific evidence for this within the text. However, in other texts, such as Horace *Carmina* 1.34.5-12 and Sulpicia *Conquestio de statu rei publicae* 33, qualities specifically related to Jupiter are connected with the name Diespiter. In the case of Sulpicia a line from Virgil's Jupiter is quoted in relation to Diespiter (*imperium sine fine dedi*), removing any doubt that they are thought of as the same deity.

[187]Livy 1.24.8 ***Iuppiter*, *audi… si prior defexit publico consilio dolo malo, tum tu ille* ***Diespiter*** *populum Romanum sic ferito ut ego hunc porcum hic hodie feriam.*

[188] Hence any argument that seeks to explain the mention of Diespiter in the *Apocolocyntosis* in light of Claudius' revival of the fetial oath is on shaky ground if it treats Diespiter as his own wholly distinct deity without accounting in some form for the original identification between Diespiter and Jupiter.

[189] Jupiter is given the message about a strange creature at the gates of Heaven and sends Hercules to investigate (*Apoc.* 5); Jupiter presides over the meeting of the gods, intervening when it gets out of hand (*Apoc* 9).

not give us a real basis to untangle the names Jupiter and Diespiter, and hence their identities. When Diespiter is introduced, his name appears first, and then his lineage follows. On the basis of most examples of this name in other texts, Diespiter could, at least at first, be taken to be another name to refer to Jupiter.[190] This obviously proves quickly not to be the case with the description of Diespiter that follows. However, there is still a legitimate question as to whether Diespiter is in some way connected with Jupiter, as is most often the case. Simply stating that they are two different deities cannot entirely erase the consciousness that the two are firmly connected in other circumstances.

What is the relationship between these two gods? Was Jupiter once the same as Diespiter? Were his origins once as lowly as Seneca constructs Diespiter's to be? Or was Diespiter once as grand as Jupiter? Did he at some later point in time separate from Jupiter and devolve down to the status he has in this text, that of a *nummulariolus*? We cannot distinguish between these different possibilities or be certain that they are implied by the text, but we do not need to. In this text about apotheosis and transformation, in close proximity to a reference to the fluctuating world of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, it is worth recognizing that there are questions surrounding the identity of Diespiter, and more importantly, that those questions implicate the presiding deity, Jupiter. Seneca could have employed any name at this point to fit the character he has created, the son of an obscure goddess, who is open to bribes and engages in such lowly activity as money-lending. Instead, he chose to use the particular name, Diespiter, which on the basis of the name in other texts, was open to confusion with Jupiter. There is no definitive answer to who exactly Diespiter is meant to be, or which associations Seneca intended to be conjured by

[190] It is worth noting that Seneca has already referred to Jupiter as both *Iuppiter* and as *Iove* (*Iovi* 5.2; *Iuppiter* 5.3; *Iove* 8.2; *Iovi* 9.1).

employing this particular name, but that may be precisely the point. Diespiter's identity, and any potential connection to Jupiter, cannot be pinned down. In this light Diespiter becomes a fitting figure to speak at this moment, joining our list of deities in the immediate vicinity of the reference to the *Metamorphoses* (Hercules, Romulus, Augustus) whose identities are not firmly fixed but have changed and evolved over time.

When viewed through the lens of Ovid's poetry even Janus, who professes to be highly critical of newer gods, can also be understood as a deity whose identity has undergone a transformation. The *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* together provide Janus' history, and reveal that he did not always have the two-faced appearance for which he is well-known today. In the opening book of the *Fasti* the poet asks Janus the reason why he alone of the gods sees both what is behind and ahead (*F.* 1.91-2). Janus replies thus (*F.* 1.103, 111-14):

> me Chaos antiqui (nam sum res prisca) vocabant….
> tunc ego, qui fueram globus et sine imagine moles,
> in faciem redii dignaque membra deo.
> nunc quoque, confusae quondam nota parva figurae,
> ante quod est in me postque videtur idem.

The ancients called me Chaos (for I am a primitive being)… Then I, who had been a shapeless mass, a ball, took on the appearance and limbs befitting a god. Even now, a small sign of my once jumbled shape, my front and back appears the same.

Janus, in his own words, has not always been Janus. He was once the ultimate first and ancient matter, Chaos, who evolved into the deity he is now, a previous identity that draws the reader back to the beginning of the *Metamorphoses*.[191] The first speaker of

---

[191] Much has been made of the connections between the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* that the figure of Janus provides. See Hinds 1987a.42-3; Barchiesi 1991.6, 15; Hardie 1991.52ff; Barchiesi 1997.230-1; DiLorenzo 2001(Diss).

the *Fasti* used to be Chaos, the subject matter with which the *Metamorphoses* opens.[192] The marked difference in their appearances, as Kate DiLorenzo notes, underlines the extent of the transformation that has taken place.[193] While Janus is *biformis* ("two-formed", *F.* 1.89), Chaos is marked as the opposite (*unus…vultus* – "one…face", *M.* 1.6*;* *corpore in uno* – "in one body", *M.* 1.18). Janus may be introduced in the *Apocolocyntosis* as "a fellow who sees both in front and behind" (*homo…qui semper videt ἅμα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω* 9.2), but the background of Ovid's poetry reminds us that this notable feature of his appearance has not always been integral to who Janus is.

All three of the speakers, (Janus, Diespiter and Augustus) as well as the other gods who are named in this section of the text (Jupiter, Hercules, Romulus), have this shared point of contact concerning their divine status, which is illuminated by the reference to Ovid. All have evolved in some way to become the gods that they are in this text or have some kind of question mark over their identity. Their identities have not been static, whether that is due to their transformation from mortal to divine, or to a certain blurriness concerning the edges of where the name of one god ends and another begins, or having once been a different form entirely. Regardless of the basis of the shift in their identities, these gods were once different, marking them all as metamorphic in some way. A certain fluidity concerning divine identity, which is exemplified in the world of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is thus also part of these gods. The fabric of the world of the *Apocolocyntosis* based on shifting identities and changes in status is thus akin to Ovid's world, a connection which Seneca pushes us to comprehend by putting a reference to the

[192] *Met.* 1.5-7: *Ante mare et terras et quod tegit omnia caelum / unus erat toto naturae vultus in orbe, / quem dixere chaos: rudis indigestaque moles…*
[193] DiLorenzo (Diss) 2001.39.

Metamorphoses in the mouth of Diespiter within the context of the discussion concerning Claudius' potential apotheosis.

In considering Seneca's agenda in referring explicitly to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* I have moved from the level of Diespiter who makes the connection to broader resonances between the two texts which Seneca is making. Questions of continuation and authority were at the core of both discussions. Diespiter may have wished to draw on the authority of the *Metamorphoses* in terms of imperial apotheoses, but closer consideration of what type of prequel the *Metamorphoses* is in relation to apotheosis and divine identity suggests that the earlier poem cannot be employed as a source of authority in such an uncomplicated fashion. Through the resonances with the *Metamorphoses* we can perceive that Claudius is not a unique case in his path to apotheosis, worse than those deities who are judging him. The divine establishment of the *Apocolocyntosis*, both new and old gods, are implicated in the stories Ovid tells about divine identity. Claudius is in fact in good company.

In this section I have focused on the connections that Seneca is making with a particular part of Ovid's corpus, namely the poem that is named in the text, the *Metamorphoses*. The foundation for the connections between the two texts was easily comprehensible as it was based on the linear temporal sequence of the earlier poem. However, in the course of my argument, another text of Ovid's has surfaced, the *Fasti,* which is not based on a linear progression of time. Instead it is structured by the calendar, by cyclical time, and therefore any connection with a later text cannot be so easily conceptualized as along a linear timeline. Yet, in order to view Janus as metamorphic, it

is necessary to have both poems in mind. The cyclical poem cannot be separated from the linear one. They fit together.

Ovid's *Fasti* would be unfathomable without an understanding of the historical institution of the *fasti*, since Ovid adopts and exploits that form in structuring his poem. The historical fasti also happen to surface in scholarly discussion of this exact point in the *Apocolocyntosis.* In his commentary on this passage Eden comments that the *Metamorphoses* is an unexpectedly comic substitution for the official *fasti*, where such an event should have been recorded.[194] One could say that the *fasti* are conspicuous by their absence. Eden refers only to the calendrical institution of the *fasti.* But surely, if the *Metamorphoses* is in some way a startling substitution for one kind of *fasti*, we cannot forget (and Seneca would not have forgotten) that the poet whom the text mentions by name, happened also to have written a poem on that very subject, namely the *Fasti.* As the aim of this chapter is to explore and explicate Seneca's interaction with Ovid in the *Apocolocyntosis*, this apparent absence deserves greater scrutiny. Both the historical *fasti* and Ovid's *Fasti* have been missing from discussion of the *Apocolocyntosis.* In the next two sections of this chapter I will address this gap in the scholarship. I will argue that just as Seneca is engaging with, parodying and puncturing many different modes and genres in the course of the satire, he is also engaging with calendrical concerns and cyclical time in the form of the *fasti*, and further to that, with Ovid's poem, the *Fasti,* the most recent poetic intervention in the tradition of the *fasti*. The *Metamorphoses* may be the only Ovidian work that is named in the text, but this does not preclude Seneca from interacting with another Ovidian work without specifically naming it within his text.

Section Two: The *fasti* and the *Apocolocyntosis*

[194] Eden. 1984.114.

The *fasti* and how it creates and relates to the Roman conception of time are vast topics in their own right.[195] As such, I will comment on both only to the extent that it is necessary for my argument in relation to the *Apocolocyntosis* and Ovid's two poems. The linear temporal relationship, which supports the connection between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Apocolocyntosis,* was not the only temporal frame available to Seneca. The Roman conception of time encompassed both a linear and cyclical time frame. The practicalities and ramifications of this are much discussed in contemporary scholarship. For example, Laurence and Smith state that "the nature of time at Rome was a culturally embedded system that relied upon a linear history and genealogy, alongside an annual calendar of events."[196] The official time and record-keeping institution at Rome encompassed both aspects of this conception of time: the "consular" *fasti* provided a list of eponymous chief magistrates, principally the consuls, who gave their names to the year, while the "calendrical" *fasti* was the annual calendar in which days and months reoccur in a regular cycle.[197] Both are necessary in order to fix the day and the year, a crucial task of any calendrical system, but they work on the basis of different temporal frames.[198] In focusing on the *Metamorphoses* in the first part of this chapter, I was concerned with connections between the two texts in relation to a linear time frame, "time's arrow". I will now consider how Seneca structures the text in relation to the other

---

[195] For initial bibliography see Taylor and Holland 1952; Hanell 1956; Beard 1987; Feeney 2007.
[196]Laurence and Smith 1995-6.133.
[197] "Calendrical" and "consular "are modern terms used by Degrassi in his edition of the surviving inscriptions to help distinguish between the different types. Ancient sources refer to both as *fasti*.
[198] Hanell 1956: symbiosis of the two kinds of fasti as part of the calendar, the interdependence as the means of fixing a mark in Roman time. Taylor and Holland 1952: "The two types of *fasti*, consular list and calendar, enumerations of years and days, belonged together."

time frame integral to the Roman conception of time, a cyclical time frame, "time's cycle."[199]

In this section I will first briefly sketch in the context of the *fasti* as it would be relevant to Seneca to demonstrate that the calendrical *fasti* was bound up together with contemporary concerns surrounding the imperial family and apotheosis. This context is important as the fact that the *fasti* was enmeshed in the contentious questions of imperial dynastic succession furnishes a credible motivation for Seneca to be interacting with the *fasti*. Secondly I will pinpoint calendrical moments in the *Apocolocyntosis* to establish that Seneca was evoking and engaging with the *fasti* and cyclical time from the outset. In this section I will be leaving Ovid to one side for the most part and concentrating on how and why Seneca is concerned with the institution of the *fasti*, regardless of any interaction with Ovid's poetic *Fasti*. This is necessary because the *fasti* has not been previously discussed as an important context for Seneca and a mode with which he is engaging. Even though engagement with the *fasti* is not a pre-requisite for Seneca to be interacting with Ovid's *Fasti*, the former adds weight to my argument for the latter. It is for this reason that in this section I will limit myself to the historical *fasti* and close reading of moments in the text which relate to cyclical time without necessarily also being concerned with Ovid's *Fasti*. This is not to deny that the two are closely bound together, depend and build upon one another. There are also moments in the text, which will only come into focus as engaging with the calendar through the lens of Ovid's calendrical poem. For the purpose of clarity, I will establish the basis for my argument in relation to the historical *fasti* in this section, In Section Three my primary focus will then be Ovid's

[199] From this point forward I am not concerned with the "consular" portion of the *fasti* and therefore for the sake of clarity I will use the term *fasti* to refer only to the calendrical portion of the *fasti*.

Fasti and a fuller explication of Seneca's interaction with the calendar and its ideological implications, encompassing both the historical and the poetic.

2.1 The Context of the *fasti* for Seneca

As the form and status of the calendrical *fasti* was not static, there are a few key aspects and events, which we should bear in mind in relation to Seneca and his position under the Julio-Claudians. The first is the reform of the calendar by Julius Caesar. At the juncture of republican and imperial forms of power and governing, in 45 BC Julius Caesar overhauled the annual calendar with a myriad of far-reaching effects from the mundane and mechanical to the conceptual and symbolic.[200] A second important aspect is the dramatic effect that Augustus and the principate had on the calendar.[201] The imperial family became embedded in the *fasti* when previously individual mortals had not been part of its remit.[202] Feeney describes the change as "every few days, another imperial anniversary, another commemoration of the princeps and his family, a positive invasion, a planned and systematic act of intrusion".[203] Births, deaths, and most importantly for us in relation to the *Apocolocyntosis*, apotheoses of imperial family members were recorded and commemorated in the calendar.[204] The personal events from the linear timeline of an individual (imperial) life were inscribed into cyclical time with the result that they would reoccur annually.[205] From this development the ideological

[200] Bibliography on Republican Calendar and Julius' Caesar's reforms: Michels 1967; Blackburn and Holford Strevens 1999; Bickerman 1980.
[201] Large bibliography on the subject of the Principate's impact on the *fasti*: Beard 1987; Wallace-Hadrill 1987; Fraschetti 1990; Rupke 1995 and 2011.
[202] E.g. months named after Julius Caesar and Augustus. The Augustalia was the first festival to be named after a living mortal.
[203] Feeney 1992.5.
[204] For epigraphic evidence for Augustan *fasti see* Degrassi 1954; Herz, 1978; and Rupke 1995 and 2011.
[205] See Feeney 1992 and Laurence and Smith 1995-6 for more on this idea.

stakes of the *fasti* were raised.[206] Ovid's *Fasti* should be mentioned here as a significant intervention in the tradition of the *fasti* in the wake of the Augustan ideological impact on the calendar. Ovid demonstrates his awareness of the particularly imperial ideological potential now embodied in the *fasti*, engaging with such ideologies bound up in the form, exploiting them and developing them further.[207] The Augustan period and the changes to the *fasti* that it brought quickly became foundational in their own right.[208]

However, the calendar and the uses to which it could be deployed by the emperor and the senatorial elite continued to evolve. The *fasti* as a locus for imperial power maneuvering intensified even further after Augustus. Suggesting changes and additions to the *fasti* became part of the language of flattery and praise employed by the Senate in their relationship with the emperor.[209] Emperors also made additions themselves to the calendar for their own personal agenda and consolidation of power.[210] As such additions by each emperor became the norm, so did deletions by the next emperor. The holidays

---

[206] The number of surviving fragmentary inscriptions of the *fasti* from the Augustan and Tiberian period suggest that the *fasti* were very much part of public consciousness in this period and part of the wider imperial discourse. See Rupke 2011 for discussion of the epigraphic record.

[207] It's hard to untwine bibliography on Ovid's *Fasti* from scholarship on Roman time as the poem is one of the pieces of evidence we have to aid our understanding of Roman time in general and Augustus' use of time and impact on the *fasti* in particular. Some key works are Beard 1987, Wallace Hadrill 1987, Hinds 1992a and b, Newlands 1995, Barchiesi, 1997 Pasco-Pranger 2006.

[208] Rupke 2011.139.

[209] Such flattering suggestions were not always accepted but the *fasti* was clearly an arena for this kind of posturing. Tiberius was disdainful of such offers from the Senate – he turned down a proposal that September should be given his name and October that of Livia (Suet. *Tib.* 26.2) and he appears to have seen through the game being played when he pointedly asked the Senate what they would do if there were 13 Caesars (Dio 57.18.2). Other emperors were not as dismissive – April was renamed after Nero (Tac. *Ann.* 15.74); Nero tried to rename other months from other parts of his name, May from a form of Claudius, June from Germanicus (Tac. *Ann.* 16.12); Domitian renamed September Germanicus and October Domitianus, as he came to the throne in the former and was born in the latter.

[210] For example Caligula instituted funeral sacrifices each year for his mother and brother as well as renaming September Germanicus in memory of his father (Suet. *Cal.* 15). See Suet. *Claud.* 11 and Dio 60.5.2. for Claudius' actions upon his accession to power.

added by a previous ruler would fall victim to the dynastic transition.[211] Even within the reign of a ruler, the *fasti* could reflect the rise and fall of imperial favorites.[212]

This fluidity and manipulation of the calendar at the whim of imperial power did not escape the notice of at least the elite, and probably the wider public, with the likely result that the *fasti* itself came to be devalued. A passage in Tacitus describing an event under Nero is illustrative of the tenor of attitude that we can imagine surrounds the *fasti* for this time period. In AD 58 Nero achieved a military victory for which he was voted various honors by the Senate, including that the days relating to the victory should be celebrated as national festivals.[213] More extravagant proposals were suggested until Gaius Cassius pointed out that if they were enacted, the whole year would be too short for their thanksgivings.[214] Cassius identifies the crucial flaw in using the *fasti* as a pawn in the relationship between Senate and emperor. There is only so much time available in the calendar and continued additions in this manner would quickly render the institution meaningless, a consequence of which contemporaries were seemingly aware. At the start of Vespasian's reign Tacitus relates that one action necessary for the new ruling power to have a clean slate was "to purge the public records defiled by the flattery of the times" (*fastos adulatione temporum foedatos exornerarent, Hist.* 4.40.2).

It is against this backdrop of the evolving status of the *fasti*, - from Julius Caesar's reform to Augustus' establishment of the *fasti* as a reflection of imperial time and personal power, to its open-endedness and liability to manipulation at the hands of the emperors and elite, - that we should consider how Seneca might be engaging with a

---

[211] Caligula and Claudius removed some of their predecessors' *ferialia* (Suet. *Cal.* 21.1; Dio 60.17.1).

[212] One example is Sejanus. His birthday was marked by public celebration in the calendar, but his abrupt fall from grace meant the removal of those celebrations and new *feriae* introduced on the day of his execution instead (Tac. *Ann.* 6.25.2).

[213] *Ann.* 13.41.5: *inter festos referretur dies.*

[214] *Ann.* 13.41.5: *ne totum quidem annum supplicationibus sufficere disseruerit*.

cyclical time frame and calendrical concerns in the *Apocolocyntosis* and with what motivation.

2.2 Cyclical / Calendrical Moments in the *Apocolocyntosis*

While there are clearly many layers and motivations to the ways in which Seneca exploits and molds the motif of time within the *Apocolocyntosis,* in this section I will establish that the *fasti* is also present as a temporal frame and tradition with which Seneca is purposefully engaging.[215] Seneca builds in moments in the satire that evoke a cyclical time frame and the types of concerns which correspond to cyclical time in the form of the calendar. These moments suggest that Seneca is aware of the growing manipulation of the *fasti* at the hands of imperial power. In the close readings, which follow Claudius in particular is to blame for distorting the calendar. This is caused both by deliberate acts on his part, and also simply arises from the natural events occurring in his life, such as birth and death. But in both these cases the disruption of the calendar is focused on Claudius' particularly monstrous nature that could potentially result in such drastic effects on the calendar.

The frame of cyclical time is raised at the very beginning of the text. While it has been argued that the opening paragraph parodies the conventions of historians' prefaces, dates and topics suitable to the context of the calendar are also present.[216] The opening sentence reads *quid actum sit in caelo ante diem III idus Octobris anno novo, initio*

---

[215] For example, Robinson 2005 argues that Seneca parodies annalistic, vatic and theogonic traditions of time and that he employs abrupt temporal transitions and periphrases in order to tacitly critique Claudius, Nero and the institution of the principate.

[216] See Damon 2010. The opening could theoretically also be an allusion to the wording of the *acta senatus,* although as we do not have examples of wording and structure, it is not possible to pursue this potential allusion further,. Such recordings of the official proceedings of the Senate were first made public by Julius Caesar in 59 BC (Suet. *Iul.* 20) but Augustus subsequently forbade their publication (Suet. *Aug.* 36). Little is known about the *acta senatus* in the early Principate beyond two citations, one in Tacitus referring to Nero (*Ann.* 15.74) and one in Suetonius when describing the birthplace of Augustus (*Aug.* 5). For discussion of our evidence for the *acta senatus* see Talbert 1984.308-337.

saeculi felicissimi, volo memoriae tradere (I want to commit to memory what happened in heaven on the thirteenth of October in the new year which was the beginning of a most prosperous era, 1.1). We are immediately told the day and month on which the action of the text is occurring, the 13th of October, the day on which Claudius died[217]. However, we are not told the specific year. In annalistic history the year would be fixed by naming the two consuls. As discussed above, the Roman conception of time required the names of the consuls (in relation to the linear temporal frame of the consular *fasti*) and the day and month (referring to the calendrical *fasti*) in order to firmly fix the point in history (day, month and year) on which an event happened. Without the names of the consuls to specify the point in the linear time frame of the consular *fasti*, the year to which the text is alluding (54 AD) would not have been immediately obvious.[218]

If the dating does not fix the action within a linear timeframe, instead the text can be understood in the context of the cyclical time frame of the calendar. The manner in which Seneca chooses to give the date in the opening sentence evokes a cyclical and hence calendrical time frame. Could the *Apocolocyntosis* be intended as the entry for this day in the calendrical *fasti*? This would then imply that what happens on this day would reoccur again on the same day when the cycle repeats, just as imperial honors were inscribed into the cycle of the year. But, instead of the normal honorable entry bestowed in the calendar upon the death or deification of an imperial person, it is the absurdity of Claudius' bid for apotheosis and his eventual banishment from the heavens that could be continually re-enacted year on year.

[217] Suet. *Cl.* 45; Dio 60.34.3.

[218] This is especially true because, although in the *Apocolocyntosis* the death of Claudius, his funeral and the conferment of divine honors occur on the same day, they did not actually all happen within the space of a single day. The date of October 13th alone would not necessarily have been immediately intelligible as the day of Claudius' death. See Tac *Ann.* 13.2.6 and Osgood 2011.242-259 for the shenanigans surrounding Claudius' death and funeral.

As we move through the sentence, after the day and month are given, the names of the consuls to fix the year are absent. Instead the sentence continues *anno novo* (in the new year). As we do not have the names of the consuls to mark the start of a new linear year, *anno novo* could be taken to mean the start of a new cycle of the calendar. This would be surprising as, of course, the start of the cyclical year is normally January 1st. We could identify this reference to a new year with the next chunk of the sentence, *initio saeculi felicissimi* (the beginning of a most prosperous era), understanding both to refer to the new era which is being introduced with the death of one emperor, and the coming rule of Nero. However we should not gloss over the idea that the death of Claudius on October 13th could impact the calendar to such an extent that the start of the cycle is moved from January 1st to this date in October. From Augustus onwards it was the norm for the births, deaths and achievements of the emperor and imperial family to be marked in the calendar. It was even possible for events concerning the emperor to change the start date of the new year in local calendars.[219] The clear distaste which the text displays for Claudius as a ruler would be consonant with the idea that the event of his death would be welcome to such an extent that from now on that date could mark the start of a new cycle.[220]

---

[219] See Laurence and Smith 1995-6.143-4 for variations in the start of the calendar depending on the emperor. E.g. in 9 BC the province of Asia adopted Augustus' birthday as the start of the calendar, some cities in Italy started the year on the day on which Augustus had visited. Very confusing!

[220] The possibility that the start of the year could move and was not firmly fixed was also not unheard of in the history of the calendar. In the opening of the *Fasti* Ovid relates how Romulus arranged the year into ten months, with the opening month named for his father (Mars-March) and the second for the originator of his line (Venus-April) and that it was Numa who added the two months onto the start of the year to honor Janus and the ancestors (*F.* 1.27-44). At the start of Book Three on March Ovid returns again to the idea that the yearly cycle once began in March, providing evidence that the Kalends of March was the first day of the year (*F.* 3.99-154). He continues the narrative about changes to the calendar, connecting the early history of Romulus and Numa with Julius Caesar and his more recent reform of the cycle of the calendar (*F.* 3.155-166).

Thus if we read the first sentence through a calendrical lens the form of dating given in *ante diem III idus Octobris anno novo* could read as the entry for a day in the *fasti* within time's cycle, rather than specifying a point in linear time. This could suggest that what we subsequently learn is the defining event on this date, namely Claudius' death, could have necessitated a change in the start date of the cycle of the year, meaning that this date, the 13th of October, was now the beginning of the yearly cycle. The absence of a specific year continues in the second section of the text in which Seneca parodies the bombastic circumlocutions of time, of which he suggests poets were unduly fond. As he expands on the different ways in which one can express time, switching between poetry and prose, the day, time of day and season of the year are marked but again we are still in the setting of days and months, not a historical year.[221]

There are two subsequent points in the text, which fit within the concerns of cyclical time and which also specifically relate to Claudius and the abnormal influence he had on the calendar. As Mercury and Clotho spar over the moment of Claudius' death, Mercury refers to the difficulty that astrologers have had at predicting the hour of his death, due to the uncertainty surrounding the day of his birth (3.2). This fits within the theme that marking points in time is a slippery business but Mercury also says that the astrologers have been burying Claudius every year, every month since he was made princeps (*mathematicos….qui illum, ex quo princeps factus est, omnibus annis omnibus mensibus efferunt,* 3.2). While the apotheoses of members of the imperial family would become a part of the *fasti* after their death, according to Mercury, Claudius' death has already become a repeated feature of the calendar, even before its actual occurrence.

---

[221] *Apoc* 2.1.1-5 Poetry: *iam Phoebus breviore via contraxerat arcum / lucis….. et deformis Hiems gratos carpebat honores / divitis Autumni; Apoc* 2.2 Prose: *mensis erat October, dies III idus Octobris.*

The anonymous speaker who lambasts Claudius for his wish to become a god also suggests that Claudius intentionally corrupted the workings of the calendar. The anonymous speaker hurls the criticism at Claudius that "even if he had asked this favor from Saturn, whose month he celebrated for the whole year as the Saturnalian emperor, the Saturnalian ruler would not have received it" (*si mehercules a Saturno petisset hoc beneficium, cuius mensem toto anno celebravit Saturnalicius princeps, non tulisset,* 8.2). The festival of Saturn traditionally occupied only one day in December, the 17th, but it was extended by Claudius and established as a festival lasting five days.[222] This in itself would be a significant extension of one festival. But the suggestion by the anonymous speaker goes even further. It seems that in celebrating the Saturnalia Claudius allowed one month, that of December, to take over and subsume the rest of the year. Seneca refers elsewhere to this phenomenon of Saturn's festival being indulged in for longer than was appropriate and that the month of December now seemed to be a whole year but he does so without specific blame being attributed to Claudius.[223] In the *Apocolocyntosis* the blame for the extension of the festival outside its proper boundaries, to the point that it takes over *toto anno*, is placed firmly on Claudius.

These examples show that elements relating to cyclical time are present in the *Apocolocyntosis.* It is a framework, which Seneca wants the reader to have in mind in relation to the action of the satire. These moments, which I have highlighted thus far as relating to the *fasti* and the concerns of cyclical time, also hinge on the figure of Claudius. Claudius has had an impact on the calendar while still alive (by extending the

---

[222] Dio 65.25.8.

[223] Sen. *Epp* 18,1: *December est mensis: ingenti apparatu sonant omnia, tamquam quicquam inter Saturnalia intersit et dies rerum agendarum; adeo nihil interest ut non videatur mihi errasse qui dixit olim mensem Decembrem fuisse, nunc annum.*

festival of Saturn beyond its proper boundaries and the repeated occurrence of his death every year and month before it actually happens) and also due to the event of his death (a day so joyous that it could cause the inauguration of a new annual cycle beginning on this date). As the impact on the calendar relates to Claudius, these moments could be understood within the broader themes of the satire, namely Claudius' monstrosity and his inability to fit within the normal boundaries of life due to that monstrous nature.[224] It is Claudius' unique awfulness and monstrosity that has caused such irregularities in time's cycle and interrupted the normal workings of the calendar.[225] These examples of calendrical elements in the text do certainly accuse Claudius in this way and could explain Seneca's motivation for engaging with cyclical time. It is another stick with which one can beat Claudius.

However, moments in the text concerning the *fasti* and calendrical questions do not only appear in relation to Claudius. These examples have served the purpose of establishing an initial basis for the presence of cyclical time in the *Apocolocyntosis* and the *fasti* as a mode that Seneca is aware of and engaging with. However, moments in the text relating to the *fasti* and time's cycle do not only appear in relation to Claudius. In the next section I will expand upon the presence of the *fasti* within the satire, utilizing the lens of Ovid's *Fasti* as well as the historical institution. In some ways these further moments appear disparate and perhaps even somewhat meaningless in their seeming randomness within the text. I will argue that it is only through the lens of the most recent literary treatment of the *fasti* by an author with his own complex relationship with

---

[224] See Braund 1998 for the ideological implications of the depiction of Claudius as monstrous.

[225] This suggestion also fits with Robinson's (2005) arguments that digressions and distortions of time in the *Apocolocyntosis* are caused by and befit the monstrous nature of Claudius. Robinson, however, does not discuss the presence of cyclical time.

imperial power, that these moments can be understood within the broader framework of cyclical time and the satire as a whole. In my readings based on Ovid's poem Seneca's motivation for drawing attention to the manipulation of the *fasti* moves beyond being simply another proof of Claudius' monstrosity (although that agenda may also be in play). Instead, the whole imperial machinery, its handovers of power and manipulation of the *fasti* for its own self-serving ends is implicated.

Section Three: Ovid's *Fasti* and the *Apocolocyntosis*

Seneca does not explicitly name the *Fasti* or direct the reader to think about his text in relation to the later Ovidian poem as he does with the *Metamorphoses*. However, this does not mean that the *Fasti* is definitively absent either. In other parts of his corpus Seneca alludes to Ovid without explicitly acknowledging what he is doing. When he does explicitly cite Ovid, it is often a hint that there is more to be uncovered in the surrounding passages in relation to Ovid.[226] It would thus be in keeping with how Seneca interacted with Ovid in other parts of his work to look further than just the explicit mention of the *Metamorphoses.* Through my readings in Section Two I demonstrated two key points which were an important foundation to have in place for my argument in relation to Ovid's *Fasti*: the first is that the subject matter of imperial apotheosis and dynastic succession was entwined with the *fasti*, with particular ideological implications for the calendar; the second is that there are moments in the satire which relate to cyclical time and the calendar, showing that Seneca is aware of the dialogue between the *fasti* and imperial power. The consequence of this for my argument in relation to Ovid's *Fasti* is that since a general frame of cyclical time and issues relating to the *fasti* are present at

[226] See the introduction to this chapter (Footnotes 143-45) for bibliography on Seneca's allusive habits in his wider corpus.

certain moments in the text, it is not a big leap for the reader to be also thinking about the *Fasti* and for Seneca to be pushing the reader to make connections with another Ovidian poem.

Why would Seneca cultivate connections with Ovid's *Fasti* as well as the *Metamorphoses*? The *Fasti* is an equally fertile prequel for Seneca in relation to apotheosis as the *Metamorphoses*, with the difference that since it was written at a later period, it provides a different perspective on apotheosis and the imperial family. While there is overlap in the period of composition of the two poems, the *Metamorphoses* builds to the prediction of Augustus' apotheosis and was primarily complete before Augustus' death. The *Fasti,* on the other hand, is a poem of the time after Augustus' death, revised under the rule of Tiberius, but before the next imperial succession happened.[227] It thus provides a window on apotheosis and the imperial family, which is different to the *Metamorphoses* and different to Seneca. It is this difference of perspective that Seneca takes advantage of in order to spotlight the habits of the imperial family in relation to their manipulation of the practice of apotheosis for their own benefit and purposes.

In this section I will argue that there are two facets to Seneca's interaction with Ovid's *Fasti*, both of which implicate the imperial family to an extent but without Seneca directly criticizing the imperial family and its practices as a whole. Firstly I will explore how the *Fasti* can be viewed as a prequel to particular moments in the text. I will argue that by looking closely at the connections between the texts an inherent disconnect is revealed between reality as presented in the text and actual historical events as recorded in the historical *fasti*. In this way the instability of the imperial family's involvement in

[227] For dating of both poems see Syme 1978.21-36; Bomer 1988.15-17; Newlands 1995.235-6; Holzberg 1995.351-3; Barchiesi 1997.259-71; Fantham 1998.1-4. For discussion of the revision of the *Fasti* in exile see Green 2004.14-20.

the *fasti* is present without being directly remarked upon by Seneca. Secondly I will argue that just as we are prompted to think about the *Apocolocyntosis* as a continuation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Seneca is playing with the idea of continuing Ovid's *Fasti*, a provocative undertaking within the imperial landscape as the poem is unfinished in an especially meaningful fashion with respect to imperial power. In both of these respects, interacting with Ovid's *Fasti* provides Seneca with a means of critiquing not just Claudius in relation to his apotheosis, but the wider question of the manner in which the principate and imperial family deployed, consolidated and manipulated their power and positions.

3.1 Ovid's *Fasti* as prequel to the *Apocolocyntosis*

The *Fasti* is important in providing the background and personal history of particular imperial persons of interest in Seneca's text who do not feature in the *Metamorphoses* but are present in the *Fasti*. Although we cannot pin down exactly when Ovid was writing the *Fasti*, its general perspective is later than that of the *Metamorphoses*. More important, it engages with the power dynamics of the imperial family after the death of Augustus, but before Rome had more experience of the difficult transitions from one ruler to another, with the manner in which these transitions were played out in the *fasti* and with the process of apotheosis in relation to the imperial household. While there is a common subject matter in terms of apotheosis, the circumstances under which Ovid and Seneca were writing are different: hence the perspective that they bring to this subject matter is naturally different. Seneca brings to his text an awareness of the recent history of the imperial family and apotheosis, as well as the vicissitudes it has undergone which Ovid had simply not experienced. It is this

difference in perspective which makes Ovid's *Fasti* an important prequel for Seneca. By connecting the imperial figures from the *Apocolocyntosis* with the background of Ovid's *Fasti*, we uncover points of disconnect within the tradition of apotheosis. These disconnects draw attention to the gap between the world of the *Apocolocyntosis*, that of Ovid's *Fasti* and also the record-keeping institution of the *fasti*. The extent to which apotheosis and its recording in the *fasti* were at the mercy of the imperial family and its ideological agenda is present in the *Apocolocyntosis* in this way without Seneca having to directly address it.

There are three imperial figures whose apotheosis is mentioned in the *Apocolocyntosis* whom I will consider in light of the background of Ovid's *Fasti*, namely Tiberius, Livia and Drusilla. I will begin with Tiberius. Tiberius appears in the opening paragraph of the *Apocolocyntosis* in connection with Augustus and apotheosis. The narrator makes reference to the Appian Way, "by which, as you know, both the divine Augustus and Tiberius Caesar went to join the gods" (*qua scis et divum Augustum et Tiberium Caesarem ad deos isse,* 1.2).[228] Tiberius' apotheosis is treated straightforwardly as fact. He may not be honored with the epithet *divum* as Augustus is, but his apotheosis appears alongside that of Augustus, and is thus legitimated by that connection. Augustus' deification would presumably be above question. The epithet *Caesarem* also provides a reason why one would have expected Tiberius to have been deified as Augustus was. He was part of the imperial family, Augustus' adopted heir, and eventually ruler of the Roman empire. He ticked all the boxes for apotheosis. The fact of Tiberius' apotheosis

[228] *ad deos ire* is a well-attested phrase in ascension literature. For example, Varro *Menipp.*560B: *…vias:unam ad signum scorpionis, qua Hercules ad deos isse diceretur.* Other examples include Cic *Tusc. Disp.* 1.32.5; Curtius Rufus 4.7.27.5; Velleius Paterculus 1.2.1 and 2.75.3; Sen. *Epist. ad Luc.* 73.16.2; Servius on *Aen.* 8.288. See Green 2010 on this passage in the *Apocolocyntosis*.

here is based upon the same assumptions as those underpinning the texture of Ovid's *Fasti*. While Tiberius does not feature prominently in the *Fasti*, when he does appear he is defined by his family line, a genealogy which provided a divine thread from Julius Caesar, through to Augustus, and finally to Tiberius.[229]

However, while in both texts the assumption is that Tiberius will be deified on the basis of his connections to the illustrious divine line of his predecessors, and his status in the imperial family, the contemporary context of the two texts provides different perspectives on the validity of that assumption. From Ovid's perspective Julius Caesar and Augustus had both been deified, and it was a natural and safe assumption that subsequent rulers would undergo apotheosis based on the evidence of the imperial deaths thus far. In contrast Seneca is writing when several rulers have come and gone and were not given the honor of apotheosis, as was true in the case of Tiberius. He was himself skeptical of the process of apotheosis and was not in fact deified upon his death. His apotheosis would not have been entered into the *fasti.* Why does Seneca then claim that Tiberius was deified?

I do not think that Seneca was simply mistaken in his facts. There is an underlying point to unquestioningly referring to Tiberius' apotheosis in the same breath as that of Augustus. Seneca is paying lip service to an expectation one could have concerning the imperial family, namely that emperors would be deified upon their death, an expectation which was natural in Ovid's earlier text but not for Seneca. Such an expectation was not borne out by the events of the last few decades or by the historical record of the *fasti*. The pieces of information presented by the poet, the satirist and the historical reality of the

---

[229] Ov. *F.* 1.533: *et penes Augustos patriae tutela manebit: / hanc fas imperii frena tenere domum. / inde nepos natusque dei, licet ipse recuset, / pondera caelesti mente paterna feret…*

fasti do not line up. The turning of the imperial machinery, as one ruler fell and another arose, was not smooth. The manner in which Ovid talks about the members of the imperial family, as destined to be deified, is suited to his own time but reality played out very differently. Tiberius was not deified by his successor, Caligula, just as Caligula was not deified by Claudius. Transitions of power were messy, and apotheosis and the *fasti* were an arena in which new emperors fought to differentiate themselves from what came before and consolidate their own authority. By referring to Tiberius' deification as fact when it was not, Seneca shows an awareness of the history of the imperial family in this respect and points to their inconsistency in the matter of apotheosis, an inconsistency, which arose out of their struggles against the past in order to secure their own power in the present. The very text of the *Apocolocyntosis* with its subject matter of the potential apotheosis of a recently deceased ruler could be understood as knowingly continuing the pattern of contested apotheoses.

For those readers who do know that Tiberius was not deified, the equivalence that Seneca constructs between Augustus and Tiberius is unsettling. The colloquial tone of the sentence draws the reader into a dialogue with what is being asserted by the narrator. The narrator directly addresses the reader with the assertion that both Augustus and Tiberius went to join the gods along the Appian Way (*scis*… "you know that…." or parenthetically "as you know" 1.2). The reader is made responsible for the statement made by the narrator. But the well-informed reader would not just blindly follow this assertion. The reader must question what the narrator says and recognize the assumptions underlying the assertion that Tiberius was deified the same as Augustus. In this way the falseness of the statement about Tiberius could reflect back on Augustus and taint what a

reader may have thought they were sure of, namely that Augustus was deified. Augustus is one of the few characters within the text, who seems to be untouched by its satirical tone.[230] His portrayal is often read as the anti-Claudius, embodying all the qualities that are lacking in Claudius.[231] Any way that the text may then draw Augustus into the quagmire of confusion characteristic of other imperial figures and stain him and his apotheosis with similar reservations, however small, is significant. Seneca deliberately puts the apotheoses of Augustus and Tiberius side by side. If Augustus cannot legitimize Tiberius, for the well-informed reader, Tiberius may then unavoidably delegitimize Augustus.

Livia is another person of imperial interest whose apotheosis is referred to in both texts. The disconnects between the two accounts again provide a window into the struggles for power and how the honors such as apotheosis recorded in the official *fasti* were at the mercy of imperial power struggles. In his poetic *Fasti* Ovid confidently speaks of Livia's future apotheosis, placing a prophecy of it in a climactic position in the entry the Carmentalia episode in Book One. When Evander travels to Italy, it is his mother, Carmentis, who first sets foot on land and gives an exultant speech, addressing the land and prophesizing events in the future from the coming of Aeneas to the consolidation of power within the family of Augustus (*F.* 1.509-536). However, it is not Augustus, or even Tiberius who is the climax of this speech, but Livia. Carmentis closes her speech by intertwining the establishment of her own cult and the prophetic announcement of Livia's deification (*F.* 1.535-6): *utque ego perpetuis olim sacrabor in aris, / sic Augusta novum Iulia numen erit* - "and as I myself will be venerated at eternal

[230] Eden 1984.115: "The author presents him, unlike the previous speakers, without obviously disrespectful caricature."
[231] Knoche 1966; Cole 2006.

alters, so will Julia Augusta (i.e. Livia) be a new divinity". Ovid is able to speak confidently about Livia's future, assured of her coming apotheosis as a member of the imperial family, closely connected to the now divine Augustus.[232] While Livia's apotheosis does happen, unlike in the case of Tiberius, the process of her apotheosis is not as simple as one expects from Ovid's standpoint, a fact from which Seneca does not shy away.

In the opening of his speech, as I discussed above, Diespiter tries to establish Claudius' divine credentials through kinship by drawing attention to his blood ties with *divus* Augustus and *diva* Augusta, Livia, his grandmother (9.5). But, more importantly, Diespiter gives us the nugget of information that it is none other than Claudius himself who raised Livia to the status of a goddess (*quam ipse deam esse iussit* 9.5). Setting aside the circular foundation of Diespiter's argument at this point (i.e. that Claudius is worthy of being deified because he is connected by blood to deified beings, but one of whom was only deified because of him), if we have Ovid's treatment of Livia's prospective apotheosis in mind, there is a distinct disconnect between the expectations at play in Ovid's *Fasti* and what actually happened as attested in the *Apocolocyntosis*. Diespiter may wish to utilize this as a point in Claudius' favor in that he had the authority to make Livia a deity. But it raises the question of why it was left to Claudius to make Livia a goddess, long after her death, when Ovid was able to speak of it with such assurance. Claudius is the one who fulfills Carmenta's prediction, aligning the future hypothesized by Ovid in the *Fasti* with reality.

[232] For the role Livia in Ovid's *Fasti* see Herbert-Brown 1994.130-172; Wahlberg (Diss) 2008.292-4. For other women of status in the *Fasti* see Wahlberg (Diss) 2008.298-301.

Here again the gap between the circumstances under which Ovid was writing, and the contemporary imperial landscape in which Seneca lived is glaring. Ovid may have been able to weave the future apotheoses of Tiberius and Livia into his poetry with confidence, but the reality of imperial shenanigans in the coming years did not allow those prophecies to come true in a straightforward way. In A.D. 14 by Augustus' will Livia was adopted into the Julian *gens* and renamed Julia Augusta, the name by which Ovid refers to her.[233] But when she died in A.D. 29, she was not deified by Tiberius, thanks to the strained nature of their relationship in her final years. [234] Tiberius' ill will towards her denied her the honor. It was only in A.D. 41 when Claudius came to power that Livia was divinized.[235]

However, one should not mistake this as an act of affection on the part of Claudius. Upon his accession Claudius sought to consolidate his position by bestowing a number of honors upon his dead kinsmen in the Julio-Claudian family, strengthening his own authority through the imperial cult as recorded in the *fasti*. Through the prism of Ovid's *Fasti*, Seneca's text and the historical reality, in the case of Livia we can see how the process of apotheosis was at the mercy of the personal pleasure or displeasure of the emperor, and also the imperial power plays attendant upon transition to a new ruler. The imperial *fasti* may have been the official vehicle through which the cycle of time at Rome was maintained, but through the disconnects between Ovid's *Fasti* and the *Apocolocyntosis* Seneca highlights its responsiveness to the power, life and deaths of the imperial family.

---

[233] Suet. *Aug.* 101.
[234] Suet. *Tib.* 50-51: *prohibuit consecrari, quasi id ipse.*
[235] Suet *Claud.* 11; Dio 60.5.2.

Ovid expected Tiberius and Livia to be deified upon their deaths. Seneca presents Tiberius as a deified emperor but in reality he was not. His apotheosis would have been recorded in the imperial *fasti* but no such record was ever made because the new emperor, Caligula, refused to honor Tiberius. The reality of Livia's apotheosis, which occurred only because of Claudius, is present in the text. Her deification was initially withheld due to the personal animosity of one emperor, but was later granted because of the need for a later emperor to consolidate his position within the wider imperial family. By presenting Ovid's *Fasti* as a prequel to these moments concerning Tiberius and Livia, the *Apocolocyntosis* characterizes apotheosis and the imperial *fasti* not as lofty, impartial institutions but ones deeply compromised by their responsiveness to the vicissitudes of imperial power.

The final imperial apotheosis that I consider in this section is that of Drusilla, the sister of Caligula. Drusilla does not appear in Ovid's text: nevertheless, his *Fasti* provides a model for the story of her apotheosis. In the opening paragraph of the *Apocolocyntosis* Seneca mocks the conventions of historical prefaces, including the reliability of his source who will attest that he saw Claudius ascend to the heavens. He states that to find the source, one should ask the man who saw Drusilla on her way to the heavens (*quaerito ab eo qui Drusillam euntem in caelum vidit,* 1.2). He goes on to relate that he saw this because he was the overseer of the Appian way, and that he swore in the senate that he had seen Drusilla ascending into the heavens (*Appiae viae curator est…. in senatu iuravit se Drusillam vidisse caelum ascendentem,* 1.3). The fact that the narrator claims the same witness for the apotheosis of Claudius as in Drusilla's case initially seems to be aimed at puncturing Claudius' claim to apotheosis from the beginning.

Name-dropping Drusilla as a precedent for Claudius immediately brings up a history of dubious actions on the part of the imperial family in relation to apotheosis. Regardless of the truth of the more salacious rumors concerning brother and sister, upon Drusilla's death in A.D. 38 Caligula mourned her greatly, even excessively, decreeing deification for her, the first imperial woman in Roman history, together with a shrine and other divine honors.[236] Caligula did not simply decide himself that Drusilla was divine. Her apotheosis was vouched for by a senator, who swore under oath for a sum of money that he had seen Drusilla ascending to the heavens.[237] Seneca changes the details a little for his own purposes when he makes the witness to Drusilla's apotheosis the overseer of the Appian Way but by making her apotheosis and that of Claudius hinge on the same witness Seneca immediately taints Claudius with the shiftiness that surrounded Drusilla's apotheosis. Drusilla's swift promotion to first female imperial divinity could be smirked at for a variety of reasons: her position as a figure of gossip with regard to her relationship with her brother, Caligula; the excessive, out of proportion scale of Caligula's mourning, as attested by Seneca himself elsewhere; not to mention her status as a relative youngster on the imperial scene when the well-established matriarch Livia had not been elevated by such an honor. The witness to the apotheosis of such a woman does not lend much credence to Claudius' case.

However, with the context of Ovid's *Fasti* we can make connections between not only the dubious cases of Drusilla and Claudius, but also the apotheoses of more esteemed figures, including even Augustus, who for the most part seems above the

[236]For Caligula's close attachment to his sister and reaction to her death see Suet *Cal.* 24-25; Dio 59.11; Sen. *Cons. Polyp.* 17.4-6. For discussion of the significance of Drusilla's deification see Wood 1995.

[237] Dio 59.11.4: *Λίουιός τέ τις Γεμίνιος βουλευτὴς ἔς τε τὸν οὐρανὸν αὐτὴν ἀναβαίνουσαν καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς συγγιγνομένην ἑορακέναι ὤμοσεν, ἐξώλειαν καὶ ἑαυτῷ καὶ τοῖς παισίν, εἰ ψεύδοιτο, ἐπαρασάμενος τῇ τε τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν ἐπιμαρτυρίᾳ καὶ τῇ αὐτῆς ἐκείνης· ἐφ᾽ ᾧ πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι μυριάδας ἔλαβε.*

satirical agenda of the text. The details of Drusilla's apotheosis story are not unique but have their precedent in the story of Romulus' ascension to the heavens, which was witnessed by one Julius Proculus (*F.* 2.475-512).[238] Ovid relates how Romulus' disappearance during a storm at first causes consternation among the senators, prompting allegations of murder.[239] A vision of Romulus then appears to Julius Proculus, telling him that the senators should not profane his divinity (*nostra numina F.* 2.506) by mourning him, but instead they should worship him as the new Quirinus (*F.* 2.507). It is only when Proculus relays this vision to the people that they recognize Romulus as a god and begin to worship him (*F.* 2.510-12). The need for an apotheosis to be witnessed is not only an ingredient of the more dubious apotheosis stories, such as Drusilla and Claudius, but is a crucial part of one of the foundational apotheosis stories.

The skepticism surrounding the witness and their motivation present in Seneca's treatment of Drusilla's and Claudius' potential apotheoses is also hinted at in Romulus' story. Ovid's version in the *Fasti* at first appears to be fairly straight in its treatment of the timely appearance of Julius Proculus, especially in comparison to other authors.[240] But as is integral to the manner in which Ovid constructs the *Fasti* there are ways to read the story, which undermine the apotheosis, particularly in relation to its juxtaposition with Ovid's explanation of the *festa stultorum* which follows on immediately from Julius Proculus and the deification of Romulus.[241]

---

[238] Ovid also tells of the apotheosis of Romulus at *Met.* 14.805-51 but he does not include the role of Julius Proculus as witness as part of that version, making his inclusion in the *Fasti* more significant.
[239] *F.* 2.497: *luctus erat, falsaeque patres in crimine caedis*.
[240] For other accounts of Romulus' apotheosis with varying levels of skepticism see Cic. *Rep.* 2.17-20; Diony. *Anth.* 2.56, 63; Livy 1.16; Plutarch *Rom.* 27.4-28.3.
[241] Barchiesi 1997.112-19 makes the argument that Ovid stretches the credibility of the story. Robinson 2003.615-6 analyzes connections between the entries for the Quirinalia and the *Festa Stultorum,* suggesting that the deification of an oven in the second festival makes deification of Romulus in the first highly problematic.

In fact it is not only a mythical apotheosis story from the past that we can connect with Drusilla and Claudius in relation to this aspect of the apotheosis, but Augustus' own story as well. As Robinson points out in relation to Ovid's text, any treatment of the deification of such a foundational Roman figure would need to be handled with care as it would reflect upon the more recent imperial deifications of Julius Caesar and Augustus.[242] This could certainly explain why on the surface Ovid's version of Romulus' deification appears above reproach, but with close reading of the surrounding entries it seems that Ovid does not take the story at face value, slipping in a healthy dose of skepticism through the juxtapositions he creates. For Seneca the shared structure of these apotheosis stories not only connects Drusilla and Claudius back to the mythical foundation of Rome, but also brings in the apotheosis of the divine Augustus himself.

Even Augustus was not above needing his own Julius Proculus to vouch for his apotheosis. Suetonius relates that a witness was not lacking who swore that he had seen the form of Augustus ascend to the heavens.[243] Dio gives the additional detail that the witness was paid a sum of money, perhaps a bribe, by Livia for swearing under oath that he had seen Augustus undergo apotheosis.[244] Apparently the going rate for witnessing the ascension of an imperial member of the family was the same for Augustus and Drusilla as the same sum was paid to both witnesses for their testimony.[245] By contextualizing the details Seneca focuses on in the case of Drusilla with their precedent in the mythical past of Ovid's *Fasti*, we can see that those details which appear designed to puncture Claudius' attempt at apotheosis, suggesting that his attempt is as dubious as Drusilla's

---

[242] Robinson 2003.611.
[243] Suet. *Aug.* 100.4.
[244] Dio 56.46.2.
[245] C.f. Dio 56.42.2 and 59.11.4.

before him, in fact are shared by one of the core early myths of Rome, which then, most crucially, brings us almost full circle back to Augustus' own path to the heavens.

In my readings of Ovid's *Fasti* as a prequel to the moments in the *Apocolocyntosis* when Seneca makes reference to Tiberius, Livia and Drusilla I have brought in a significant amount of historical detail from outside both texts. Seneca and his readers would have been well aware of these details of how the apotheoses, or lack of them, played out for different members of the imperial household in the years after Ovid's poem. I have given depth to a few brief moments in Seneca's text by connecting them back to Ovid's text, and then also considering the historical reality of the years between the two authors. In my readings it is this prism which I suggest Seneca is putting to work, namely Ovid's perspective and handling of imperial apotheoses, the historical reality as it evolved after Ovid, and the details that Seneca focuses on and how he chooses to present them. Seneca cultivates connections and moments of disconnect between these three points, the result of which is to draw attention to the consistent inconsistencies in how the imperial household employed, withheld and manipulated the process of apotheosis in the years following the death of Augustus. Again, the underlying conclusion to take away is that the characteristics of Claudius' bid for apotheosis are by no means unique but fit within the tradition of apotheosis and the imperial family stretching back even to the recent foundational figure of Augustus.

Thus far in terms of the *Apocolocyntosis* and Ovid's *Fasti* I have considered what Ovid's poem brings to Seneca's text when it is conceptualized as a prequel in a similar way to my reading of the *Metamorphoses* as a prequel. However, I do not think that this is the only facet to Seneca's engagement with the *Fasti*. He also activates connections

with the earlier text through particular moments of shared subject matter and characters. In the following section I will argue that Seneca is also connecting the *Apocolocyntosis* with the *Fasti* on a broader level, namely in terms of the idea of continuation. The continuation of a poem such as the *Fasti* cannot be based on an instinctive, linear temporal connection as is the case in relation to the *Metamorphoses*. Yet, a scattering of moments in the *Apocolocyntosis* which are otherwise under-motivated suggest that Seneca is playing with the idea of continuing Ovid's *Fasti* in a manner which is again provocative within the context of the contemporary imperial landscape.

3.2 The *Apocolocyntosis* as the Continuation of the *Fasti*

It may seem strange to think about the continuation of a poem based on the form of a calendar. The calendrical *fasti* are cyclical and therefore by its very nature their continuation is embedded within their own form. The temporal line forwards and backwards does not apply. Instead it is the depth of each entry that can be extended with new additions augmenting the layers of a particular date. Since this is the structure of the calendrical *fasti*, one could talk easily about addition, but not necessarily continuation.[246] However, this is where Ovid's *Fasti* is crucially different to the historical *fasti*: the poem was unfinished. In its six books Ovid covers the first six months of the year, breaking off on the last day of June. Much has been written about the fragmentary state of Ovid's poem, whether it was a deliberate act on the part of Ovid and if so, what his motivations were.[247] The political orientation of the poem in general is also much debated, and that question can be brought to bear on the issue of its unfinished status. The breaking off point just before the months of July and Augustus, which are saturated with dynastic

[246] For the structure of the Roman calendar see Beard 1987.
[247] See Miller 2002.167-9 for a summary of the debate.

significance, has been interpreted as a deliberate, provocative act in defiance of the imperial establishment.[248] These questions cannot be definitively answered.[249]

However my primary concern is not Ovid's intention and motivation, but how Seneca, and others could plausibly have interpreted Ovid's poem, and interacted with it. In this regard, unlike the historical institution of the *fasti,* Ovid's *Fasti* could be open to continuation since the second half of the yearly cycle, July to December, is absent. The *Apocolocyntosis* obviously does not continue Ovid's *Fasti* by providing the entries for those six missing months. But there are several points in the text, relating to dates and months, which seem poorly motivated, or at the very least without obvious meaning, within the context of the satire. My suggestion is that if we gather these points together and think about them in the context of the missing months of Ovid's *Fasti*, we can read them as a means by which Seneca can allude to Ovid's poem, specifically to its unfinished state and the potential causes of this in relation to his relationship with the imperial family.

For this purpose I will first return to Seneca's depiction of Janus. In Section One I discussed how reading with the background of both Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* in mind allows a metamorphic Janus to emerge, whose identity has evolved in somewhat the same way as those of the other gods mentioned in the text. The Ovidian background is significant not only for Janus in relation to the *Metamorphoses*, but even more so for Janus and the *Fasti*. As would be logical for the god for whom the first month of the year was named, the popular conception of Janus' divinity came to be closely associated with

---

[248] Feeney 1992.19; Newlands 1995.26; Barchiesi 1997.262.

[249] However, I do think we fall into the well-worn trap of underestimating Ovid if we believe the survival of only six books of the *Fasti* was entirely unintentional and without significance, especially due to the number of allusions in the first six books to events which would have been recorded in the second half of the poem.

time and the calendar.[250] As such it was natural for Janus to feature in the opening of Ovid's calendrical poem. But Ovid takes full advantage of the raw material which the character of Janus provided, molding him into a figure of thematic and programmatic importance for the poem as a whole. When we come across Janus in the *Apocolocyntosis*, my suggestion is that the general associations of Janus with the calendrical *fasti* should be in our minds, as well as Ovid's portrayal and manipulation of Janus in his poetic *Fasti*. This hinges on two significant ways in which Seneca picks up Ovid's Janus in order to shape his own Janus, namely by making Janus the first to speak on the issue of Claudius' apotheosis (*primus interrogator sententiam* 9.2), and by his otherwise perplexing introduction as the consul designate on July first for the afternoon (*is designatus erat in kal. Iulias postmeridianus consul* 9.2).

When Jupiter has dismissed Claudius and restored order to the meeting of the gods, Seneca puts Janus in the prominent position of being asked to give his opinion first on whether Claudius should be admitted into the circle of the gods. Janus is also given the privileged position of being the first divine interlocutor in Ovid's poem. Due to the calendrical structure of the poem, this means that Janus is the first to speak not only at the beginning of the poem and the book, but also of the year. This privileged position as first speaker connects Seneca's Janus back to Ovid's. Certain strands of how Ovid's Janus

---

[250] Janus' association with time and the beginning of the year, was a core part of the god's identity as is attested in a number of texts other than Ovid's *Fasti*. For example Pliny the Elder (34.33) refers to Janus as *temporis et aevi deum.* In *Silvae* 4.1 Statius describes Janus as *immensi reparator maximus aevi* (4.1.11); Janus goes on to give a speech, beginning with the following lines: *salve, magne parens mundi, qui saecula mecum / instaurare paras, talem te cernere semper / mense meo tua Roma cupit; sic tempora nasci,/ sic annos intrare decet. da gaudia fastis / continua* 17-21. Janus identifies himself with the cycle of the year and its renewal. Other examples include: Ovid *Epist. Ex Ponto* 4.4.23-24 *Ergo ubi, Iane biceps, longum reseraueris annum / pulsus et a sacro mense December erit,*; Lucan *BC* 5.5 *instabatque dies, qui dat nova nomina fasti / quique colit primus ducentem tempora Ianum*; Martial 9.1.1-2 *dum Ianus hiemes, Domitianus autumnos / Augustus anis commodabit aestates.*. For discussion of Janus' connections to time and the *fasti* see Taylor and Holland 1952.

presents himself are also significant for Seneca. Ovid's Janus portrays himself specifically as a guardian of the boundary between mortals and gods. Janus says about himself "along with the gentle Hours, I am in charge of heaven's door, it's my job to let Jupiter come and go" (*praesideo foribus caeli cum mitibus Horis / it, redit officio Iuppiter ipse meo, F.* 1.125-6). Janus does not appear to mean this metaphorically. He compares how an actual door-keeper is stationed near the entrance of a building and sees the comings and goings to how he himself, as the doorman of the heavenly hall (*caelestis ianitor aulae, F.* 1.139), surveys the East and West at once.[251] This aspect of Janus' personality, emphasized in Ovid, as the doorkeeper of the divine world, adds further nuance to Seneca's choice of Janus to be the first god invited to speak on the matter of Claudius' apotheosis and as the god to suggest that not only should Claudius be refused the right to cross the threshold and enter the world of the gods, but that all mortals should be barred in the future.

By making Janus speak first and seemingly speak forcefully in his guise as keeper of the divine threshold, Seneca picks up on one aspect of Janus' significance for Ovid. But Janus is not just significant for Ovid in the first book of the *Fasti*. He is important for the overall structure of the poem.[252] Ovid's exchange with Janus in the opening of the *Fasti* is a model for his many interactions with divine locutors that occur in the coming books and months. The content of Janus' speech also encapsulates the poetics of the poem. Janus stands at the start of the calendar, overseeing the beginning of Ovid's *Fasti* and providing a condensed version in miniature of the themes of the poems as a whole. Janus' privileged position does not disappear as the poem progresses. Janus appears again

---

[251] Ovid *F.* 1.137-140: *utque sedens primi vester prope limina tecti / ianitor egressus introitusque videt, / sic ego perspicio caelestis ianitor aulae / eoas partes hesperiasque simul*.

[252] See Miller 1983.164-74; Barchiesi 1991.14-17, 1997.230-7; Hardie 1991.60-4; Newlands 1995.6-7.

in the opening of Book Six in the story of Carna (*F.* 6.101-96). The outcome of the story involving Janus and Carna demonstrates Janus' privileged position within the poem as it is the only sexual success story in the *Fasti*.[253]

The re-appearance of Janus on the Kalends of June is also significant. Ovid deliberately inserts Janus into the opening of Book Six to create a link back to the opening of Book One. This is part of broader intratextual links, which Ovid creates between Book One and Book Six.[254] Whether he intended to continue the poem and the year on further or not, it is clear that Books One to Six are a unit in Ovid's mind and one of the ways which Ovid demonstrates this is through the figure of Janus. Janus has opened the calendar year and now reappears on the Kalends of the month, which closes the first half of the calendar. Due to the overlapping categories of months and books, Janus has also opened the first book of the poem, and then appears at the beginning of Book Six which closes what seems to be the first half of the poem, but which closes the poem as a whole as we have it.[255]

It is with the programmatic status of Ovid's Janus for the structure of the *Fasti* in mind that I would then consider the otherwise perplexing details of Seneca's introduction of Janus, that he was going to take up the consulship on July 1st just for the afternoon. This detail of Janus' introduction has been previously contextualized in several ways with the joke hinging primarily on the surprisingly short appointment.[256] Janus is also an apt

---

[253] Ovid includes three prominent stories of sexual failure in the *Fasti:* Priapus and Lotis (1.391-440); Faunus and Omphale (2.303-58); and Priapus and Vesta (6.319-48).

[254] See Newlands 1995.134-45 and Holzberg 1995.353-62.

[255] This type of play on the structural level of a poem is not unusual for Ovid, or for other Latin poets. For poetic book structure in general see Hutchinson 2008.

[256] See Eden 1984.107-8; Lund 1994..95-6. Interpretations include that Claudius had not designated any new consuls at the time of his death; short honorary appointments had increased greatly under the emperors; and that as consuls and the senate stopped work at lunchtime there would be nothing for a consul to do in the afternoon.

figure to be linked with the office of the consulship as it was on the Kalends of Janus' own month that the consuls traditionally entered office.[257] However, the date is still perplexing and the fact that this date, July first, is firmly connected with Janus.[258] If Seneca's focus were to play on Janus' association with the office of the consulship, we might have expected him to chose January first as the date in light of Janus' obvious connection with his named month. Since we know these events are occurring on October 13th, a date of January 1st would also have been logical as the Kalends of January would occur before that of July in the cycle of the year from this particular start date.[259]

So why did Seneca mention July first in connection with Janus' consulship? It is in this respect that it is necessary to reach beyond the general aspects of Janus' identity and consider the Janus of Ovid's *Fasti* and his programmatic status. The date of July 1st, which otherwise appears strangely unmotivated in Seneca's text, happens to be the very date on which Ovid's poem broke off. Janus' privileged position in the overall scheme of the six books of Ovid's *Fasti* would make him an ideal figure to think with when considering how Ovid's *Fasti* may have continued. If Ovid had continued his poem, perhaps it is unlikely that Janus would have appeared in the entry for the Kalends of July, but as it stands we, and Seneca, do not have Ovid's entry for the start of the second half of the year, and the second half of his poem. We do know that Janus had a prominent position in the opening of Ovid's poem, and the closing of the first half of the poem. Therefore he would be a plausible figure to open the second half of the year. As Janus

[257] Because of this Janus came to be closely associated with the list of consuls, overseeing those who were entered into the list as he oversaw them taking up office, another way in which Janus was associated with the institution of the *fasti*. See Martial 8.66.9-12; 11.4.5-6.
[258] The next speaker, Diespiter, is also described as a consul designate (*ipse designatus consul* 9.4) but with no specific date attached.
[259] Commentators mention that Claudius had failed to designate any future consuls as relevant background information for this point. But if this were Seneca's main satirical target, a January first date would still be more logical to make his point that July first.

bookends the surviving six books of the *Fasti*, he could potentially have served the same purpose in the remaining books, opening and closing the second half of the year from July to December. By making Janus, a god closely association with the *fasti* and programmatic for the structure of Ovid's *Fasti*, take up a consulship on July 1st, Seneca can draw attention to the end point of Ovid's poem which breaks off so abruptly. By choosing this date Seneca can position himself in relation to the earlier text, potentially able to continue the poem where Ovid was unable to do so, or chose not to.

The first of July is not the only date in the text from that part of the calendar, which Ovid did not treat in his *Fasti.* Claudius himself in his exchange with Hercules mentions the months of July and August. He pleads for Hercules' help by reminding him of the services he rendered to him while alive. He tells Hercules that "if you search in your memory, it was I who used to dispense the law in front of your own temple for entire days in the months of July and Augustus (*si memoria repetis, ego eram qui tibi ante templum tuum ius dicebam totis diebus mense Iulio et Augusto,* 7.4). The months of July and August would have been the next months in the calendar year, and therefore in Ovid's poem. While Janus' consulship takes place on the exact date where Ovid breaks off, the first of July; and Claudius' reference to July and August alludes to the subject of what would have been the seventh and eighth books of Ovid's poem. The naming of July and August also brings in the inescapably imperial flavor of these two particular months, which could have contributed to the unfinished state of Ovid's poem, as we and Seneca could hypothesize. These two months are named after the first two Julio-Claudians whose lives and deaths initiated the practice of commemorating the imperial family within the

calendar.[260] The equation between the names of the rulers and names of the months is a vivid illustration of the influence of the imperial household on the calendar.

The manner in which Seneca has embedded the names of these two months and emperors within Claudius' reference to his law cases is worth pressing to understand exactly what Claudius is referring to and why. July and Augustus would normally have been quiet periods in the law courts due to the number of *feriae* and *dies nefasti*.[261] Suetonius reports that Claudius was conscientious in administering justice and would often disregard even his own anniversaries and those of his family, as well as ancient feast days.[262] Suetonius does not specify particular months when this would have occurred but Seneca connects Claudius' zeal for his legal duties specifically with the months of July and August. The logical conclusion to draw from Claudius' statement is therefore that in his dedication to the law-courts during these two months, Claudius would have been deliberately ignoring the many imperial festivals he should have been observing.[263] He would have pronounced judgments on days that were by rights *nefasti*. The Claudius of the *Apocolocyntosis* appears as disdainful of the imperial flavor of the months of July and August as one could imagine Ovid was, motivating him to break off his poem to avoid dealing directly with those months and their honorees, just as Claudius shied away from the pomp and circumstance of those months. Claudius and Ovid are thus strangely aligned. By mentioning July and August in this context Seneca adds to the

---

[260] Suet *Iul.* 76.1; Suet *Aug.* 31.2.
[261] See Pliny 8.21.2.
[262] Suet. *Cl.* 14.2 *etiam suis suorumque diebus sollemnibus, nonnunquam festis quoque antiquitus et religiosis.* C.f. *Apoc.* 23.1 *quis nunc iudex toto lites / audiet anno?*
[263] Ovid draws attention to the impact of the *fasti* on legal business at the beginning of his poetic *Fasti* (*F.* 1.45-52), specifying *ille nefastus erit….. / fastus erit…* (1.47-48) in terms of the presence and absence of legal judgments.

sense of continuing Ovid's *Fasti,* drawing attention to what is missing from the poem and also a possible and provocative reason for the absence of those months.

In addition to the date of July 1st for Janus' consulship, and the reference to July and August by Claudius, providing the exact points of continuation from where Ovid breaks off, a general sense of the second half of the year and hence of what might have constituted the second half of Ovid's poem is also present. The action of the satire itself supposedly occurs on October 13th, the day of Claudius' death, as we are told in the opening line (*ante diem III idus Octobris,* 1.1). I discussed earlier how the anonymous speaker accuses Claudius of extending the festival of Saturn beyond its requisite time, introducing the final month of the year into the satire.[264] Other dates are not as explicit but Seneca does mention a number of events concerning the imperial family, which occurred in the second half of the year, and so would presumably have been recorded in the imperial *fasti*. In the opening paragraph he refers to the apotheosis of Augustus which took place after his death in the month of August (1.2).[265] He also mentions the deification of Drusilla who died in June but was deified on Augustus' birthday in September (1.2).[266] Later Mercury complains about the difficulty astrologers had predicting Claudius' death date because no-one knew he had even been born.[267] In fact Claudius was born on August 1st and the text tells us he died on October 13th.

This collection of dates and events from the second half of the annual cycle are by no means stand-out moments in the satire. On their own they do not necessarily give the

---

[264] 8.2: *Si mehercules a Saturno petisset hoc beneficium, cuius mensem toto anno celebravit.* See pages 97-98.

[265] The apotheosis of Tiberius who died in March is mentioned in the same sentence, but as I explored in Section 3.1 above, Tiberius was not in fact deified.

[266] *Docs.* no. 5, p. 12; Herz 1981.101. For commentary see Hurley 1993.100.

[267] 3.2: *Et tamen non est mirum si errant et horam eius nemo novit; nemo enim unquam illum natum putavit.*

reader reason to pause. But when they are considered in light of the fragmentary state of Ovid's *Fasti* these moments come together to provide a sense of the general parameters under which the second half of the poem would have operated, providing the point of continuation (July 1st, July and August), the end point of the cycle (December), and a snapshot of the types of imperial events, which would be entered in the records of the imperial *fasti,* including the births, lives and deaths of the imperial family. The scope of what is missing from Ovid is present. As the dates and events focus on or imply the presence of the imperial household in the calendar, there is the impression of how the imperial machinery would be at work in the second of the year. By constructing the time of the second half of the year in this manner, Seneca not only continues Ovid's *Fasti* in some way but he also focuses attention on what is missing and on a plausible and provocative reason for that absence, namely his volatile relationship with the imperial family and its inescapable presence in the subject of the second half of the year.

Through these interactions with Ovid's *Fasti* Seneca is able to hint at the practices of the imperial family as a whole with regard to apotheosis. These practices do not show the imperial family in the best light. Claudius cannot be separated from the rest of the imperial family and conveniently scapegoated where apotheosis is concerned. The manner in which the imperial family handled and manipulated apotheosis is troubling across the board, not simply in the case of Claudius. By alluding to Ovid and his fragmentary *Fasti* in the ways in which I have suggested, Seneca moves beyond Claudius' apotheosis as a target to subtly indict the many acts of self-serving manipulation and exploitation which the imperial establishment as a whole inflicted upon apotheosis and the institution of the calendrical *fasti*.

Conclusion

In the speech that eventually wins the day and results in Claudius being booted out of the heavens Augustus makes the following argument (11.4):

hunc deum quis colet? quis credit? Dum tales deos facitis, nemo vos deos esse credet.

"Who will worship this man as a god? Who will believe in him as a god? While you create gods of this kind, no one will believe that you yourselves are gods."

On the surface this presents the root of what we are meant to think is at stake in the text and Claudius' potential apotheosis. The issue hinges on the person of Claudius. Claudius has brought the imperial family into disrepute. Claudius is inherently different from Augustus. He cannot possibly be given the same divine honors as Augustus. Augustus is worthy to be counted among the gods. Claudius is not. He will disgrace all of heaven. This is the stance that is necessary for Seneca to take as the imperial machinery has once again gone into action. One emperor has fallen, another now arises who must be differentiated from the one who came before. Claudius must become the scapegoat.

However, by imagining the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* as prequels to his text, and cultivating connections with the two earlier poems to position the *Apocolocyntosis* as a continuation in some way of those prequels, Seneca allows a different perspective on Claudius, apotheosis and the imperial family. Through connections with the *Metamorphoses* the origin and stability of divine identity in general is brought into question. Claudius is not as unique as he first appears. Many of the divine characters who play a part in the text have murky origins or a sense of fluidity to their identity which undermines the desire to make that a characteristic of Claudius alone. The *Apocolocyntosis* is a continuation of the world of the *Metamorphoses* with respect to the

instability of divine identity. The foundation of the *Apocolocyntosis* to pronounce authoritatively on the question of Claudius' apotheosis is thus unavoidably weakened.

While the *Metamorphoses* as a prequel brings into question the divine identity of gods from the distant or mythical past, the *Fasti* is able to bring in more recent history and the path the imperial family has taken since the death of Augustus. The connections with the *Fasti* again work to undermine the idea that Claudius is unique but this time he is situated within the context of the imperial family. A picture of the practices of apotheosis and manipulation of the *fasti* emerges that encompasses the imperial machinery in general and indicts the institution as a whole, not just Claudius.

Augustus' questions and statement may seek to suggest that the legitimacy of apotheosis and the gods hinges on what happens to Claudius, but Seneca's interaction with Ovid's poetry hints that that the focus on Claudius as a unique case is a red herring. Claudius is no different than the wider imperial household, or even examples of gods from the distant and mythical past. The characteristics of Claudius and his path to apotheosis which are presented as distinctive to him in fact can be found across the spectrum. In condemning Claudius based on those characteristics Augustus and the company of the gods are hypocritical in the extreme. That they succeed in making Claudius a scapegoat for qualities that they are all implicated in and seem to willfully ignore the similarities between themselves and Claudius makes the outlook for the future even bleaker. Nero may on the surface appear to be the counter-weight to Claudius, returning imperial power to the status-quo it deserved, to the hey-day of Augustus. But if Claudius was not the aberration everyone willed him to be and if he was in fact akin to what came before, then the contrast between Claudius and Nero dissolves, in which case

Nero cannot be the answer to all the woes caused by Claudius, but actually just more of the same, as Claudius was with potentially the same results.

Through his interactions with these two poems by Ovid Seneca gave voice to this viewpoint indirectly, a viewpoint that he could not explicitly admit to. In this respect also Seneca appears to have been a diligent pupil of Ovid, walking the tight-rope of engaging with politically sensitive issues and ideologies without being explicitly accountable for them.

Chapter Three: How to be an (Ovidian) Satirist in Persius *Satire* One

In this dissertation I set out to argue for Ovid's influence on satirical authors writing in the early imperial period. In the first two chapters I dealt with Phaedrus' fables and Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, both texts that can and should be seen as satirical writing and hence within the bounds of this dissertation. In this third and final chapter I have reached an author who is unequivocally a satirist, Persius. Persius' primary generic identity is satiric. He is third in the line of satiric succession, following Lucilius and Horace. The relationship Persius constructs between himself as a writer of satire, the tradition of the genre and his immediate satiric predecessors is of vital importance for understanding his poems. Hooley has written a foundational study concerning Persius' relationship with Horace but it is fair to say that Persius' relationship with his satiric predecessors impinges on almost any and every topic of research concerning the satires.[268] The elements that I establish as markers of Ovidian influence in this chapter do not seek to displace the primacy of the generic lineage. However, in his satires there is a direct connection with Ovid, which I argue is crucial for understanding Persius' authorial identity as not simply a satirist, but specifically a post-Augustan, imperial satirist.

In addition to looking back to his satiric pedigree, Persius is a Neronian author, writing under the circumstances of the imperial period. Political constraints have a particularly significant impact on a satirist, a genre with its roots in verbal violence, designed to provoke and offend, in a time of growing restriction and uneasy relationships

[268] Hooley 1997. Important scholarship on Persius includes Reckford 1962, Anderson 1966, Dessen 1968, Bramble 1974, Relihan 1989, Powell 1992, Freudenburg 2001; Reckford 2009. Companions to and collected essays on Persius and Juvenal include Freudenburg (ed.) 2005, Plaza (ed.) 2009 amd Braund and Osgood (eds.) 2012.

between literary output and political realities.[269] The theme of freedom of speech in the genre, of satiric *libertas*, is keenly felt from the earliest moments of the genre in Lucilius and then developed further by Horace.[270] Persius acknowledges the changing circumstances under which these predecessors wrote and responses in how they wrote satire.[271] Yet, even though freedom of speech is a characteristically satiric theme and Persius is aware of its generic baggage, the imperial circumstances under which Persius was living and writing separate Persius from his predecessors.

Ralph Rosen, writing on satire in the Republic as the context for Persius and Juvenal, succinctly describes the dynamics at play between the two sets of satirists, Republican and imperial. In his words, "when Persius and Juvenal looked to Lucilius and Horace as generic models, they found much to learn and assimilate, even replicate, but the deepest, most definitional core of satire as fundamentally a mode of verbal ridicule against contemporaries became problematic for them in a way that it never quite was for Lucilius and Horace. If the Republican satirists wondered what constituted good satire (as Horace, for example, often did in his *Sermones*), Persius and Juvenal had to wonder whether it was even safe for them to attempt writing satire in the first place."[272] Lucilius and Horace cannot offer Persius a suitable model for negotiating the issue of freedom of speech in satire. There is a limit to how far they can help him in thinking about this issue and the particularly imperial challenges he faced. It is at this point that Ovid becomes a compelling predecessor for Persius. If we were to map earlier poets on to these

---

[269] See Introduction page 12.

[270] See Braund 2004a for discussion of the tension between *libertas* and *licentia* in Roman satire with key passages in Horace, Persius and Juvenal. Fragments of Lucilius suggest he presented the issue as one of concern for him too even though he enjoyed the greatest freedom of speech of any of the satirist. Our view of Lucilius is heavily shaped by how his successors choose to portray him.

[271] *Sat.* 1.114-118 – I will discuss these lines in the chapter below.

[272] Rosen 2012.21.

circumstances and concerns, we would find Ovid alone situated at the intersection of imperial discourse and the theme of freedom of speech. In his poetry and his life Ovid combines these two aspects that are important for Persius, as I discussed in the Introduction.[273] Ovid is the first poet to address the discourse of the imperial age, circumstances that Persius can see are in part shared in his own time period, while freedom of speech is also a concern shared by Ovid and Persius. It is unsurprising then that Persius would incorporate Ovid into his discourse on satiric *libertas* as he provides a point of intersection at which these two important issues for Persius meet.

This chapter is based on a reading of *Satire* 1. In the programmatic first satire Persius navigates how he can write satire at this moment in time as well as thoroughly reviewing and critiquing contemporary literary culture. In the first section I consider the elements in Persius' contemporary literary scene-setting that have Ovidian resonances, arguing that Persius presents a slice of the literary landscape, a potentially fictive slice, as imitative of Ovid and his poetry. On the surface the concerns surrounding satire and free speech are absent from this aspect of Persius' engagement with Ovid, but there are hints that Persius is mobilizing deeper engagement with Ovid than the picture of superficial imitators that he creates. In Sections Two and Three the concerns stemming from freedom of speech within an imperial climate are at the heart of Persius' interaction with Ovid. Persius constructs the frame of the satire around the difficulty he faces in deploying satiric speech, intimating that he has a secret in the opening lines that he is not free to speak (1.8-12), and then returning in the later part of the satire to finally spill the secret, but within the guarded language of the myth of Midas (1.119-123). As programmatic

[273] See Introduction pages 10-13.

statements about his approach to satire, their importance and meaning have been much discussed, but I argue that in these pivotal lines we can see how Persius brings Ovid into the dialogue surrounding satiric freedom of speech. In Section Two I consider how Persius poses the problem of his secret and the limits of satiric speech with an Ovidian gloss, before turning in Section Three to the deep Ovidian resonances underlying Persius' solution to how he can speak satirically bound up in his choice of the imagery of the Midas myth. These Ovidian gestures do not make Persius a predominantly Ovidian author, but they do demonstrate how Persius viewed Ovid from his perspective as a satirist navigating his contemporary pressures.

Section One: The Ovidian Tenor of Persius' Literary Criticism

In Satire One Persius is involved in an extended excursus on literary criticism, positioning himself in opposition to both the quality of the poetry produced by his contemporaries and the literary taste of the audiences who heap exaggerated praise upon it. Persius' critiques are wide-ranging, dipping into different slices of contemporary (pseudo-) literary life, as well as providing his own miscellaneous samples of fashionable poetry. Although the scene-setting seems to be firmly rooted in the here and now of the present day, there are Ovidian resonances in both Persius' explicit criticism and in the lines of faux-poetry. These resonances come together to form a theme within *Satire* 1, one that has a distinctly Ovidian tenor. Persius chooses to present a slice of the contemporary literary scene as post-Ovidian.

This is especially striking as the hints that Persius provides concerning post-Ovidian poetry, particularly elegy, have a precursor in Ovid's own self-interested

perspective on his place in literary history and the hints he gives as to what he imagines the fate of elegy will be after himself. In this section I will explore this Ovidian strand of Persius' literary criticism and argue that Persius picks up on and continues a perspective that was begun by Ovid. Ovid projected this perspective into an imagined literary future, which then becomes the literary present for Persius as he chooses to portray it. This criticism of facile Ovidian imitators then sets up a contrast with the broader Ovidian frame to Satire One, Persius' own nuanced and significant engagement with Ovid and his poetry that I will present in the later sections of this chapter.

One of Persius' first vignettes of contemporary literary culture defines a type of poetry by its concern with mythological heroines and its generally melancholy nature (1.32-35):

hic aliquis, cui circum umeros hyacinthina laena est,
rancidulum quiddam balba de nare locutus
Phyllidas, Hypsipylas, vatum et plorabile siquid,
eliquat ac tenero subplantat verba palato.

At this point, someone with a hyacinth wrap around his shoulders snorting and lisping some nauseating stuff, filters his Phyllises and Hypsipyles, the typical tear-jerking stuff of bards, tripping up the words on the roof of his delicate mouth.[274]

This passage is not explicitly directed at elegiac or Ovidian poetry, but the defining characteristics of the poetry are within the realm of the types of imitation that we can imagine Ovid would have inspired. The two heroines cited by name, Phyllis and Hypsipyle, are prominently featured in Ovid's *Heroides* as the "authors" of epistles 2 and 6 respectively. Phyllis in particular was favored material for Ovid in his other elegiac poetry, though not in the *Metamorphoses*. In the *Ars Amatoria* Phyllis makes several

[274] Translations of Persius are my own adapted from Braund 2004b.

appearances in mini-catalogues of women, focusing on a different aspect of her story as an *exemplum*: as an example of a woman whose lover's absence increased her love for him, together with Penelope and Laodamia (*AA* 2.352-3); alongside Ariadne, Medea and Dido as women who were faithful to their loves and hence destroyed by men, and therefore as women who would have benefited from learning from Ovid how to love with *ars* (*AA*. 3.37-8); and as an example of a woman whose lover made false promises together again with Ariadne (*AA*. 3.459-60). In the *Remedia Amoris* Ovid briefly laments that Phyllis would have lived if he had been her teacher (*RA* 55-6), as well as selecting her and her story as an extended example, this time focused on loneliness as the cause of her suicide (*RA* 591-608). Across these appearances, together with her own letter in *Heroides* 2, Ovid's Phyllis emerges as a woman embedded within Ovid's community of abandoned women, drawing connections between herself and Ariadne in particular, but also as one whom Ovid makes stand out.[275] As he returns to her sad fate from different angles, Ovid makes her an especially evocative example of what his readers should avoid, both in terms of her actions and her own poor reading habits, failing to learn the lessons from the stories of other mythical women.[276]

Persius' literary-critical terminology also points towards elegy. *Plorabile* is unattested before this instance in Persius and so it is not a conventional descriptor for poetic genre. While the designation of this type of poetry as *plorabile siquid* could simply evoke the piteousness of the stories of these heroines, it can also be understood as a

---

[275] See Lindheim 2003.92-106 and Fulkerson 2005.23-39 for intra-textual connections between Dido, Ariadne and Phyllis.

[276] Kennedy 2006 peels back the layers of intertextual connections between *Heroides* 2 and the passages in the *Remedia Amoris*, uncovering the lessons to be learnt by the reader of the *Remedia Amoris* from Phyllis' own poor reading of Ariadne's story in her letter. Gardner 2008 also sees Ovid's Phyllis as an example of a woman whom Ovid cannot save, stuck as she is in "women's time".

marker of the presumed genre of poetry under scrutiny, namely elegy. Greek elegiac poetry encompassed a wide range of themes, whereas Latin elegy came to be strongly identified with the twin arenas of love and lament. The origin of elegy was commonly theorized as being related to lament as, for example, in Horace's *Ars Poetica*.[277] Elegy is frequently defined in relation to its plaintiveness.[278] Ovid makes the dual nature of love and lament in elegiac poetry especially evident in the two different personifications he creates in *Amores* 3: one Elegy is a sexy *puella* (3.1.9-12), while the other is a figure of bereavement, identified with the supposedly mournful origins of the genre (3.9.3-4).[279] As the last canonical elegist, the path that Ovid takes in his final elegies, his exile poems, solidified this aspect even further as a defining quality of elegy.[280]

That we should read *plorabile siquid* as a generic marker referring to elegiac poetry is borne out a few lines later when Persius vents his exasperation at the exaggerated levels of praise that undeserving poetry receives. In conversing with an imaginary opposing voice, Persius says (1.48-52):

sed recti finemque extremumque esse recuso
"euge" tuum et "belle." nam "belle" hoc excute totum:
quid non intus habet? non hic est Ilias Atti
ebria veratro? non siqua elegidia crudi
dictarunt proceres?

[277] Horace *Ars Poetica* 75-8: *versibus impariter iunctis querimonia primum, / post etiam inclusa est uoti sententia compos;/ quis tamen exiguos elegos emiserit auctor,/ grammatici certant et adhuc sub iudice lis est.* See Brink 1971 and Hinds 1987a.103-4.

[278] For example *miserabilis…elegos* (Hor. *Carm.* 1.33.2-3); Ovid: *flebilis…Elegia Am.* 3.9.3; *elegi quoque flebile carmen Her.* 15.7; *flebilis ut noster status est, ita flebile carmen Tr.* 5.1.5. Elegy is defined by the act of mourning love in the epigram on Tibullus' death: …*elegis molles qui fleret amores* Dom. Mars. Fr.7.3 Courtney.

[279] See Bessone 2013.45 for further discussion.

[280] See Fantham 2001.209 and Rosati 2005.133. C.f. *Tr*. 3.1.9-10; 5.1.5-6. Pseudepigrapha continue to prominently combine these two elements: *Epicedium Drusi* describes itself as *miserabile…carmen* 3 and the *Elegiae in Maecenatem* calls itself *carmen triste* 1.

But I refuse to take your "bravo!" and your "lovely" as the be all and end all of excellence. Give that "lovely" a thorough sifting: is there anything it does not include? Won't you find Attius' *Iliad* intoxicated with hellebore? And all the romantic ditties dictated by our gorged lords?

One of the types of poetry that to Persius' mind earns public approval undeservedly is elegy, which he calls not *elegia*, but *elegidia*. This is the only known instance of the diminutive, by which Persius clearly signals his disapproval. The designation of the supposed poets as *crudi…proceres* chimes with the post-prandial setting of the earlier lines in which the men are similarly stuffed (*saturi,* L31, also a programmatic word for satire), enquiring about the state of poetry over their refreshments (*inter pocula,* L30). Persius' contemptuously explicit reference to *elegidia* plausibly connects back to the earlier vignette, giving a clearer designation of the genre of the poetry under attack.

If we conclude that Persius is referring to elegiac Phyllises and Hypsipyles, full of woe, Ovid is unmistakably brought to mind. In theory, then, Persius could be criticizing Ovid himself. But when Persius died in 62, Ovid had been dead for almost half a century, and Persius' target in these lines is contemporary poetry. The most reasonable inference, then, is that he is alluding to the production of unimaginative post-Ovidian elegy. Harvey, too, notes that Persius' description fits Ovid himself, but he quickly adds that Persius probably does not have Ovid's own poetry specifically in mind.[281] Noting that the names of the heroines here are in the plural, Harvey suggests that Persius is skewering the output of contemporary poets who were continuing to write elegy and amatory poetry in the

[281] Harvey 1981.27. In studies of the *Heroides* and the *Ars Amatoria* Scivoletto (1976.98) and Spoth (1992.213-14) both highlight this passage in Persius as reminiscent of Ovid in subject matter and style. Scivoletto also notes similarities between the the language Persius uses to derogatorily describe the men's performances and a passage in *Ars Amatoria* 3: *hic aliquis* 1.32, *atque aliquis AA* 3.341; *tener* 1.35, *tener Propertius AA.* 3.333; and the language of lisping and feminized performance compared to an earlier passage in the *Ars Amatoria* in which Ovid comments on the artificial tears and lisping of women *AA.* 3.291-6.

Ovidian tradition but at a significantly lower quality.[282] The plurals do indeed suggest that Persius is not alluding to after-dinner performances of Ovid's own *Heroides*. There are numerous, second-rate Phyllises and Hypsipyles. The picture of poetic performance that Persius is painting does not suggest the production of dynamic, original elegies, but instead a recycling of well-worn Ovidian material.

This seems to fit with our conventional understanding of the literary history of elegy as a genre, but it is important to recognize that the development of elegy, and especially its fate after Ovid, is difficult for us to judge, shaped as it is by the narratives the poets themselves construct and pieced together from snippets of evidence. A conventional history of Latin elegists traces a canon of four from Gallus, through to Propertius and Tibullus, to end with Ovid, a quartet that Ovid constructs with himself as the capstone.[283] Quintilian gives this group of four elegists, adding no other names, whether from disinterest in discussing the genre, or a genuine absence of elegists of note in the intervening years.[284] Aside from elegy alone, both Horace and Ovid create a general impression that the climate is becoming less favorable to literary talent, leaving a few stand-outs, such as Ovid.[285] After Ovid we are left with a murky picture of the genre. Elegies seem to have been being written but who exactly was writing them, the quality of their attempts, and whether the poems would be recognized as elegiac compared to the canonical elegiac poets, are all open to question. Ovid himself is often linked to a post-Ovidian decline in the genre because of his innovations in it. He pushed the boundaries, it

[282] Harvey 1981.27.
[283] *Tr.* 4.10.51-54. Ovid also implies that he is concerned about his place in the canon of elegists by withholding himself from that final position: *Tr.* 5.1.17-19.
[284] Quintilian *Inst. Or.* 10.1.93.
[285] For example, see Horace *Ep.* To Augustus 2.1.214-44. I will discuss the significance of Ovid's narrativizing of his position in the literary world, past, present and future, shortly.

is argued, to such an extent that he brought the genre to its pinnacle, or even exhausted it, necessitating a period of breathing space before elegiac poetry of any quality could be produced again.[286]

Fantham and Rosati both tackle the question of what happens to elegy after Ovid.[287] They bring together the examples of elegies that we do have, pseudepigraphic works that were attached to famous names, with passages in Statius, Martial and Pliny the Younger that appear to bear witness to post-Ovidian, poet-erotic elegy, piecing together a picture rife with amateurism.[288] From the discussion of these two forms of evidence we can draw out two different features of the nature of elegy post-Ovid in the first century that are relevant to the passage in Persius. Firstly, while elegy as a meter seems to have still been in use in the second half of the first century, this does not necessarily translate to the production of elegies generically similar to Ovid. Secondly, the pseudepigrapha fit within and are witness to a literary culture of imaginative imitation in which canonical works and poets inspired the creation of poetry in the name and style of these figures, and Ovid played a role in such works.[289] These passages in Persius, while they have not figured in conventional discussions of the literary history of elegy, are potentially another

---

[286] Sullivan (1991.106) even suggests that the consequences that befell Ovid due to the *Ars Amatoria* were instrumental in "killing off" elegy.

[287] Fantham 2001, Rosati 2005.

[288] Fantham 2001 concludes that by the Flavian era "the elegists are not real poets and the poets are not elegists" (207) and that the "elegists" mentioned in Martial, Statius and Pliny, ostensibly connected to bastions of the genre, Tibullus and Propertius, are in fact indulging in versifying simply as a "gentlemanly time-killer" (210). Rosati 2005 also views the genre as becoming neutralized after Ovid, becoming indistinguishable from other occasional forms of poetry, as evidenced by Statius' portrayal of the figure of Elegia trying to blend in as a respectable matron, hiding her most distinguishing features (*Silv.* 1.2.7-10).

[289] Zwierlein 1999 put forward an especially provocative argument that the period of Tiberius was not simply imitative of Augustan poets, but that the texts of Ovid and Virgil were the victims of mass interpolations and forgeries at the hand of one particular editor / reviser / imitator, Julius Montanus. For a more recent exploration of the pseudepigrapha and the climate that produced such works see Peirano 2012.

data-point to add to the evidence, pointing to the derivative, imitative quality of elegy in the half century or so after Ovid's death.

In these lines, however, Persius is not simply a witness to the decline in elegiac poetry. There is more to be said concerning both Ovid and the tendentious nature of Persius' viewpoint. These lines appear to provide a window on the existence of a particular kind of Ovidian *imitatio* in Persius' contemporary literary world but as we just saw, the evidence is thin for judging the fictiveness or reality of these claims in a literary landscape that we do not have full access to. In the absence of definitive corroboration of this perspective on elegy, it is especially striking that Persius' window on Ovidian *imitatio* corresponds to the picture that Ovid himself paints of the types of poetic imitation that he inspired. Persius is creating the impression of contemporary literary culture that has its origins in Ovid's own self-interested perspective on his place in literary history, and influence on later poets.

As early as the *Amores* Ovid suggests that the *Heroides* have found imitators. He writes that his friend Sabinus has taken up the invitation that the epistolary form of the *Heroides* provided by writing replies to the women from their lovers. The women he names include Phyllis and Hypsipyle.[290] Thus Ovid himself suggests that the subject matter of the *Heroides* was an especially attractive model for imitation. In the final poem of the *Epistulae Ex Ponto* in which Ovid surveys the landscape of poets, he describes Sabinus as the one who bid Odysseus to write back to Penelope as well as defining

---

[290] *Am.* 2.18.27-34: *Quam cito de toto rediit meus orbe Sabinus / scriptaque diversis rettulit ille locis! / candida Penelope signum cognovit Ulixis; / legit ab Hippolyto scripta noverca suo. / iam pius Aeneas miserae rescripsit Elissae, / quodque legat Phyllis, si modo vivit, adest. / tristis ad Hypsipylen ab Iasone littera venit; / det votam Phoebo Lesbis amata lyram.*

Tuscus as being well-known for his *Phyllis*.[291] Long before Persius, then, Ovid himself provides the evidence that his innovative *Heroides,* and these particular heroines, were popular material for poets to respond to — or rehash.

In the exile poetry especially, Ovid is also increasingly concerned with his legacy — his place in the elegiac canon and in literary history generally.[292] This interest is manifested in the manner in which he constructed his place in the canon of elegists, and also in the impression he gives of a diffuse, undistinguished crowd of younger poets who follow him. In his well-known biographical poem (*Tr.* 4.10), the corollary to his cultivation of poets who were his elders (*temporis illius colui fovique poetas* – "I revered and cherished the poets of that time", L41) was the attention paid to him by the younger crowd of poets (*utque ego maiores, sic me coluere minores* – "and as I revered older poets, so the younger ones revered me", L55). One could claim here an equivalency between Ovid acting as the younger poet, and the subsequent *minores*. Younger poets do not by necessity have to be derivative, as Ovid himself proves as he more than holds his own against the greats who came before him, or even surpasses them. However, Ovid works to undercut any equivalency between himself and these poets. He does not deem them worthy of being named, forcing them into the amorphous mass of a crowd, unknown and indistinguishable from each other. Ovid does not give his readers the chance to judge the quality of these poets for himself, leaving us with the assumption that this crowd of poets will forever be merely *minores*, lesser poets who will never manage to surpass Ovid.

---

[291] *E. P.* 4.16.13: *qui Penelopae rescribere iussit Vlixem*. 4.16.20: *quique sua nomen Phyllide Tuscus habet*.
[292] *Tr.* 3.1.65-74; 3.14.1-10; *Ex. P.* 1.1.5-10 and especially *Tr.* 5.1.17-19.

In the final poem of the exile poetry (*Ex P.* 4.16), Ovid provides a more detailed look at the literary landscape. This time, Ovid does personalize the picture, throwing out names and subject matter or genre for most of the poets. This literary scene that Ovid constructs has significant points of correspondence with the wider literary scene that Persius satirizes in Satire One. Ovid's tour through the different poets and types of poetry lacks Persius' satiric bite, as is to be expected in the different genre, but the types of poetry that each draw attention to do overlap in general and specific ways. Much of the poetic material that Ovid mentions is based on conventional mythological material (Hercules 4.16.7-8; posthomerica and the Trojan cycle 17-18, 19, 26; Perseus 25; water-nymphs and satyrs 25). Well-trodden mythological pathways are also the targets of Persius' criticism. For instance, Ovid refers to a poet translating a *Phaeacis* out of Homer (27), while Persius seems particularly irked by poets who undertook the repetitive task of translating Homer (*Sat.* 1.4, 50). A number of these poets are Ovid's elegiac successors. In addition to Sabinus (L13-16) and Tuscus (L20) mentioned above, Montanus (11-12), Proculus (32) and Capella (36) can also most likely be considered elegists.[293] We can read Persius as expanding upon this picture of a wealth of minor poets and elegists, training his satirical aim on them and their poetry.

Although Ovid gives specifics here with names and works, the overall impression we are left with from this closing poem of the collection is not dissimilar to the effect of Ovid's comment at *Tristia* 4.10.55. Even though in the latter poem he deigns to share his stage with other poets, the structure of the poem undercuts their standing compared to Ovid. The catalogue of poets moves through different names and genres to a crowd of

[293] Montaus is described as skilled in equal and unequal verses (11-12). Proculus held to the tender (*molle*) path of Callimachus (32). Capella locked words in uneven verses (36).

anonymous poets, too many to name, except for the amateur Cotta Maximus, notable for his position of patronage in the world of the exile poems, and then finally Ovid.[294] At first it could appear that Ovid is swallowed up by the crowd of amateurs, but in fact Ovid is the one that stands out. This works on a grammatical level in that the whole catalogue is a single, long subordinate clause that culminates with Ovid anchoring the sentence in the main clause.[295] Further, although Ovid places himself last in the list, he is in fact the predecessor for the majority of the poets named. These poets fit the position of the *minores* whom Ovid earlier spoke of as cultivating him.

It also seems obvious that Ovid does not need to show off his poetic fame and achievement in order for it to be clear that he is the poet of the highest standing, caliber and fame. This is an aspect that is probably exacerbated for us as readers today, separated from the contemporary literary scene. Our knowledge of the poets named here varies but for many of them they would truly have been subsumed into the anonymous *turba* were it not for Ovid naming them here.[296] While the passage of time hands down to us little or no poetry written by these poets, leaving us to surmise that the survival rate is low due to the vast chasm in quality between their output and Ovid's poetry, we can imagine that a contemporary reader, familiar with the poets of his own period, would also be struck, perhaps even more than we are, by this diffuse crowd of poets. Mediocre may be too strong a descriptor, but Ovid certainly provides a picture of a crowd of poets with no peers worthy of the designation who rise to the top to match his standing, much less surpass him in the future.

---

[294] *Ex Ponto* 4.16.37-40 crowd of anonymous poets; 41-44 Cotta Maximus; 45-46 Ovid.

[295] Luck 1963.553 and Helzle 1989.181.

[296] For surviving fragments of these poets see Courtney 1993 and Hollis 2007. Hollis 2007.420-30 provides an appendix of authors with no surviving fragments with all tidbits of information that one can find about them gathered together from different sources.

Ovid's method of constructing his place in literary history and attesting his influence on later poets is understandably selective, fuelled by self-interest. For example, by highlighting Sabinus as a conscious imitator of the *Heroides*, Ovid draws attention to the creative inventiveness that his poetry inspired, but he can also imply that those who follow him lack originality. It benefits Ovid to insinuate that, as he approaches the end of his career, there is a dearth of creative ideas among poets, leaving them to continue to imitate him. Ovid's self-interest is more than understandable but Persius is also not an impartial reporter here. Presumably both Ovid and Persius are not so distant from reality in what they are writing that it would push a contemporary reader beyond the boundary of belief. But at the same time, Ovid's self-interest bleeds into Persius' account. In suggesting that there are imitators of Ovid, churning out poor-quality *elegidia*, repetitive, derivative, Phyllises and Hypsipyles, Persius appears to be picking up on Ovid's perspective on literary history, and continuing this self-interested narrative. Persius orients his perspective on this slice of the contemporary literary scene from Ovid. This picture of an off-the-shelf, ready-to-write, supply of poetic material fuelled by Ovid is the logical sequel to Ovid's self-interested perspective.

There is further evidence that Persius is aware of and continuing Ovid's perspective on his imitators later in the satire when Persius concocts his own supposed examples of contemporary poetry. He presents these examples as real quotations but they could also be, and probably in fact are, examples of Persius' own making.[297] These lines

[297] Scholiasts actually attributed these lines to Nero which has been variously accepted and rejected by scholars since then. Sullivan 1978 argues for the attribution. It seems unlikely that Persius would have quoted Nero to illustrate the poor quality of contemporary poetry. But it is equally unsurprising that readers would suspect that Nero is lurking in the satires. Gowers 2009 explores how Nero worms his way into the satires even with little encouragement from Persius. Nero also casts his shadow over the punch line of the satire that will be my focus in Section Three. Rumor was that Persius had explicitly alluded to Nero at

of faux-poetry not only have a vaguely Ovidian tone, as we might expect if Persius were simply targeting subpar poetry belonging to a generally Ovidian tradition, but there are also significant intertexts with Ovid's poetry. We could read these intertexts as providing concrete examples of the strand of Ovidian *imitatio* that I have argued that Persius is suggesting in the passages discussed above. The close connections with Ovid that are to be found in these lines bolster my argument that Persius has in mind an Ovidian perspective on literary history. One of his targets in the contemporary literary scene appears to be poor quality Ovidian imitators who would mangle original Ovidian poetry in composing their own, and in these lines Persius is providing examples of what he sees Ovid's imitative successors doing. However, although the Ovidian connections in these lines may seem to be deployed haphazardly and without broader significance by the imagined contemporary poets who authored these lines, I will suggest that Persius does not in fact deploy these Ovidian connections randomly, but that they come together to provide an articulate interaction with Ovid that speaks within the broader, more nuanced framework of Persius' engagement with Ovid and his poetry that I will set out in Sections Two and Three.

Persius' imaginary interlocutor quotes the following snippets of lines in order to demonstrate the unprecedented smoothness of contemporary poetry (1.92-95):

sed numeris decor est et iunctura addita crudis.
cludere sic versum didicit "Berecyntius Attis"
et "qui caeruleum dirimebat Nerea dolphin"
sic "costam longo subduximus Appennino."

1.121 but that Cornutus, his tutor and editor, sanitized the line after Persius' death. As Gowers (2009.176) puts it this "is just the sort of invention we would expect". These types of readings of Persius, presuming risky allusion to Nero at every turn, reinforces Persius' precarious position in writing satire and the need for the subtle handling of satiric speech that I argue Ovid enables for Persius.

But elegance and smoothness have been added to the raw rhythms of old poetry. That's how "Berecynthian Attis" learned how to end the line, and "the dolphin parting azure Nereus" and "we stole a rib from the long Apennines too".

Berecyntius Attis is a phrase only found in Persius but there are several connections between it and Ovid's poetry. It appears to be a conflation of two line endings in Ovid: *Cybeleius Attis* at *Met.* 10.104 and *Berecyntius heros* at *Met.* 11.106.[298] *Attis* on its own is clearly not a word that one can isolate and comment on in a meaningful way, but by introducing the phrase as a specific kind of poetic clausula, Persius provides a way for us to approach its significance here. *Attis* alone is found not infrequently at the end of a hexameter line (although perhaps not as frequently as one might imagine) but the combination of an adjective ending in *–ius* preceding Attis at the end of a line is not common at all. In fact, Persius here and Ovid's *Cybeleius Attis* are the only two attested instances. The use of the epithet Berecynthian to describe a male person is also rare. The epithet comes from the name of Mount Berecyntus, a place of special importance to the goddess Cybele. As such the epithet is used to denote a connection to the goddess.[299] However at *Met* 11.106 Ovid also uses the epithet to describe a male mortal, not Attis, but Midas.

On the surface it may appear that the imagined poet of these lines is simply using a handy, slightly out of the ordinary epithet together with Attis to fit the end of the line. Both Attis and Midas can plausibly be connected to Cybele by the epithet, one as lover, the other as son. In creating the faux quote Persius shows he can play the game of Ovidian *imitatio* by substituting *Berecyntius* for *Cybeleius.* However, Midas and the

[298] Kissell 1990.234-35; Harvey 1981.44.
[299] Virgil uses the epithet to describe Cybele specifically: *Aen.* 6.784; 9.82; 9.619.; as does Statius: *Theb.* 4.789 Horace and Ovid both use the epithet for musical instruments in relation to the worship of Cybele or Bacchus: Hor. *Carm.* 1.18.3; 3.19.18; 4.1.22; Ovid *Met.* 11.16; *Fasti* 4.181. See *TLL* entry for *Berecyntius*.

myths surrounding him are going to resurface later in Satire One in an ideologically charged moment that holds great significance for Persius' satiric project and for the question of satiric freedom of speech in general. Persius' deployment of the myth of Midas and his barber at L119-123 of the satire is a very well known episode, but the significance of Midas' appearance in relation to Ovid has not been fully explored. I will discuss the implications of Midas' presence here and of the connections Persius is making through him with Ovid's perspective on freedom of speech in Section Three of this chapter. For now I will simply comment that as Persius manipulates the Midas myth in a significant manner later in the satire, the presence here in a line of faux-poetry that combines two Ovidian line endings of an epithet that Ovid uses to describe Midas cannot be brushed aside as mere coincidence. Persius nods his head towards Midas here before the reader is made aware of Midas' full significance for Persius' satire. This is the first hint in these faux lines that Persius is engaging more deeply with Ovid than the debased Ovidian imitators whom he is targeting.

Persius then responds to the interlocutor with quotations of his own, evoking an array of Bacchic clichés (1.99-102):

"torva Mimalloneis inplerunt cornua bombis,
et raptum vitulo caput ablatura superbo
Bassaris et lyncem Maenas flexura corymbis
euhion ingeminat, reparabilis adsonat echo."

Their fierce horns they filled with Mimallonian booming and Bassaris, poised to carry off the head torn from the proud calf, and the Maenad poised to steer the lynx with ivy clusters and shouts and shouts "euhion" and reverberating echo chimes in."

Within these few short lines that Persius holds out as an example of the type of poetry to which he objects, a significant number of Ovidian connections present themselves.[300] Alone, they may appear to be of minor significance, but once noted, their cumulative effect increases and mobilizes Ovidian intertexts of deeper resonance. First *Mimalloneis* is a rare noun that before its appearance here in Persius is unparalleled, except for one instance in Ovid in the *Ars Amatoria*.[301] Ovid uses it to denote Bacchus' reveling female followers, *Mimallonides* (*AA.* 1.541), in the context of Bacchus sweeping Ariadne off Naxos where she had been abandoned, a narrative moment that Ovid also utilizes in the *Heroides*. It is worth noting the subtle connections here to Ovid's Ariadne who was a significant intertext for Ovid's Phyllis.[302]

The final line of these four is packed with Ovidian connections, including one which plays off the same passage in the *Ars Amatoria*. We could simply ascribe the overlaps with the *Ars Amatoria* passage to the shared subject matter of Bacchus and his followers, but the playfulness of the nod to Ovid suggests that Persius is fully aware of the connections and is in fact indulging in them. The phrase *euhion ingeminat* intersects with *AA.* 1.563: *Pars 'Hymenaee' canunt, pars clamant 'Euhion, euhoe!* – "Some sing" Hymeneus", some shout "Euhion, euhoe!" In the Ovidian passage Bacchus has arrived to carry off and wed Ariadne and his followers sing out in celebration. *Euhoe* is the common cry of Bacchus' followers. *Euhius* is a cult title of Bacchus, most often used as an alternative name for the god.[303] In both Persius and Ovid *euhion* is not being used

---

[300] As noted in commentaries of the satires at 1.99-102. Harvey 1981.43 observes that the connections to Ovid in these lines suggest that "Persius has in mind the work of *Ovidiani poetae*". Kissell 1990.244-48 notes when Persius orientates himself from Ovidian lines.
[301] It also appears later in Statius at *Thebaid* 4.660.
[302] See above page 127-28.
[303] For example: Hor. *Carm.* 1.18.9; 2.11.17; Petronius 41.6; Statius *Theb.* 4.740; *Achill.* 1.616.

simply to designate and name Bacchus. Instead both use the word in the context of his followers shouting, calling out the Bacchic cry.[304] In Persius this cry is not to be called out just once, but it is to be repeated and doubled, called out again and again (*ingeminat*). In Ovid there is not only the same word in the context of calling out in celebration but the very doubling of the cry that Persius speaks of. In Ovid we have the exuberant speakers who shout out *euhion, euhoe*. We should also keep in mind that the idea of doubling is not without relevance when thinking about intertextual connections, an aspect that is further underlined by the echoing that closes the passage.

As the line continues, *reparabilis* is another word that has an Ovidian connection, with which Persius seems to be creatively engaging. Ovid employs this word three times, always in a passive sense, something is able to be restored or repaired (*Am*. 1.14.55 the damage to hair; *Her.* 5.103 wounded chastity; *Met.* 1.379 the drowned world). The word also appears in the negative in several authors but it is only in Ovid that the word appears in the positive form prior to Persius.[305] Persius, however, flips the sense of the word from passive to an active sense, creatively revising Ovid's usages. Finally the line ending, *adsonat echo*, is comparable to one in Ovid when he is telling the story of the mythical figure, Echo: *plangetibus adsonat Echo, Met.* 3.507.[306]

It is this final line with its focusing on doubling and echoing that provides the basis for the most compelling argument that Persius is engaging with Ovid in these lines

[304] The *TLL* entries for *euhius* and *euhoe* succinctly illustrate the rarity of the former to denote the Bacchic cry with only three attested instances (Ennius *scaen.* 125 along with only these passages in Ovid and Persius) as opposed to the latter with numerous usages.

[305] Examples of *inreparabilis*: Virg. *Georg.* 3.284 and *Aen.* 10.467; Columella 11.1.29; Seneca *Ep. Mor.* 123.10.5. Other examples of *reparabilis*: Cal. Sic. *Ecl.* 5.20; Lucan 10.429; Val. Fl. 6.562.

[306] Kissel 1990.248 also comments on how Persius ends the line here with echo as do several of Ovid's lines that are concerned with the figure of Echo: *Met.* 3.507 quoted above, 3.368, 3.358 *resonabilis echo*.

in ways that go beyond simply providing examples of the haphazard tags that second-rate Ovidian imitators could have spliced together. Doubling and echoing are thematically significant for ideas surrounding intertextuality. In a study of the figure of Echo in Renaissance and post-Renaissance writers, Hollander explores the different facets and connections between the acoustic phenomenon and the dynamics of textual echoing, intertextuality. In discussing metaphorical echo Hollander draws attention to the reversal in priority between source and echo that in nature gives greater presence to the source, whereas in intertextual echoing the echo of the present text takes control.[307] The intertextual echo fragments and breaks off the original, incorporating it into a new utterance and meaning, as Persius' echoes of Ovid do.[308] The reference to doubling and echoing in these lines alerts the reader to potential intertextual engagement in general, but Ovid's Echo in particular is also necessary to fully understand the intertextual facets of the lines.

An echo does not fit within the strongly Bacchic context of these lines as comfortably as the other elements. The majority of the lines consists of a muddle of Bacchic clichés. Echoing and doubling of sound is not a cliché associated with Bacchic rituals. Rather than accepting the acoustic focus of the final line at face value and rolling it into the surrounding Bacchic clichés, one ought to provide an explanation that accounts for Persius' emphasis here on echoing. Such inclusion can be most plausibly understood when the line ending is placed in its Ovidian context. It is in Ovid's treatment of Echo, in which the intertext for the line ending is found, that the character of Echo does fit within the realm of Bacchus. In Book Three of the *Metamorphoses* Ovid tells the story of Echo,

---

[307] Hollander 1981.62-112.
[308] Hollander 1981.88.

which he innovatively grafts onto that of Narcissus (*Met*. 3.339-510).[309] Intertwining the stories of Narcissus and Echo is not the only aspect of Ovid's construction of the narrative in Book Three that is unexpected. Ovid gives the pairing of Narcissus and Echo a prominent place in the middle of Book Three, which most significantly for us in thinking about Persius, is also the middle of Ovid's Theban cycle. Book Three spans the founding of the city of Thebes by Cadmus to the death of Cadmus' grandson, Pentheus, at the hands of his mother in a Bacchic frenzy. Persius' mishmash of Bacchic lines could very well be applied to the mania of Ovid's Agave as she tears the head of her son, believing it to be animal prey.[310] In the middle of this tightly-constructed Theban cycle, Ovid breaks off to tell the story of Narcissus and Echo, neither of whom are native to the area of Thebes and so are surprising additions to the surrounding Theban stories, just as echoing strikes an odd note amidst Persius' Bacchic clichés.

The "resident-alien" status of Narcissus and Echo within the Theban mythical landscape has attracted comment and explanation, in particular in relation to the absence in Ovid of a figure central to the story of Thebes, Oedipus. Janan builds on previous attempts to unpack the presence of Narcissus and Echo and the absence of Oedipus to show how through Narcissus "Ovid can introduce the Oedipal narrative into his Thebes without entailing the complication that Oedipus' myth trails".[311] Janan acknowledges the unexpectedness of the presence of Narcissus and Echo and then shows how Ovid has embedded their stories into his agenda for Book Three and his Theban cycle. From this

---

[309] Ovid appears to have been the first ancient writer to combine the stories of Echo and Narcissus. See Janan 2009.114-155 for discussion of Ovid's version of their stories.
[310] *Met.* 3.692-733.
[311] Janan 2009.183. See specifically Chapters Four and Five for discussion of Ovid's telling of the stories of Echo and Narcissus in *Met*. 3. Earlier discussions of the surprising presence of Narcissus and Echo in the Theban cycle can be found in Hardie 1990 and Gildenhard-Zissos 2000.

Ovidian perspective we can see that Echo / echoing does have a place within the mish-mash of Theban, Bacchic clichés in Persius, but that such inclusion is also markedly Ovidian. Ovid grafts Echo onto the story of Narcissus and then unexpectedly embeds both of them within a Theban context, connected to Bacchus. By closing his jumble of Bacchic material with echoing Persius appears to provide an Alexandrian-style footnote, pointing the reader towards Ovid.

In addition to their placement in a Theban landscape, Ovid's Echo and Narcissus are significant because their story embodies an array of acoustic and speech issues. Hinds makes the point that Hollander's exploration of Echo as a way of thinking about poetic language in later non-classical authors is prefigured by Ovid's manipulation of the story of Narcissus and Echo.[312] Ovid packs the story with every kind of echo: repetitions of and responses to lines within the story; intertextual echoes to poets such as Virgil and Catullus; and the imaginative conversation between Narcissus and Echo.[313] The back and forth between the two provides an example in action of the power of an echo, real and intertextual. Ovid's Echo, in repeating back to him Narcissus' words, illustrates the capacity of echoing to take control of the original and at times radically renegotiate meaning.[314] Even though Echo appears to be hobbled in her ability to communicate, she is able to take hold of and renegotiate language and meaning beyond sampling repeating what she hears. This is exemplary for thinking about how and why Persius is engaging intertextually with Ovid in these lines and *Satire* 1 as a whole. In echoing Ovid Persius fragments and takes control of the original Ovidian utterances, redeploying them into his

---

[312] Hinds 1998.5.
[313] Hinds 1998.5-8. Rosati 1983. Anderson 1997.
[314] *Met.* 3.380-92.

own meanings. By doing so, he is able to communicate more than he feels able to openly say. In the introduction to this chapter, I emphasized the pressures that Persius faced in writing satire. Persius himself suggests that he is hobbled in his ability to communicate and to freely speak satirically. Even though these nods to Ovid are packaged as random Ovidian stylistic tags by an imaginary contemporary poet, it is through them that Persius is able to slyly communicate. The subtle nod to Midas hints at the intertextually significant passage to come based on the Midas myth. In Ovid's Echo Persius finds and brings into his satire a metamorphic model for speaking in difficult circumstances, for making oneself heard when open communication is not possible.

In this section I have highlighted elements within Persius' literary criticism that have Ovidian resonances, both in his presentation of the types of poetic production that make up the current literary scene, and in his reporting of alleged examples of contemporary poetry. By viewing these elements together we can see that there is a strand to Persius' literary criticsm that is self-consciously post-Ovidian. This could be read simply as an additional witness to post-Ovidian elegy and Ovidian *imitatio,* but Persius is continuing a perspective that Ovid inaugurated himself in passages concerned with his legacy and impact. Persius takes up Ovid's self-interested literary-historical observations and chooses to represent a slice of the contemporary literary scene as being oriented from Ovid.

By doing this, Persius provides for himself a target ripe for satire: debased Ovidian imitators. However, in the Ovidian connections in Persius' faux-quotations of contemporary poetry, there are hints that Persius' engagement with Ovid has a deeper motivation. Persius provides a window into shallow poets imitating Ovid's style and

material, while also pointing the reader towards Persius' own nuanced and substantive interaction with Ovid. As a poetic predecessor, Ovid and his corpus can offer much more than such shallow imitators allow, and Persius demonstrates this by engaging with Ovid's poetry on his own satiric terms, specifically in relation to a thematic concern that underpins the genre of satire, but that also came to be of crucial importance to Ovid, namely freedom of speech. In the following two sections of this chapter I will explore how Persius engages with Ovid to think about the problem of satiric of freedom of speech and to express his solution to being a satirist at this time period.

Section Two: Persius' secret, an Ovidian lens on a satiric problem

While in the bulk of Satire One Persius is concerned with targeting the lamentable state of the contemporary literary scene, this is framed by a secret, its intimation (8-12) and then subsequent disclosure (119-123). At first Persius appears to be about to tell us what the cause of the state of current literature is, but he pulls himself back from revealing the secret before moving into another observation and then breaking off into uncontrollable laughter (1.8-12):

> nam Romae quis non – a, si fas dicere – sed fas
> tum cum ad canitiem et nostrum istud vivere triste
> aspexi ac nucibus facimus quaecumque relictis,
> cum sapimus patruos. tunc tunc – ignoscite (nolo,
> quid faciam?) sed sum petulanti splene – cachinno.

The reasons? Is there anyone at Rome who doesn't – oh if only I could say it – but I may, when I look at our grey heads and that gloomy life of ours and everything we've been doing since we gave up our toys, since we started sounding like strict uncles. Then, then – excuse me (I don't want to, I can't help it), but I've got a cheeky temper – I cackle.

Persius performs here coming up against the limit of what it is possible for him to say and then stopping himself at the crucial moment. He then returns to this secret later in the

satire, but it still cannot be revealed in a carefree and careless manner. In the lead-up to the disclosure of the secret, his interlocutor warns Persius about the dangers of speaking his mind and Persius' initial response is to concede the space and seemingly abandon any satiric undertaking (*discedo* 114). He then sets out the differing positions of his satiric predecessors, Lucilius and Horace, comparing and contrasting what they could say in satire and how they could say it (114-18). Their approaches are different but they both had greater freedom than Persius. Finally, in tortured desperation, Persius reveals his deep observation about his fellow Romans, but secretly in mythic language, into his book, as if to a hole in the ground (1.119-123):

> me muttire nefas? Nec clam? Nec cum scrobe? Nusquam?
> Hic tamen infodiam. Vidi, vidi ipse, libelle:
> auriculas asini quis non habet? Hoc ego opertum,
> hoc ridere meum, tam nil, nulla tibi vendo
> Iliade…

Am I forbidden to mutter? Not even in secret? Not even in a hole? Nowhere? Never mind: I'll dig a hole for it here. I have seen it, yes, have seen it for myself, little book: is there anyone who does not have ass' ears? This secret, this joke of mine, so insignificant, I'll not sell to you for any *Iliad*.

The broken off joke and subsequent revelation ring-fence the satire.[315] Within the programmatic first satire, these passages are recognizably critical for understanding how Persius views the genre of satire and his own status as satirist.[316] We see Persius struggling with the limits of what is possible and permissible for him to say. This is a theme that is far from peculiar to Persius alone. It has a long history in satire, as a genre that thrives on ridicule and attack, with each satirist having to face the question for

---

[315] The two passages are connected by the language of *fas / nefas* and the *quis non* of the revelation itself at 121 recalls the *nam Romae quis non* of the original question at 8. Freudenburg 2001.158-59 even suggests that the secret is already trying to slip out at 8 as the *a, si* starts to spell out the punch line, *asini*.

[316] As such they have enjoyed a wealth of critical attention and interpretation - any general treatment of Satire One has space to discuss these passages. For example, see Bramble 1974.70-71; Hooley 1997.62; Freudenburg 2001.158-59, 179-80; Reckford 2009.20, 48-49. Braund 2004a puts these passages alongside ones in Horace and Juvenal in which satirists are talking about their genre.

himself and decide on his own approach.[317] Lucilius enjoyed the greatest degree of *libertas* in exercising satiric speech, a view in part constructed by later satirists, but also borne out by surviving fragments of his poetry, although there are also points that suggest he was aware of such concerns.[318] Horace is acutely aware of the threat of satiric speech, constructing his persona and satire in order to soften the danger while still engaging in writing satire.[319] Persius' epigrammatic descriptions of Lucilius and Horace create and continue this narrative about the evolution of the theme of free speech within the genre. His satiric predecessors are clearly important for Persius' thinking on satiric *libertas* and a point against which he can position himself.[320]

However, in these two critical passages, in which Persius presents how the problem plays out in practice for himself and then his own personal strategy as a satirist in the climate of this period, Persius is not only engaging with the satirical tradition of this issue but also with Ovid in significant ways. The Ovidian connection with Midas in 119-123 has been pointed out to the extent that Ovid tells the story of Midas and was most likely a source passage for Persius — as if the *Metamorphoses* had, already in the mid-first century, ceased to be a living poem, and had already been reduced to the status of mythological handbook — but Persius' engagement with Ovid in both these passages is deeper than simply sharing a mythical story.[321] Even though Ovid did not write satire, his life and poetry became uniquely enmeshed in the theoretical issues surrounding the

---

[317] The warning about the dangers of indulging in satiric speech is common across Roman satirists: Lucilius 713-14 W = 620-1 M; Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.60-2; Juv. 1.160-70. Braund 2004a places the tension between *libertas* and *licentia* at the heart of the genre.

[318] For example, when Persius uses the verb *muttire* at 1.119, it is suggested that he is alluding to Lucilius: Fr. 454 W: *non laudare hominem quemquam neque mu facere unquam. Mu* - *muttire* which I will discuss further in Section Three. For the role of later satirists, especially Horace, in constructing the narrative about Lucilius *libertas* see Freudenburg 2001.2-5, Tzounakas 2005, Rosen 2012.

[319] See Schlegel 2005.

[320] See Tzounakas 2005 on Persius and his predecessors.

[321] Sse Bramble 1974.136, Koster 1988.78-80, Tzounakas 2005.563.

boundaries of free speech and the real ramifications of violating those boundaries. As such, on this particular issue Ovid impinges on the line of generic continuity that runs from Lucilius to Horace through to Persius. In both these passages, Persius reaches outside his conventional satiric predecessors to Ovid as the first poetic ancestor to clash with the imperial climate, who is good to think with about the boundaries of satiric speech. In Section Three I will push further on the Ovidian connections of Persius' Midan solution to the problem of satiric *libertas*. In the remainder of this section I will draw out the Ovidian resonances of Persius' first intimation that he has a secret that he must hold himself back from speaking out loud.

It is the plaintive exclamation that intercedes and takes the place of Persius' secret – *a, si fas dicere* "oh if only I could say it", 8 – that is my focus in this section. The exclamation appears at the crucial moment at which Persius perceives himself to have reached a boundary of what it is possible for him to say. The phrase is not to Horace or Lucilius and as such does not appear to fit within Persius' intertextual agenda with relation to his specifically satiric predecessors. Instead, I suggest, Persius employs these three words at the crucial moment of exclamation because of their significance to Ovid and his concerns with and perspective on the limits of free speech. In this section I will consider the significance of the boundaries of free speech for the thematics of Ovid's work and how these concerns are especially concentrated around the word *fas* in relation to speech. I will then examine the two instances of the combination of these three specific words that appear twice near the end of the *Epistulae Ex Ponto,* both in highly charged moments concerning the power of poets' speech and the powerful individuals they write about. There are two further instances of a combination of *si fas dicere* that occur

suggestively in pseudo-epigraphic works, the first in the "Ovidian" *Consolatio ad Liviam* and the second in the "Vergilian" Ciris, which I will also consider as evidence that the significance of these three words for Ovid and his work was noted by others before Persius. These instances add weight to the argument that Persius would recognize the significance of this phrase for Ovid and therefore employ it at a crucial moment in his own satire in order to reference and engage with Ovid's struggles and his perspective on the boundaries of free speech.

A major surge of critical interest in the exile poetry, initiated by scholars such as Nagle and Evans, has focused attention on the theme of free speech in Ovid's poetry, and in particular has highlighted that the limits of what is *fas* for a poet to utter are an increasingly important element in Ovid's work as a whole.[322] The lens that this scholarly background provides on reading Ovid is crucial for understanding the Ovidian resonance of *si fas dicere* in Persius. Ovid's fate and the cause of his exile, as he presents it, meant that the issues surrounding free speech and its limits are an inescapable part of what we as readers bring to Ovid's poetry, both on our own impetus and through Ovid encouraging his readers towards this viewpoint. As is known to everyone, he presents two reasons for his exile, *carmen et error* (*Tr.* 2.207), the *carmen* being the *Ars Amatoria*.[323] The lived experience of having transgressed the boundary of free speech, suffered the consequences, is at the heart of Ovid's exile poetry. This also shapes those works of Ovid that, while not strictly exile poetry, come to have an exilic gloss, the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*. In the *Tristia,* Ovid indicates that his composition of both poems was interrupted by his exile (*Tr.* 2.549-52, 555-6). As Hinds suggests, this may be

[322] Nagle 1980, Evans 1983.
[323] References to cause of exile in exile poetry: *Tr.* 1.67-8, 109-114; *Tr.* 2.207, 211-212, 345-56.

more factual for the *Fasti* than for the *Metamorphoses*, and the degree to which Ovid revised the poems in exile is open to debate.[324]

However, even before exile and any revision to the poems, Ovid was deeply concerned with the evolving status of free speech in the contemporary political climate. The significance of *fas* in relation to speech is woven into the fabric of the *Fasti*.[325] In his noteworthy article on the *Fasti*, Feeney also demonstrates how "the question of what may be said, and when, and by whom, is one of the poem's key thematic preoccupations.[326] Ovid's interest in occasions of speech and their regulation is showcased across stories within the poem, in which speaking out of turn or using your tongue without restraint almost inevitably proves to have fatal consequences.[327] The broken off nature of the poem also opens up compelling avenues of inquiry concerning the boundaries of free speech. Feeney suggests that "important sections of the poem were re-written from exile so as to make the *Fasti* read like a poem whose *licentia* has been suppressed, which has not been allowed to keep speaking, which has become *nefas*".[328] In this light, the end of the *Fasti* provocatively presents an example of the poet's voice silenced, an example of what happens when the boundaries of what it is *fas* to say are adhered to. The poet's voice does not simply stay within the safe zone, but it cannot continue speaking at all. In this discussion the poles of *libertas* and *licentia*, whose tension Braund sees as intrinsic to the genre of satire, line up with the language of *fas* / *nefas* that Ovid chooses to talk about

---

[324] Hinds 1987b.10. For the possible exilic revision of the *Metamorphoses* see Kenney 1982.444; Bömer 1986; Bömer 1988; Richmond 2002.472-74. For the state of the *Fasti* see Bömer 1957.16-22; Fantham 1985.256-66; Bömer 1988 and Herbert-Brown 1994.172-85, 204-212.
[325] Varro *Ling*. 6.29 shows the linguistic basis of the *fasti* relating to speaking.
[326] Feeney 1992 "*Si licet et fas est:* Ovid's *Fasti* and the problem of free speech under the Principate", 6.
[327] For example the story of Tarquin, Lucretia and Brutus (*F.* 2.685-852); Priapus and Silenus' braying donkey (*F.* 1.433-40, 6.341-6; the goddess Tacita (*F.* 2.601-16).
[328] Feeney 1992.15.

the limits of free speech.[329] There is a crucial difference between satire's negotiation of these issues and Ovid's: for satire, it is intrinsic to the genre; in contrast, such concerns are external to Ovid's genres of choices, playing out in his poetry because of external circumstances. Yet, Persius, the first satirist after Ovid, prominently stages the issue that is intrinsic to his genre, the tension between *libertas* and *licentia*, with the Ovidian language of *fas / nefas*, recognizing, that in this regard, satire and Ovid come to have a shared concern.

The specific phrase, *si fas dicere*, does not appear in the *Fasti* but it is instructive to pause briefly on how Ovid deploys the language of *fas* in the programmatic opening of the poem. In the first lines Ovid sets out his intended subject matter, a poem based on the calendar, adding the stars to the traditional remit of the historical *fasti* (*F.* 1.1-2). Ovid then turns to his chosen addressee, Germanicus, portraying him as a divine figure who will oversee the poem (1.3-6). Fantham has established that the dedication to Germanicus was composed in exile, with the original dedicatee Augustus moved to the opening of Book Two.[330] Ovid goes on to elucidate the close familial connections between Germanicus and the subject matter of the poem (1.9-12). The power and impact of the imperial family are embedded in Ovid's poem. Ovid fosters a connection between himself and Germanicus by focusing on the prince's own poetic leanings (1.19-20, 23-4), before he concludes the opening lines by expressing a wish for Germanicus to safely oversee the poetic project introduced by a conditional joined with the word *fas* (1.25-26):

> si licet et fas est, vates rege vatis habenas,
> auspice te felix totus ut annus eat.

[329] Braund 2004a.
[330] Fantham 1985.243-56. C.f. dedication to Augustus at *F.* 2.15-18.

If it's right and lawful, being a poet, guide the poet's reins, so beneath your auspices the whole year may be happy.

Feeney observes that this couplet within the opening of the poem reveals an anxiety concerning whether the poem will reach its projected completion, ie whether Ovid as poet will be allowed to reach the end of the year and simultaneously complete the twelve books of the poem that would make up the twelve months of the year.[331] *Fas* is not explicitly joined with the act of speaking but, since it refers to completing the composition of the poem, it signifies Ovid's voice as a poet. In the opening of the poem Ovid intertwines the imperial family, their achievements and the role poetry plays in commemorating and immortalizing them, while the power of the imperial family also impacts upon the speech of a poet, imposing boundaries of what is *fas*.

McGowan expands this way of reading Ovid and demonstrates how across his works Ovid increasingly emphasizes the importance of *fas* in general, but especially in relation to speaking and to the voice of the poet.[332] McGowan documents how Ovid's use of the term *fas* changes: in the *Ars Amatoria* and the *Heroides* the usage is less frequent and without wider significance in relation to speech; in certain passages in the *Metamorphoses* the word has the critical connection to the poet and what is right for him to say (such as *Met.* 15.867); in the *Fasti* the word provides one of the guiding principles, as Feeney shows; and finally the word comes into its own in the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* in which Ovid most often connects it to speaking and his position as a poet, particularly in relation to the *princeps*.[333] This broader framework of Ovid's deployment of *fas* and the significance and weight he ascribes to it in his exilic works provides an important context

---

[331] Feeney 1992.15-16.
[332] McGowan 2009 Chapter 5, 121-167.
[333] McGowan 2009.124-8.

for the two instances of the specific phrase, *si fas dicere*. The two examples of the phrase in the final book of *Epistulae Ex Ponto,* in poem 4.8 and the closing poem of the whole collection and Ovid's poetic career, 4.16, do not stand alone but fit within and add to the broader thematics.

The phrase first appears in a letter in the middle of Book 4, addressed to Ovid's quasi-son-in-law, Suillius. The dynamics of the poem as a whole are important. Ovid begins by thanking Suillius for his late, but welcome offer of help for Ovid in his exilic condition. He suggests that the best way to help would be to exhort the gods as a supplicant; specifically, Suillius should exhort the divine Germanicus. Ovid writes *di tibi sint Caesar iuuenis* ("Your gods are the young Caesar", 4.8.23), turning the young Germanicus into the only god who needs to be supplicated. Ovid then switches to addressing Germanicus himself, presumably providing a template for Suillius to follow in his exhortations of imperial power on Ovid's behalf. Ovid laments that he cannot offer lavish temples to Germanicus in exchange for his help (31-2), but instead he will show his gratitude with the only riches available to him, his poetry.[334] Ovid, somewhat disingenuously, apologizes for the meagerness of such a gift (*parva…munera* 35), before enumerating all that poetry can offer (43-51).[335] Ovid proceeds to give examples of the power of poetry: we know of Agamemnon and all those involved in the Trojan war through *scriptis* ("writings", 51-2); no one would know of Thebes and its seven generals *sine carmine* ("without song", 53); and even more sweepingly, we would not know of anything that happened before or since (*et quicquid post haec, quicquid et ante fuit,* 54).

---

[334] 4.8.34: *Naso suis opibus, carmine gratus erit.*

[335] 4.8: (43-4) nothing is more fitting for the leaders of men than to be hymned in a poet's verses; (45) poetry heralds men's glory everywhere; (46-51) it withstands the test of time, ensuring one's fame is known to future generations.

At this point our phrase of note appears as Ovid moves to consider the role of poetry in relation to the gods (4.8.55-56):

di quoque carminibus, si fas est dicere, fiunt
tantaque maiestas ore canentis eget.

The gods too, if it is right to say, take on existence through poetry, such great majesty needs a singing voice.

Ovid's wording could be taken as a conventional show of respect with regard to the gods, a simple reverential aside. However, the broader thematics discussed above as well as the context here suggest that it is not simply a throw-away comment. In this context Ovid is ascribing a great deal to the power of poetry, giving it the ability even to bring divinities into being. The intimation that there is a need to be wary concerning what one should and should not say about the gods brings to the fore the idea that poetry is not only powerful in this respect but also dangerous. What one says and about whom should be carefully considered in a medium as powerful as poetry. It perhaps also suggests that it is not only that the one wielding the poetry should be wary of crossing the line in terms of what they say, but that others should be wary of the one who wields such a powerful and dangerous tool. The poet is potentially both vulnerable and dangerous.

The combination of this phrase with divine figures is also noteworthy. The reference to the gods seems to move us out of the realm of the leaders of mortal men who have been prominent thus far. But Ovid has already made the imperial addressee, Germanicus, into a divine figure, worthy of worship and supplication. The wariness that Ovid voices here, and the awareness he shows about the boundaries of what one can say, in relation to the gods, can easily be understood as applicable to the powerful figures of

the imperial family, leaders of mortal men, who are ostensibly mortal themselves but who transcend the boundary between mortal and divine.

Ovid then brings up a subject closer to home for Germanicus, that also reinforces the tight connections between imperial power and the divine sphere. Ovid addresses Germanicus directly (4.8.63-64):

et modo, Caesar, auum, quem uirtus addidit astris,
sacrarunt aliqua carmina parte tuum.

And Germanicus, your grandfather, whom virtue has just recently added to the stars, was sanctified in part at least by poetry.

Ovid is referring to Augustus, Germanicus' grandfather through his adoption into the line of succession by Tiberius, and Augustus' deification upon his death which figuratively placed him among the stars. Ovid ascribes to poetry a defining part in the process of deification. It is worth noting here the relevance of this passage not simply for poetry in general but for Ovid's *Fasti* in particular. Ovid took the innovative step of making the stars an integral part of his calendrical poem, as he states in the first lines (*F.* 1.1-2), a topic that was not included in the historical *fasti*, the form upon which Ovid based his poem. Ovid makes the *Fasti* a work concerned with the stars and the place of the imperial figures of power, past and present, among the stars.[336]

The effect of the broken-off nature of the *Fasti* also merits consideration in relation to these lines. If Ovid is drawing attention to his own poem in connection with the commemoration of the deification of Augustus, then the definitive manner in which

[336] Another aspect of 4.8 that suggestively overlaps with the opening lines of the *Fasti* is the manner in which Ovid constructs the addressee shared by both passages, Germanicus who bumped Augustus from the prominent position in the first book of the *Fasti*. For example, Ovid depicts Germanicus as a divine figure, as discussed above (*F.* 1.6); in both poems Ovid conjures the image of Germanicus overseeing the ship of Ovid's endeavours (*F.* 1.3-4 c.f. *E. P.* 4.8.27-8); he draws attention to the familial connections between Germanicus and the subject matter of poetry (*F.* 9-12) and to Germanicus' own poetic achievements (*F.* 1.19-20, 23-4).

Ovid speaks of Augustus' commemoration in poetry does not accord with reality. While the *Fasti* prospectively alludes to events in August and December that would presumably have appeared in Books 8 and 12 respectively, the *Fasti* breaks off at the end of the month of June. Is Ovid dangling the prospect of further books of the *Fasti* in front of Germanicus and the wider reading public at Rome? Would Ovid continue the poem into the months of July and Augustus, saturated as they would be with figures of imperial significance, if he were only allowed to return from exile? Such speculation provides a tantalizing, if unprovable, possibility. The shared language and thematic overlaps are suggestive that within this poem Ovid is deliberately intending to recall his *Fasti* and its relation to the issues of imperial power and the boundaries of free speech.

The second instance of a combination of *si fas dicere* in Ovid's poetry appears in the last letter of the collection of *Epistulae Ex Ponto*, 4.16, a poem which came under discussion in Section One in relation to Ovid providing his perspective on the literary scene post-Ovid. It is telling that our phrase of note is embedded at a climactic point in this particular letter that shares significant points of correspondence with Persius' construction of his contemporary literary scene. If Persius is continuing an Ovidian perspective on the literary history of elegy after Ovid, it would have in part been gleaned from this final letter. As discussed above, in this letter Ovid builds a picture of his poetic contemporaries, named and anonymous, giving the impression of a whole hive of poetic activity that then concludes with Ovid himself (4.16.45-46):

dicere si fas est, claro mea nomine Musa
atque inter tantos quae legeretur erat.

If it is right to say, my Muse, with her bright name, who was being read, was among so many others.

Dicere si fas appears here in another charged moment concerning poetry. These lines are the climax of Ovid's picture of the literary scene. In them, he seemingly inserts himself into the vast number of anonymous poets and named ones that have come in the preceding lines, but in fact he makes himself stand out as the poet who eclipses all the others, insisting that he was being read. The phrase seems to embody wariness, making explicit an awareness that one cannot say whatever one wishes and that there are boundaries to what one can say, and yet as in 4.8 it seems to possess a coloring of defiance. *Dicere si fas* shines a spotlight on what follows as something that one almost cannot, or should not say, and yet Ovid can and will say it, regardless of the consequences. His Muse, i.e. his poetry were being read, are still being read. Despite the situation he found himself in, exiled from Rome and apart from the fellow poets he enumerates, even though he is ostensibly speaking of the past, any reader of these lines is unwittingly party to Ovid's defiance. He is still being read now. His Muse, his poetry, his voice cannot be suppressed in exile.

These two instances of the phrase *si fas dicere* offer examples of the different facets and significance of *fas* in relation to speech for Ovid at the close of his poetic career. Two further examples of *si fas dicere* are found outside of Ovid's work in the pseudepigrapha. The presence of this phrase in works that are post-Ovidian, purporting to be by Ovid in the case of the *Consolatio ad Liviam*, or in a poem that substantially imitates Ovid such as the *Ciris,* is noteworthy. These two examples suggest that this turn of phrase could be picked up and deployed in the context of Ovidian *imitatio,* adding strength to my argument that Persius would include such languages as a deliberate nod to Ovid. The examples in the pseudepigrapha are not necessarily marked in terms of the

broader implications of the phrase in Ovid's poetry that I discussed above and that are at work in Persius, although close reading of the passages does leave space for more meaningful readings of Ovid on the part of the anonymous authors.

The *Consolatio ad Liviam*, purporting to be written after Drusus' death in 9 BC, is classed by all scholars as pseudo-Ovidian. There are close correspondences between the poem and Ovid's later poetry written after 8 AD.[337] In her discussion of Roman fakes and the pseudepigrapha, Irene Peirano concludes that for the anonymous author of the *Consolatio* "the works of Ovid were a quarry of memorable phrases and rhetorical conceits to be reused in a context that would be different from but not totally extraneous to the original one", and that Ovid was "a source for flashy phrases and expressions but also a writer engaged directly, albeit problematically, with the imperial family."[338] These conclusions on the characteristics of Ovidian *imitatio* in the poems are instructive when we consider the appearance of our phrase of note.

The poet compares Livia's grief to that of different mythical grieving mothers (105-117) before he ventriloquizes Livia speaking her own lament, during which she says (129-30):

Caesaris uxori si talia dicere fas est
  iam dubito, magnos an rear esse deos.

If it is right for Caesar's wife to say such things, I doubt now whether to think that the gods are great / that the great gods exist.

Livia here makes a gesture to the fact that there may be boundaries on what is possible for her to say, specifically in relation to her position as Caesar's wife. She defines herself in relation to her husband, suggesting that the boundary is fluid depending on one's

---

[337] Parallels were documented early on by Axelson 1930 and the same conclusion was reached by more recent scholars and editors: Richmond 1981 and Schoonhoven 1992.
[338] Peirano 2012.211 and 214.

position and power in relation to the imperial family. The boundary will be different for someone of her standing. But does her lofty position in the imperial family give her greater freedom of speech or restrict her? The subject matter of what she is hesitant to say relates to the gods. The two potential meanings of the line make what she is saying potentially subversive. She could simply mean "that the gods are great", but she could also be implying a deeper indifference to the gods, questioning that "the great gods exist." Such a statement could call into question the divine status of her own family members, those already elevated to the divine sphere and future apotheoses. Her position in the imperial family and vested interest in their status could actually hinder her ability to speak freely and make such a claim. Whichever way one reads the end of the couplet, the deployment of *si dicere fas* certainly sits alongside the parameters of the phrase as Ovid uses it. *Fas* is connected with speaking in a conditional, taking into account how the imperial standing of the speaker can alter the boundaries of what it is possible to say, particularly in connection with divine power.

The second example in the pseudepigrapha appears in the *Ciris*, a work that is firmly pseudo-Virgilian, rather than pseudo-Ovidian. However, the subject matter, the mythical story of Scylla, who falls in love with Minos, betraying her father, and who then undergoes metamorphosis into a bird, the *ciris*, is recognizably Ovidian.[339] Peirano understands the poem as an impersonation of Virgil, while the poet also engages with Ovid's version of the episode in terms of the overarching structure, omitting sections that Ovid narrated in depth, and repeating key Ovidian phrases.[340] This is to say that although the *Ciris* does not purport to be an Ovidian poem, the appearance of our phrase of note

---

[339] See Lyne's commentary on the *Ciris* (1978).
[340] Peirano 2012.174-188.

can still be viewed within the sphere of Ovidian *imitatio*. The phrase appears in the *proemium* in which the poet apologizes for the poem he is offering to Messalla and describes what he would write instead, if only his powers were greater, or rather what he would weave (17-22):

non ego te talem venerarer munere tali,
non equidem (quamvis interdum ludere nobis
et gracile molli liceat pede claudere versum),
sed magno intexens, si fas est dicere, peplo,
qualis Erectheis olim portatur Athenis…

I would not honor you, such as you are, with a gift such as this is, not indeed, even though from time to time it pleases me to play and round off a slender verse with a soft rhythm, but I would weave a story, if it is right to say, on a big robe such as at times is carried out in Erecthean Athens when due vows are paid to chaste Athena…

While our phrase may appear here to be far afield from the Ovidian contexts we might expect, in the combination of the phrase with the portrayal of writing as the act of weaving, specifically in connection with Athena, we can explore a broader engagement in this passage with Ovid and the issues of artistic / poetic freedom of speech.

The passage moves us from *si fas dicere* at the end of Ovid's exile poetry to an episode in the *Metamorphoses* that is commonly viewed as one of several examples of artistic failure in the poem, namely Arachne. In the opening of *Metamorphoses* Book Six Arachne battles with Athena over whose skill in weaving is the greatest (6.1-145). Athena challenges Arachne to a weaving competition in which both weave tapestries. The act of weaving is understood as a stand-in for poetic composition, making Arachne a poetological figure.[341] Arachne is a narrative artist akin to Ovid. On her tapestry Athena weaves a tableau that showcases her own position and power, her dispute with Neptune over the city of Athens in which she depicts herself as the winner (6.70-82). Neither

[341] Leach 1974; Lateiner 1983; Harries 1990; Rosati 1999.

Athena nor Envy can find fault with Arachne's weaving, yet she is still punished by Athena for failing to be sufficiently deferential to her in her artistic endeavors. The fate of Arachne as an artist is not dependent on her own skill but is subject to the whim and anger of a powerful deity who has displayed her power in the content of her own weaving. Alessandro Barchiesi notes how Ovid's portrayal in the *Tristia* of the fate of the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* matches that of Arachne's tapestry, whose tapestry is "beyond envy but not beyond the hysterical anger of Athena".[342] The composition of all three is violently broken off by powerful forces outside of the control of their creator.[343] The figure behind Ovid's exile, Augustus, can be equated to Athena, implying a similarly groundless, vindictive anger driving the stifling of the artist. These connections show how long the shadow of powerful imperial figures is cast over Ovid's work and runs through his poetry.

This passage in the *Ciris* in which the phrase *si fas dicere* is embedded, combines the equation of composing poetry with weaving, weaving in conjunction with Athena and Athena's connection to Athens, as well as a gesture towards the boundaries of what it is permissible for a poet to say. This brings together several strands from Ovid's story of Arachne and exile poetry that are significant in thinking about artistic freedom and expression in a context that addresses what type of artistic creation may please or displease a powerful, external figure. *Si fas dicere* may simply be an imitation of an Ovidian phrase but there also is space here to entertain the possibility that the anonymous author is imitating Ovid and engaging with Ovid's perspective on the theme of artistic / poetic freedom of speech and expression.

---

[342] Barchiesi 1997.197.

[343] *Met.* 6.131 (Athena) *rupit pictas, caelestia crimina, vestes; Tr.* 1.7.13 (Ovid's exile cuts short the *Metamorphoses*) *rupit opus*; *Tr.* 2.549-52 (Ovid's fate cuts short the *Fasti*) *rupit opus*).

This background to the phrase *si fas dicere*, including the thematics of *fas* in connection with speaking in Ovid's corpus, the charged examples of the phrase in the exile poetry and the presence of the phrase in the pseudepigrapha, brings a new angle to reading the phrase in Persius. It reclaims the phrase from his satiric predecessors, Horace and Lucilius, and places it firmly in the realm of Ovid's poetry and his reception and imitation. By inserting this Ovidian phrase into the moment when he pulls himself back from revealing his penetrating secret about Rome, Persius widens his negotiation of the vexed issues of what is possible for a poet to say in the genre of satire beyond his strictly satiric predecessors to include Ovid, together with Ovid's experience of and perspective on free speech. Even though Ovid is an author outside the generic boundaries of satire, Persius provides a signal that Ovid's negotiation of the boundaries of free speech, was productive for him in facing these concerns. Persius can look back to Ovid as the first poet to have dealt with the censorious aspect of the changing imperial order, packaging his perspective on the problem with an Ovidian gloss.

We can follow this language of *fas* and Ovidian resonances from this opening passage that first presents and performs Persius' awareness of the issues to the subsequent passage that completes the thought begun in the opening. The closing passage seems to offer Persius' personal response to the problem and his solution to writing satire at this time period, or at least the position that he is forced to take up under the circumstances. In that solution we find again that Persius reaches outside his conventional satiric predecessor and instead has woven Ovid into the very fiber of his thinking about satire and approach to writing satire, as I will explore in Section Three.

Section Three: Ovid, Persius and Ass' Ears

As Persius builds up to the revelation of his secret, he is clearly thinking about his position as part of the continuum of satirists, as I discussed at the beginning of Section Two. He appears to have abandoned his satiric undertaking in response to his imagined interlocutor (*discedo* 114). He refers to his predecessors, giving a snapshot of the *modus operandi* of each (115-118). He moves from Lucilius to Horace and then reaches the next poet in the generic line of succession, himself, but there is no easy model here for Persius to follow. Persius appears to reach a level of deep frustration (119). As many scholars, do I see Persius questioning his position in the satiric tradition in these lines.[344] He poses the question for himself and his readers of what kind of satirist he can be, given that he lives under different, more difficult circumstances than those who came before him. Persius cannot simply copy earlier satirists and be a Lucilius or a Horace. He seems to be asking what is now permitted for me in this genre, how is that line of generic continuity going to evolve from Lucilius to Horace, now to Persius. He must be Persius the satirist, but what does that mean?

The answer that Persius provides is not to abandon satire as the verb *discedo* implied. Instead Persius reaches for the currency of the myth of Midas to express how he views his ability to undertake satiric speech, as well as finally revealing his secret in the language of the myth. I will quote the passage again in full (1.119-123):

me muttire nefas? Nec clam? Nec cum scrobe? Nusquam?
Hic tamen infodiam. Vidi, vidi ipse, libelle:
auriculas asini quis non habet? Hoc ego opertum,
hoc ridere meum, tam nil, nulla tibi vendo
Iliade…

Am I forbidden a mutter? Not even in secret? Not even in a hole? Nowhere? Never mind: I'll dig a hole for it here. I have seen it, yes, have seen it for myself, little book: is there

[344] See Tzounakas 2005 for in depth discussion of Persius' references to Lucilius and Horace.

anyone who does not have asses' ears? This secret, this joke of mine, so insignificant, I'll not sell to you for any *Iliad*.

One of the myths told about the figure of Midas is that upon hearing a musical contest between Apollo and Pan (or Marsyas depending on the version), Midas disagrees with the judge, Tmolus, and praised Pan's music as superior to Apollo's performance.[345] Apollo punishes Midas for his aesthetic deficiencies with ass' ears. Midas is ashamed of his new appendages, hiding them from others, but his barber discovers the truth. The barber wants to tell the secret, but knows that he cannot and so he digs a hole and whispers the secret into the ground. Reeds grow over the hole but instead of keeping the speech entrusted to it, the reeds whisper the secret over and over again, making the knowledge that Midas has ass' ears public.

From this summary we can begin to see how Persius has mapped himself and his situation onto the Midas myth. Persius places himself in the role of Midas' barber, by introducing the idea of a hole (*nec cum scrobe*) and giving himself the action of digging (*infodiam*). We already know that Persius has a secret but one that he cannot say openly, just like the barber, and his solution models itself on the action of the barber. Persius makes his book the equivalent of the hole, as he addresses his secret into it (*vidi ipse, libelle*).[346] Then finally the secret is revealed. Persius turns everyone at Rome into a Midas who has ass' ears.[347] In these lines Persius provides an answer to the question of

[345] I will discuss the mythical tradition surrounding Midas and the significance of differences in the myth shortly.

[346] Some scholars connect this imagery of entrusting one's secrets to a book back to Horace's portrayal of Lucilius at *Sat.* 2.1.30-1: *ille…arcana / credebat libris*. See Hooley 1997.62. I do not dispute the relevance of such imagery in the satiric tradition. However, in turning the idea of trusting a secret to one's book into the Midas myth, Persius adds to and expands upon the initial idea. The layers of how Persius is using the Midas myth means there is more to be said here than tracing the imagery back to Lucilius through Horace.

[347] L121 is again vexed with rumors that Persius was deliberately targeting Nero with this secret and that the line originally read *auriculas asini Mida rex habet* but was changed by Cornutus editing the text after Persius' death to remove the potentially offensive connotations of the line. See Sullivan 1978 and Gowers

how can he be a satirist, an answer that fits him and the circumstances under which he is writing satire. He will not speak openly but the compulsion to speak is so great that he will hide his speech and observations in his book, the equivalent of the barber's hole. Common observations concerning the mythical imagery Persius uses here are that in behaving like the barber Persius reneges on his earlier *discedo*, finding a way to speak satirically, and that by seemingly hiding his secret in his book, i.e. hole, he is actually making his secret public.[348] Just as the reeds reveal the secret, so too will the book. Persius is then either short-sighted in his choice of confidant or canny. The book will automatically reveal the secret, so as Bramble puts it, "the burial is a sham".[349]

While the connection of the Midas myth to Ovid's telling of the story in the *Metamorphoses* is usually acknowledged, the significance of Ovid to the deeper levels of meaning that Persius is activating in using the myth of Midas, and the choice to filter an observation about the contemporary world through a mythic story has not been explored. In my reading of this passage, Persius continues his engagement with Ovid which began in the opening with *si fas dicere*. The Ovidian, metamorphic aspects of Persius' answer to his dilemma of how to be a satirist are crucially important, challenging some of the conclusions one could otherwise draw concerning how Persius' conceptualizes the writing of satire. Persius again makes Ovid a point of consideration in his dialogue about satiric freedom of speech and how he is going to negotiate the issue, stepping back from the immediate, contemporary world into a mythic one.

2009 for consideration of the relationship between Nero and Persius. As with the speculation that the faux lines of poetry could in fact be authored by Nero, I am disinclined to accept that Persius would have targeted Nero so explicitly. It is however testimony to the sensitive nature of the lines and the atmosphere of the period which could spark such rumors.

[348] For example, Roller 2012.291: "As scholars since antiquity have recognized, the satirist's "secret," which the interlocutor warns him not to disseminate….will, like Midas' secret, be disseminated from its "hole," which is nothing other than the poet's book, his libellus."

[349] Bramble 1974.136.

This begins with Persius' frustrated question *me muttire nefas?* (119). The language of the question acknowledges both the start of the satiric tradition and the new direction that Persius is moving towards to find his own strategy for negotiating the boundaries of what a satirist can say. The verb *muttire* points the reader to Lucilius' satires and what it was like to write satire in that earlier time period.[350] The word *nefas* of course picks up the language from the opening lines (*fas* 8) and is one of the elements that alerts the reader to the ring composition and that the secret that was interrupted at the start is finally about to be revealed. But, if the language of *fas* and the phrase *si fas dicere* are meant to bring Ovid to mind, as I argued in Section Two, then the return to the same language here, does more than simply create the ring composition. *Nefas* is a clue for the reader that Ovid has played a part in how Persius conceptualizes his personal satiric project and his strategy for negotiating the boundaries of free speech. He reaches for the Midas myth and so answers the question of how he can be a satirist with a distinctly Ovidian angle and perspective.

It is worth pausing to consider what Persius gains from putting himself and his secret into the language of a myth on a broad level before delving into the specifics of the Midas myth. Satire is a genre that is grounded in the present, making reference and connections to the contemporary world.[351] Myth exists on its own self-contained plane and mythic stories are told without direct reference to the present day. Persius' secret does concern the current world around him. The first intimation of it begins by referring to Rome (1.8): *nam Romae quis non…* - "is there anyone at Rome who does not…". But

---

[350] Lucilius uses of *muttire* in contexts of speaking / not speaking Fr. 454 W: *non laudare hominem quemquam neque mu facere unquam. Mu - muttire*. Programmatic Book 6 Fr. 672-3 W *clandestino tibi quod conmisum foret, / neu muttires quidquam neu mysteria ecferres foras.*

[351] Rosen 2012.21, quoted in the chapter intro: "the deepest most definitional core of satire as fundamentally a mode of verbal ridicule against contemporaries". Gowers 2009.175: "satire is writing that, in theory, cannot exist without contemporary reference."

when he comes to tell the secret Persius does not spell out the exact references to the contemporary world. He makes a deliberate move to withdraw from immediate reality to speak in the currency of a myth, instead of speaking wholly transparently. Speaking mythically allows him to side-step direct, satiric critique. But this does not stop readers from filling in the blanks for themselves, as the earliest readers appear to have done, evidenced by the allusions to Nero that rumor persisted in imagining beneath Persius' poetry. Persius uses myth as a clandestine vehicle for his satiric observations, a strategy that has been learned from Ovid. Even though it is based on mythic stories without an explicit contemporary framework, the *Metamorphoses* provides rich material for the reader seeking commentary on the present day.[352] Ovid's first exilic poem appears to encourage the reader into this space of reading more than he makes explicit.[353] In his poetry Ovid often weaves mythical stories without drawing explicit parallels, without satiric bite, but his readers still make those connections for themselves. Persius here switches from direct satiric speech into the elements of a myth, leaving the exact direct contemporary connections up to his readers. This is a space where Ovid's poetry and Persius' satires overlap. By using a myth Persius is able to leave space for the reader to make their own connections without being directly accountable for those conclusions.

Before I expand upon the connections between Ovid's Midas and Persius' use of the myth, it is also necessary to contextualize briefly the Midas myth and its close association with Ovid. There is a strong case that Ovid's version of the Midas myth,

---

[352] There are almost as many examples of this as there are mythical stories. For example, the equation between Jupiter and Augustus, which often does not work to Augustus' benefit; poetalogical figures and their run-ins with powerful figures such as Arachne, discussed in Section One, Marsyas and Apollo. Stories that Ovid connects himself to from the perspective of exile, eg Actaeon and Diana.

[353] *Tr.* 1.1.21-22: *atque ita tu tacitus (quarenti plura legendum), / ne, quae non opus est, forte loquare, cave.* See Sharrock 1994 and especially Casali 1997 on the phrase *quarenti plura legendum* and strategies of reading in Ovid.

especially in relation to asses' ears, is the version that matters here for Persius.[354] There are a number of different elements to the myths surrounding the figure of Midas, for example legendary wealth, the story of the golden touch, his connection with Cybele and Orpheus, and finally asses' ears.[355] Asses' ears were associated with Midas before Ovid but the presence of such ears on vase paintings of Midas and in other media was puzzling and various sources give different explanations for them.[356] There was no firm story explaining them. Ovid is distinctive in that he brings together many of the elements of the different strands of the myth, as well as connecting Midas' asses' ears with his poor aesthetic judgment.[357] Most importantly for Persius, Ovid continues the story with the figure of the barber (*Met.* 11.182-193). The motif of the barber telling the secret into a hole foregrounds issues of freedom of speech and is central to Persius' reading of the myth is primarily known from Ovid.[358]

In addition to the high probability that Ovid was an important source for the narrative elements of the myth for Persius, there are also verbal correspondences between the two that suggest the Persius was working closely with Ovid's Midas. It is worth quoting Ovid's version of this episode of the Midas myth in full in order to draw out the

[354] In general, as with many myths, Ovid told what came to be the defining version of the story. For example Roller 1983.312: "Later authors who recorded these tales followed Ovid closely in most details and thus Ovid's narration…may have been the last to contribute to the shaping of that legend."
[355] See Roller 1983 and Thiel 2000 for discussion of the development of the Midas myth and Berndt-Ersoz 2008 for the historical context of Midas..
[356] Even when explanations connect the ears with aesthetic judgment, there is still confusion between the stories of Apollo and Marsyas and Apollo and Pan. See Roller 1983.308.
[357] *Met.* 11: 85-145 Midas and the Golden Touch; 146-171 Contest between Pan and Apollo, judged by Tmolus; 172-193 Midas' transformation and his barber.
[358] See Bömer 1980 for commentary on *Met.* 11.186ff. Before Ovid the motif is only briefly mentioned on Dioscor. *AP.* 56,7. In a study of the development of the myth of Midas across literature Thiel (2000) draws out the strand of the myth relating to the barber from Ovid to Persius and Petronius in the ancient world and subsequently to Goethe and Chaucer. Stampacchio's short study (1968) also brings together the stories of Midas in the three authors.

verbal connections and significance of the metamorphic aspects of the story (*Met.* 11.172-93):

Iudicium sanctique placet sententia montis
omnibus, arguitur tamen atque iniusta vocatur
unius sermone Midae; nec Delius aures
humanam stolidas patitur retinere figuram, 175
sed trahit in spatium villisque albentibus inplet
instabilesque imas facit et dat posse moveri:
cetera sunt hominis, partem damnatur in unam
induiturque aures lente gradientis aselli.
ille quidem celare cupit turpique pudore 180
tempora purpureis temptat relevare tiaris;
sed solitus longos ferro resecare capillos
viderat hoc famulus, qui cum nec prodere visum
dedecus auderet, cupiens efferre sub auras,
nec posset reticere tamen, secedit humumque 185
effodit et, domini quales adspexerit aures,
voce refert parva terraeque inmurmurat haustae
indiciumque suae vocis tellure regesta
obruit et scrobibus tacitus discedit opertis.
creber harundinibus tremulis ibi surgere lucus 190
coepit et, ut primum pleno maturuit anno,
prodidit agricolam: leni nam motus ab austro
obruta verba refert dominique coarguit aures.

The judgment of the sacred mountain satisfied the opinion of all; the voice of Midas alone, however, challenged it and called it unjust. Nor did the god of Delos allow the undiscerning ears to keep their human form but he drew them out and covered them with shaggy grey hair, and made them flexible at the base, and gave them the capacity to be moved. The rest was human; he was punished in that one aspect: he wore the ears of a slow-moving ass. He wished to conceal them and tried to conceal the shameful ugliness of his head with a purple turban. But the servant who used to cut his long hair with a blade saw them, who, since although eager to broadcast it to the winds, he did not dare reveal the disgrace that he had seen, and yet unable to keep silent, he went off quietly and dug a hole in the ground. With a small voice he reported the kind of ears he had seen on his master's head and whispered into the hollow earth; and buried the evidence of his voice with the earth piled up and stole away silently when he had covered over the ditch. A thick bed of quivering reeds began to shoot up there, and as soon as they had grown at the close of the year, they betrayed the digger: for stirred by the gentle breeze, the reeds carried back the buried words and convicted the ears of the master.

In Ovid's story Midas' ears are the point of failure in aesthetic judgment (174-5). Midas is not subjected to a full metamorphic transformation. It is only his ears that undergo the change. Persius also makes the ears the telling mark of aesthetic misjudgment, their presence revealing what is otherwise hidden.[359] Ovid clearly marks the ears as a source of shame (*dedecus* "disgrace", 184). Ovid's portrayal of the barber and his motivations is especially important. The difficulty of the barber's situation is made clear. He does not dare to speak the truth that he knows, but he is also unable to stay silent. Persius' abbreviated version of the story picks up on Ovid's language. The barber, and Persius as barber, carry out the action of digging (*effodit* 11.186; *infodiam* 1.120); the speech of each is circumscribed (*voce…parva….inmurmurat* 11.187, *tacitus* 11.189; *muttire* 1.119); both create a hole or image of a hole to speak into (*scrobibus* 11.189; *scrobe* 1.119); the act of speaking and content are secret (*scrobibus…opertis* 11.189; *hoc…opertum* 1.121).[360]

The most suggestive verbal correspondence hinges on the verb *discedo*, which, if we follow the correspondence to its conclusion, indicates a different tenor to Persius' model of exercising satiric speech than previously allowed. The relevance of this verb for Ovid's telling of the myth and its connections to Persius have been hitherto unnoted but its significance moves us decisively out of the realms of Ovid's poetry as simply source material for Persius' use of the myth. This is the verb by which Persius signals his apparent abandonment of satiric speech at 113-14: *"pueri, sacer est locus, extra / meiite." discedo* – "boys, this place is holy, piss outside. I'm leaving". As this then leads

---

[359] Ears embedded thematically in *Satire* 1. See Reckford 1962 and Freudenburg 2001.171-2, 180-2. The diminuitive *auriculas* is used until the end, *aure* 126, when Persius describes his ideal reader. This aspect of the Midas myth fits within the broader theme of the satire as a whole.

[360] The verbal connections with Ovid's Midas passage concerning the ditch and secrecy are noted by Koster 1988.78-80 but he pursues the angle of seeing Nero beneath much of *Satire* 1 and is focused on mapping Persius and Nero into the Midas myth.

into Persius' revelation of his secret and so apparent return to satiric speech, it is commonly read that Persius backtracks on his earlier claim, finding a way to speak satirically, that is to speak into a hole, his book. However, in the figure of Ovid's barber, the role that Persius places himself into, we find an example of someone who has done both, who has walked away and yet also his speech manages to find a way out, independent of the barber himself. The action of Ovid's barber in releasing his speech in secret is marked by verbs of withdrawing, separating oneself. When the barber wishes to share his secret but he knows that he is unable to speak it aloud and make it public, Ovid writes: *secedit humumque effodit* (11.185-6). Then when the barber has spoken his secret into the hole and covered it over Ovid writes: *scrobibus tacitus discedit opertis* (11.189). Ovid's barber brings together the action of verbs of leaving, separating, secluding oneself along with the act of hiding his voice in the earth. In this light Persius' seemingly decisive action in the form of *discedo* and then subsequent description of voicing his satire into a hole, ie his book, are not as opposed or contradictory as it first appears. The two actions can be entwined. Ovid's barber provides an alternative model for how to speak secretly and satirically that combines the different elements that Persius foregrounds for his own strategy of writing satire.

It is also worthwhile noting the significance of the verb *discedo* for Ovid in a different body of work, the exile poetry. In the *Tristia* Ovid uses this verb to talk about the process of exile, being forced to leave his home and homeland. The verb appears twice in *Tristia* 1.3, the poem in which Ovid describes his final night in Rome, in connection with the departure that is being forced upon Ovid, once spoken by himself, the second voiced by his wife (*Tr.* 1.3.5-6 and 85-86):

iam prope lux aderat, qua me discedere Caesar
finibus extremae iusserat Ausoniae.

The day was already here on which Caesar had ordered me to leave the furthest borders of Italy.

te iubet e patria discedere Caesaris ira,
me pietas: pietas haec mihi Caesar erit.

Caesar's anger drives you to leave your country, loyalty orders me. Loyalty will be my Caesar.'

In these examples, an outside force, namely Caesar, is forcing the action of the verb upon Ovid. It is not explicit here but across the exile poetry Ovid subtly questions the validity of Caesar's anger. A powerful person has forced Ovid to go into exile, perhaps without justification. We also know that Ovid ascribes the cause of the anger, at least in part, to the *Ars Amatoria*, to Ovid's poetic speech. But being forced into exile did not silence Ovid. He found a way to continue speaking, to continue writing poetry. Ovid uses this verb on other occasions as well to portray the action of leaving his home, being forced into exile.[361] The resonances of this verb, of being forced from a space, are not without relevance to the moment that Persius chooses to use this verb. Persius is being forced from the space, and from satiric speech by an unnamed, imaginary interlocutor, but this verb perhaps hints at the types of powerful figures whom one cannot afford to offend at Rome, whose policing of the boundaries of speech is the only one that matters, namely Nero and the imperial establishment. This hints much more subtly at the types of audience who matter than the insult aimed at Nero supposedly originally written into L121. Such a head-on targeting of Nero would always be improbable, but the subtle tones of *discedo* connected to Midas' barber, and Ovid's own exilic misfortune, provide an

[361] C.f. *Tr.* 1.3.58; 1.7.15; 4.4.49; *E.P.* 1.4.47; 4.9.99.

example in action of the model of satiric speech that Persius presents through the myth of Midas and his barber.

Drawing out the correspondences between the Persius passage and Ovid's Midas myth also challenges the idea that Persius is pulling a fast one when he addresses his secret, satiric speech into his book. It is often assumed that part of the point and the joke is that in making his book into the hole, Persius knowingly entrusts his secret to an object that will betray the secret and reveal his voice. He is cannily performing the act of secluding his voice, but we can see the deliberate futility of that performance. In Ovid's version of the myth there is a definite separation of the barber from the act of revelation of his secret and his voice. His secret is made public without his impetus. The grove betrays its maker (*prodidit agricolam* 192) and repeats back the buried words (*obruta verba refert* 193). We certainly cannot ascribe the same level of innocence to Persius as to Midas' barber but we should not gloss over the separation in the metamorphic myth between voicing one's secret with the intention of keeping it hidden, and its subsequent disclosure to the world and publication.

In Ovid's Midas story the secret, the truth about Midas, is able to be made public, to be freed from the confines of the earth by the inanimate reeds and the wind. This ability for a story to be told, for a voice to be heard, without obvious, explicit human agency is often an important element of Ovid's stories of metamorphosis. Narcissus is a an example of this, whose story is known and shared despite the fact that as the story is told there are no speaking witnesses and the only remnant of the story is the physical presence of the Narcissus flower. As Janan puts it, "somehow the collection of mute

objects round the fatal pool communicates a story of thwarted desires".[362] Daphne and Syrinx provide other examples of the supposedly inanimate remnants of stories still finding ways in which they can communicate.[363] One could counter this with the fact that by the difference in its nature a book is not a mute object, unable to communicate, in the same way as the Narcissus flower or the reeds that cover over the barber's hole. This is a valid observation and I will press further on the role of the disembodied voice that resides in the book, but the connection to these metamorphic stories is worth noting. Persius' book is a physical object, a remnant that has been left behind, that will bear witness to the secret and the story that Persius cannot himself speak openly.

The relationships between poet, voice and text are multi-layered. Models of the relationships poets create between the three often set text and voice against each other. For example, in considering how poets depict writing tablets in their poetry, Roman suggests that "the deathless immaterial voice must be differentiated from the mere material text".[364] It is when the poet's writing tablets have been removed from the equation that the poet's voice can truly emerge as a lasting entity. The dichotomy between voice and text can be a sign of a poet's anxiety about the loss of control over his poetry and reception when it is by necessity separated from the poet in the form of the material text. One way of softening such anxiety was to imagine the voice transcending text as the medium through which the poet is able to live forever. Disembodied voices are also important in the *Metamorphoses*. The dichotomy between body and voice plays out through the stories of poet-figures and others whose voices survive when their bodies do

---

[362] Janan 2009.154-55. The *Heroides* also pose interesting questions about how the letters, the voices of these women, escape their circumstances to be known by the wider world. Ariadne is a particularly perplexing case whose letter must have somehow winged its way off the island.
[363] *Met.* 1.452-567 and 1.689-712.
[364] Roman 2001.352.

not. Such stories mirror Ovid's final transformation when he transcends his own body, that can be subject to outside forces, and lives on as voice alone.[365]

The triad of poet, voice and text are relevant to Persius' imagery from the Midas myth, but the oppositions do not line up along quite the same lines as is often thematized in other authors. Persius' imagery does not oppose voice and text. His voice is going to be disseminated and live on through the book. Persius' imagery brings together the metamorphic physical object left behind to tell a story separate from human agency and the idea of disembodied voice. Voice is not opposed to body and text. Instead, the crux of the imagery is the separation of Persius the poet from the voice that can reside and survive in the physical object that is left behind. Through the separation and lack of human agency Persius can no longer be held responsible for the dissemination of voice. There is an erasure here of Persius, of the body that produced the voice, an erasure of the poetic self. The human body, human agency is separated from what remains, the voice. In this light the dynamics of body, self and voice resemble Echo, whose body disappears and becomes voice alone. As discussed in Section One, Persius has made reference to echoing in his faux lines of contemporary poetry (1.102). I argued that by ending the passage with a focus on Bacchic clichés and with reference to the phenomenon of echoing Persius was pointing the reader towards intertextual echoing and specifically to Ovid's Echo. The Ovidian Echo whose voice is able to communicate despite being seemingly crucially restricted and whose voice is uncontrollable or accountable to a body, doubling and expanding sound, provides another metamorphic model, alongside Midas' barber, for voice and sound to communicate and survive.

---

[365] *Met.* 15.871-79. Farrell 1999. Ovid's description of the Domus of Fama (*Met.* 12.39-62), discussed by Gladhill 2013, provides another interesting perspective on uncontrollable, disembodied voice in the *Metamorphoses*.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have argued for two strands of engagement with Ovid by Persius in *Satire* 1. The first evidence of the presence of Ovid is that Persius portrays a slice of the contemporary literary landscape as connected to Ovid and his afterlife. Whether historical truth or not, Persius chooses to create a picture of poets who are trying hard to be like Ovid, but who are failing in their attempts. These facile Ovidian imitators, as Persius presents them, are then in contrast to his own subtle, deeper engagement with Ovid surrounding the core question of satiric freedom of speech. Persius conceptualizes the difficulties of being an imperial satirist, and his own solution to those difficulites with an Ovidian lens. The opening line of *si fas dicere*, together with the reference to echoing embedded in the bad poetry of the Ovidian imitators, and finally the imagery of Midas' barber, come together as disparate elements across *Satire* 1 to offer a coherent grouping of moments with Ovidian resonances through which Persius shows that he has a deliberate agenda for engaging with Ovid. The reference to echoing and Echo with Ovidian resonances and Persius' deployment of the speech of Midas in relation to his own satiric speech, demonstrate how Persius is looking to Ovidian, metamorphic approaches to speech, particularly how to continue to communicate under difficult circumstances.

My argument in this chapter is based on small elements of Ovidian material, pieces of Ovid's text, language and narratives, that Persius incorporates into his satiric view of the contemporary world and to craft his own personal answer to the question of how to be a satirist in this imperial time period. Persius' situation and genre are not identical to Ovid's but he chooses to create a dialogue with Ovid, deliberately exploiting

the potential connections between himself and Ovid. These connections are not overt, embedded into critical moments in the satire, showing how Persius has learnt lessons from Ovid's poetry on how to persist in subtle communication when openness, for whatever reason, is not possible. Such Ovidian engagement on the part of Persius is not necessarily limited to *Satire* One, as my readings in this chapter have been. As the pressures of being an imperial satirist continue to play a part in Persius' *Satires* outside this first poem, Persius' engagement with Ovid on these issues may also be built in as Persius persists in the task he has set himself of writing satire in the imperial world.

Conclusions

In this dissertation I have sought to demonstrate that in the earliest period of reception immediately following his death, a period that is most often overlooked in accounts of Ovid's reception, Ovid was in fact looked to as an important predecessor by satirical authors. The satirical nature of these authors stands outside any line of generic lineage from Ovid, or a fragment of his corpus, such as an elegiac or exilic Ovid. Yet, as I have argued, each of the three satirical authors are invested in engaging with Ovid and creating meaning in their own texts through dialogue with Ovid's poetry.

In Chapter One I showed how in his fables Phaedrus exploited the potential for a close relationship between metamorphic and fabular animals, in particular surrounding the deer and their struggles with surviving their hierarchical environment. Phaedrus builds up an Ovidian tone through verbal allusion, Ovidian motifs and resonances of Ovidian characters that centred on the deer and the presence of horns, as well as orienting his construction of his poetic persona and portrayal of powerful figures from Ovid's exilic misfortune. In doing so, I argue, Phaedrus adds an additional layer to his commentary in the fables on the reality of living in a post-Augustan, imperial world. Through his dialogue with Ovid both the animals in the world of the fable and authors who take up the precarious position as poets must navigate the struggles of adjusting to living in a post-Augustan, post-metamorphic imperial reality in which the potential to stand out, in one's environment or in writing, is a dangerous proposition.

In Chapter Two I demonstrated how in the *Apocolocyntosis* Seneca engages with not one, but two Ovidian poems, the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, situating the two Ovidian texts as prequels to the action of the *Apocolocyntosis* and also making

connections between the texts in order to question what kind of sequel, or continuation, the *Apocolcyntosis* is able to provide. Through this engagement with the Ovidian texts I show how Seneca subtly draws attention to the gaps between the prequels and the sequel of the *Apocolocyntosis*, highlighting the changed nature of the imperial reality of his contemporary world. These Ovidian connections also change the game of the *Apocolocyntosis*, allowing Seneca to appear to stick to the party-line on Claudius, as a uniquely awful emperor, while broadening his satiric lens to include not only Claudius, but the whole imperial family and machinery of apotheosis. In the third chapter I then argued that there are moments of Ovidian interaction in *Satire* One through which Persius firstly takes aim at supposedly superficial Ovidian imtiators, which then contrasts with his own subtle, engagement with Ovid at key, programmatic moments concerning the satiric problem of freedom of speech. As an imperial satirist Persius' generic predecessors cannot provide him with a model of how to negotiate freedom of speech at this point in time. Instead, Persius looks to Ovid to help him both articulate the difficulty he faces, and to conceptualize a solution that suits his status as satirist writing in an imperial world.

For each of these authors I have demonstrated how they are looking to Ovid as a model and incorporating him into their satirical writings in order to grapple with their imperial realities. While the interactions with Ovid are particular to each author with a range of ways of forging connections with Ovid and creating meaning through him in their own texts, I am now in a position to draw some conclusions about how satirical authors are using Ovid in this early period of his reception and comment on how this early satirical strand of Ovid's reception fits within and may impact upon the broader

dynamics and study of Ovidian reception. Firstly it is worth noting that while Phaedrus, Seneca and Persius utilize different passages and elements from Ovid, their engagement with Ovid as shown through my readings is centred on the *Metamorphoses*, the *Fasti* and the exile poetry. Ovid's earlier works, the *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris* do not appear to be strongly present, (Persius does make references to words in the *Ars Amatoria* in creating his faux lines of poetry), if at all, in what made Ovid useful as a predecessor for these satirical authors. In many ways it is unsurprising that the poetry produced by Ovid in the second half, as it were, of his lifetime and poetic career prove to be the most relevant to Phaedrus, Seneca and Persius. These three components of Ovid's poetry are the closet in time and circumstances to the later authors, with the greatest potential for them to use Ovid to think with about their own concerns. They are also the three parts of Ovid's corpus that are either exilic, or given an exilic gloss by Ovid. In them Ovid reflects and grapples with the developing, broad imperial discourse and his own clash with the imperial powers that be. This bears out my hypothesis in the introduction that there was a basis for Ovid to be an especially useful predecessor for these satirical authors because of the intersection in his poetry of imperial discourse and growing concerns with how to exercise free speech under imperial rule.

There are varying degrees of openness in these three texts concerning the authors' interactions with Ovid and different ways of connecting with him. Phaedrus is the least overt, subtly building up resonances with Ovid. In contrast, Seneca openly name-checks the *Metamorphoses*. He does not, however, explicitly mention the *Fasti*, and allusively builds up a network of connections with both poems through the *Apocolocyntosis*. Persius does not name Ovid or cite any of his works explicitly. Persius provides the example out

of the three authors of the most concrete textual evidence for his interaction with Ovid but the manner in which he incorporates these small pieces of Ovid into his satire is subtle. While there are certain moments of greater openness and ease in terms of looking back to Ovid, for the most part Phaedrus, Seneca and Persius all engage with Ovid in covert, subtle ways, that are embedded well into the context of their texts. Their interaction with Ovid also seems to allow them to grapple with issues and communicate ideas that they are uncomfortable expressing more openly. Positioning themselves as post-Ovidian is a covert affair for these three satirical authors, both in terms of how they interact with Ovid, and the viewpoints that they are able to succeed in adding into their text by means of Ovidian engagement. They are Ovidian successors in more ways than one.

I framed the impetus for this dissertation as addressing a gap in the study of Ovid's reception, namely in the early period following his death. Now that I have proposed that such a gap can be filled with a satirical strand of Ovidian reception, it is possible to comment on how my exploration of this kind of Ovidian reception may fit into the broader picture. Temporally, of course, these satirical authors are situated close to the beginning of Ovid's reception. It would be profitable to explore further this early time period and investigate whether other Ovidian receptions in different genres share features with Ovid's reception in these satirical authors. This would contextualize further the picture of Ovid's satirical reception in this period as to whether the time period and closeness to Ovid's own historical circumstances conditioned authors in other genres to engage with Ovid with similar impetus, or whether the particularly satirical concerns of these authors uniquely shaped their Ovidian reception.

Looking further in time, there is much evidence of Ovid's reception across a range of genres and authors, as I discussed in the Introduction. From the scholarly picture, which admittedly is wide-ranging in authors and Ovidian receptions, it does appear that this grouping of satirical authors is distinctive in the ways they put Ovid to work in their texts and for what purpose. Ovid as a poet of subversion is by no means limited to this early time period, reappearing in many different guises through the two thousand years of Ovid's reception, but to a certain degree Ovid's reception in the second half of the first century AD and onwards in antiquity does have a different quality to that explored in this dissertation. The *Metamorphoses* maintains its importance for Ovid's reception, especially for imperial epic, but perhaps not in the same politically subversive and charged way as in Phaedrus, Seneca and Persius. Ovid's early amatory works also come to the fore in authors such as Statius and Martial. Amidst the wealth of Ovidian receptions already explored in this later period of antiquity, it would be worthwhile investigating whether any trace of the satirically important Ovid surfaces. These are some ways in which my argument in this dissertation points towards fruitful new areas of investigation for Ovid's reception.

However, on the basis of my readings in this dissertation, it would be unsurprising that the tone of Ovidian reception shifted away from that of these satirical authors as the first century progressed. Certainly, Rome continued to be ruled by emperors, and Latin authors wrote under and responded to imperial pressures. Yet, just as the Augustan period does not prove to be monolithic, neither is imperial Rome. As the particular imperial circumstances of Ovid's life and poetry receded further into the past, and imperial dynasties came and went, the specific pressures and circumstances, under

which Phaedrus, Seneca and Persius were writing, evolved, and a subversive Ovid who was useful for satirical purposes may no longer have been needed. That is not to say that a subversive Ovid has not surfaced many times over the course of Ovid's reception, but rather that the earliest period after his death was post-Ovidian for Phaedrus, Seneca and Persius in ways that cannot be replicated, however far afield in time, space and genre, Ovid's reception comes to reach.

Bibliography

Acosta-Hughes B. 2002 Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition Berkeley.
Adrados F. 1999-2003 History of the Graeco-Latin Fable Volumes I-III Trans L. A. Ray and F. Rojas del Canto. Revised and updated by G-J. van Dijk. Leiden.
Ahl F. 1985 Metaformations. Soundplay and wordplay in Ovid and other classical poets Ithaca.
Alton E. and Wormell D. 1960 'Ovid in the Medieval school room" Hermathena 94, 21-38.
Anderson A. R. 1927 "Alexander's horns" TAPhA 58, 100-22.
Anderson W. S. 1966 "Persius and the rejection of society" Wiss. Zs. Univ. Rostock 15, 409-16; repr. in Anderson 1982, 293-361.
-------. 1973 Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books 6-10 Norman, Ok.
-------. 1982 Essays on Roman Satire Princeton.
-------. 1989 "Lycaon : Ovid's deceptive paradigm in Metamorphoses 1" ICS 14, 91-101.
-------.1995 Ovid: The Classical Heritage New York.
-------. 1997 Ovid's Metamorphoses Books 1-5. Norman, Ok.
Antoniadis T. 2013 "Beyond Impotence: Some unexplored Ovidian dynamics in Petronius's sketch of the Croton episode (Satyrica 126. 1–140. 12)" TiC 5, 179-191.
Asker D. 2001 Aspects of Metamorphosis: Fictional Representations of the Becoming Human Atlanta, GA.
Axelson B. 1930 De aetate Consolationis ad Liviam et Elegiarum in Maecenatem Göteborg.
Bailey C. 1947 Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Vol. II Commentary, Books 1-3 Oxford.
Bandini M. 1986 "Il modello della metamorfosi ovidiana nel romanzo di Apuleio" Maia 38, 33-39.
Bajoni M. 1997 "Un esempio di autoapologia in Phaedrus, III, 1?" L'Antiquite Classique 66, 289-91.
Ball A. 1902 The Satire of Seneca on the Apotheosis of Claudius Commonly Called the Apocolocyntosis New York.
Barchiesi A. 1991 "Discordant Muses" PCPhS 37, 1-21.
-------. 1997 The poet and the prince : Ovid and Augustan discourse Berkeley.
-------. 2001 Speaking volumes : narrative and intertext in Ovid and other Latin poets transl. by M. Fox and S. Marchesi. London.
Barchiesi A. and Hardie P. 2010 "The Ovidian career model: Ovid, Gallus, Apuleius, Bocaccio" in P. Hardie and H. Moore eds, 59-88.
Barkan L. 1986 The gods made flesh. Metamorphosis and the pursuit of paganism New Haven, CT.
Bartsch S. 2006 The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire Chicago.
Battaglia S. 1959 'La tradizione di Ovidio nel medioevo', Filologia Romanza 10, 185-224.
Beard M. 1987 "A complex of times. No more sheep on Romulus' birthday" PCPhS 33, 1-15.

Benvuto B. and Kennedy R. 1986 The works of Jacque Lacan: An Introduction New York.
Berndt-Ersöz S. 2008 "The chronology and historical context of Midas" Historia 57, 1-37.
Bessone F. 2013 "Latin precursors" in T. Thorsen ed. The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy Cambridge, 39-58.
Bickerman E. J 1980 Chronology of the Ancient World Ithaca.
Blackburn B. and Holford-Strevens, L. 1999 The Oxford Companion to the Year: an Exploration of Calendar Customs and Time-Reckoning Oxford.
Blaensdorf J. 1986 "Senecas Apocolocyntosis und die Intertextualitätstheorie" Poetica 18, 1-26.
-------. 2000 "Lecture pédagogique-morale-politique ? : problèmes herméneutiques des fables de Phèdre" REL 78, 118-138.
Bloomer M. 1997 Latinity and Literary Society at Rome Philadelphia.
Bogel F. 2001 The Difference Satire Makes: Rhetoric and Reading from Jonson to Byron Ithaca.
Bömer F. 1957 Die Fasten, I : Einleitung, Text und Uebersetzung Heidelberg.
-------. 1958 Die Fasten, II : Kommentar Heidelberg.
-------. 1969 Metamorphosen, I-III : Kommentar Heidelberg.
-------. 1980 Metamorphosen, Buch X-XI / Kommentar Heidelberg.
-------. 1986 Metamorphosen, Buch XIV-XV, Kommentar Heidelberg.
-------. 1988 "Über das zeitliche Verhältnis zwischen den Fasten und den Metamorphosen Ovids" Gymnasium 45, 207-221.
-------. 2006 Metamorphosen / P. Ovidius Naso: Kommentar Heidelberg.
Bonandini A. 2010 Il contrasto menippeo : prosimetro, citazioni e commutazione di codice nell'Apocolocyntosis di Seneca : con un commento alle parti poetiche Trento.
Borghini A. 1978 "L'inganno della sintassi. Il mito ovidiano di Narciso (met. 3,339-510)" MD I, 177-192.
Bramble J. C. 1974 Persius and the programmatic satire. A study in form and imagery Cambridge.
Braund S. M. 1998 "Quasi homo : distortion and contortion in Seneca's Apocolocyntosis" Arethusa 31.3, 285-311.
-------. 2004a "Libertas or licentia?: freedom and criticism in Roman satire" in I. Sluiter and R. Rosen eds. Free speech in classical antiquity Leiden, 409-28.
-------. 2004b Juvenal and Persius Cambridge, MA.
Braund S. M. and Osgood J. 2012 A companion to Persius and Juvenal Chichester.
Brenkman J. 1976 "Narcissus in the text" Georgia Review 30, 293-327.
Bretzigheimer G. 1993 "Jupiter Tonans in Ovids Metamorphosen" Gymnasium 100, 19-74.
Brink C. 1963-82 Horace on Poetry: the Ars Poetica Cambridge.
Brown S. 1999 The Metamorphoses of Ovid: From Chaucer to Ted Hughes London.
Bruere R. 1958 "Color Ovidianus in Silius' Punicia I-VII" in Herescu ed., 475-99.
Bucheler F. 1864-67 Divi Claudii Apocolocyntosis Symbola Philolog. Bonnensium Leipzig, 32-89.
Buchheit V. 1966 "Mythos und Geschichte in Ovids Metamorphosen I" Hermes 44, 80-108.

Campbell G. 2003 Lucretius on Creation and Evolution Oxford.
-------. ed. 2014 The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life Oxford.
Casali S. 1997 “Quaerenti plura legendum: on the necessity of “reading more” in Ovid's exile poetry” Ramus 26, 80-112.
Cavarzere A. 2001 “Ego polivi versibus senariis: Phaedrus and iambic poetry” in A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni and A. Barchiesi eds. Iambic ideas: essays on a poetic tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire Lanham, Md. 205-217.
Champlin E. 2005 “Phaedrus the Fabulous” JRS 95, 97-123.
Charlier J. 1954-55 Ovide et Sénèque. Contribution à l'étude de l'influence d'Ovide sur les tragédies de Sénèque Mém. de lic. Univ. libre de Bruxelles, 246.
Christesen P. and Torlone Z. 2002 “Ex omnibus in unum, nec hoc nec illud: Genre in Petronius” MD 49, 135-72.
Claassen J. 1999 Displaced persons : the literature of exile from Cicero to Boethius Madison, WI.
Clark J., Coulson F. and Mckinley K. eds. 2011 Ovid in the Middle Ages Cambridge.
Clausen W. V. 1959 A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturae Oxford.
Cole S. 2006 “Elite scepticism in the Apocolocyntosis: further questions” in K. Volk and G. D. Williams eds., 175-182.
Connors C. 1998 Petronius the Poet Cambridge.
Connery B. and Combe K. 1995 Theorizing Satire: Essays in Literary Criticism New York.
Conte G. B. 1986 The rhetoric of imitation. Genre and poetic memory in Virgil and other Latin poets transl., ed. and with a foreword by Segal Ithaca.
-------. 1994 Latin literature : a history Baltimore.
Coffey M. 1989 Roman Satire Bristol.
Correa P. 2007 “A human fable and the justice of beasts in Archilochus” in P. Finglass, C. Collard and N. Richardson eds. Hesperos : studies in ancient Greek poetry presented to M. L. West on his seventieth birthday Oxford, 101-17.
Courtney E. 1991 The poems of Petronius Atlanta.
-------. 1993 The Fragmentary Latin Poets Oxford.
-------. 2001 A companion to Petronius Oxford.
Cremona C. 1980 Lexicon Phaedrianum Hildesheim.
Cozzoli A. 1995 “Poesia satirica latina e favola espoica (Ennio, Lucilio e Orazio)” RCCM 37, 187-204.
Currie H. 1984 “Phaedrus the fabulist” ANRW 32.1, 497-513.
Damon C. 2010 “Too close? : historian and poet in the Apocolocyntosis” in J. F. Miller and A. J. Woodman eds. Latin historiography and poetry in the early empire : generic interactions Leiden, 49-70.
Davis P. 2006 “Allusion to Ovid and others in Statius’ Achilleid” Ramus 35, 129-43.
DeGrassi A. 1947 Inscriptiones Italiae. Vol 13, Fasti et Elogia Fasc. 1, Fasti Consulares et Triumphales. Rome.
-------. 1954 Fasti Capitolini Turin.
-------. 1963 Inscriptiones Italie Vol 13, Fasti et Elogia. Fasc 2, Fasti Anni Numani et Iuliani Rome.
Della Corte F. 1939 “Phaedriana” RFIC, 136-144.
-------. 1986 “Orazio favolista” Cultura e scuola 100, 87-93.

De Lorenzi A. 1955 Fedro Florence.
Dessen C. 1968 Iunctura callidus acri : a study of Persius' Satires Urbana.
De Vivo A. 1995 “Seneca scienziato e Ovidio.” in I. Gallo and L. Nicastri eds. Aetates Ovidianae : lettori di Ovidio dall'Antichità al Rinascimento Naples, 39-56.
Dewar M. 2002 "Ovid in the 1st-5th Centuries A.D" in Weiden Boyd ed., 383-412.
DiLorenzo K. 2001 Looking both ways : Janus, doubling, and intertextuality in Ovid. Diss. University of Pennsylvania.
Dinter M. 2012 “The life and times of Persius: the Neronian literary renaissance” in Braund and Osgood eds., 41-58.
DiSalvo M. 1980 “The Myth of Narcissus” Semiotica 30, 15-26.
Dryden J. 1680 Ovid’s Epistles London.
Duff J. W. 1960 A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age From Tiberius to Hadrian New York.
Dunn F. 1989 “A prose hexameter in Seneca? (Consolatio ad Marciam 26.7)” AJPh 110, 488-491.
Eden P. 1984 Seneca Apocolocyntosis Cambridge.
Elliott A. 1985 “Ovid and the critics” Helios 12, 10-20.
Ellis R. 2008 Ibis / Ovid Bristol.
Elsner J. 1996 Art and Text in Roman Culture Cambridge.
Esposito P. 1989 “Una citazione ovidiana in Seneca” Vichiana 18, 52-62.
-------. 1995 “Lucano e Ovidio” in Gallo and Nicastri eds., 57-76.
Estafania D. 1999 “Ovidio, Quintiliano y el canon literario” in Schubert ed., 829-40.
Evans H. 1983 Publica Carmina: Ovid’s Books from Exile Lincoln, NE.
Fabre-Serris J. 1995 Mythe et poésie dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide : fonctions et significations de la mythologie dans la Rome augustéenne Paris.
Fantham E. 1986 “Ovid, Germanicus and the composition of the Fasti” in F. Cairns ed. Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, V Liverpool, 243-381.
-------. 1998 Fasti. Book IV Cambridge.
-------. 2001 “Roman elegy: problems of self-definition, and redirection” in E. Schmidt ed. L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine Entretiens sur l’Antiquite Classique 47 Geneva, 183-211.
Farrell J. 1991 Vergil's Georgics and the traditions of ancient epic : the art of allusion in literary history Oxford
-------. 1992 “Dialogue of Genres in Ovid's "Lovesong of Polyphemus" (Metamorphoses 13.719-897)” AJPh 113, 235-68.
-------.1999 “The Ovidian corpus : poetic body and poetic text” in P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi and S. Hinds eds, 127-141.
Feeney D. 1992 “Si licet et fas est : Ovid's Fasti and the problem of free speech under the principate” in J. Powell ed. Roman poetry and propaganda in the age of Augustus, 1-25.
-------. 2004 “Tenui…latens discrimine: spotting the differences in Statius’ Achilleid” MD 52, 85-105.
-------. 2007 Caesar's calendar : ancient time and the beginnings of history Berkeley.
Ferzoco G. and Gill M. 2005 “De hereditate Protei: ways of metamorphoses” in C. Dente, G. Fercozo, M. Gill, M. Spunta eds. Proteus: the Language of Metamorphosis Aldershot, Hants, 1-12.

Fielding I. 2014 “A poet between two worlds: Ovid in Late Antiquity” in Miller and Newlands eds., 100-13.
Fisher C. 1922 Tacitus Annales I-VI, XI-XVI Oxford.
-------. 1922 Tacitus Historiae I-V Oxford.
Fontenrose J. 1940 “Apollo and the sun-god in Ovid” AJPh 61, 429-444.
Fowler D. 1997 “On the shoulders of giants: intertextuality and classical studies” MD 39, 13-34.
Frankel H. 1945 Ovid: a Poet between Two Worlds Berkeley.
Fraschetti A. 1990 Roma e il principe Laterza.
Freudenburg K. 1993 The walking muse : Horace on the theory of satire Princeton.
-------. 2001 Satires of Rome : threatening poses from Lucilius to Juvenal Cambridge.
-------. ed. 2005 The Cambridge companion to Roman satire Cambridge.
Fredricksmeyer E. 1991 “Alexander, Zeus Ammon, and the conquest of Asia” TAPhA 121, 199-214.
Fulkerson L. 2005 The Ovidian heroine as author : reading, writing, and community in the Heroides Cambridge.
-------.2013 No regrets : remorse in classical antiquity Oxford.
Gahan J. 1985 “Seneca, Ovid, and exile” CW 78, 145-147.
Gais R. 1978 “Some problems of river-god iconography” AJA 82, 355-370.
Galinsky K. 1967 “The Cipus Episode in Ovid’s Metamorphoses (15.565-621)” TAPA 98, 181-91.
-------. 1989 “Was Ovid a silver Latin poet? ICS 14, 69-89.
Galli R. 1983 “Fedro e Orazio” Paideia 38, 195-99.
Gardner H. 2008 “Women's time in the Remedia amoris” in G. Liveley and P. Salzman-Mitchell eds. Latin elegy and narratology Columbus, OH, 68-85.
Gärtner U. 2000 “Phaedrus tragicus : zu Phaedr. 4, 7 und seinem Selbstverständnis als Dichter” in E. Stark and G. Vogt-Spira eds. Dramatische Waldchen: Festschrift fur Eckard Lefevre zum 65. Geburtstag Hildesheim, 661-682.
-------. 2007a “consulto inuoluit ueritatem antiquitas: zu den Werten bei Phaedrus” Gymnasium 114.5, 405-434.
-------. 2007b “levi calamo ludimus: zum poetologischen Spiel bei Phaedrus” Hermes 135, 429-459.
Gaertner J. 2007 Writing exile : the discourse of displacement in Greco-Roman antiquity and beyond Leiden.
Gallo I. and Nicastri L. 1995 Aetates Ovidianae : lettori di Ovidio dall'antichità al Rinascimento Naples.
Gertz M. C. 1888 “Adnotatiunculae criticae in libellum satiricum qui nunc vulgo inscribitur Apocolocyntosis” Philologie 137, 843.
Geyssen J. 1999 “Sending a book to the Palatine: Martial 1.70 and Ovid” Mnemosyne 52, 718-38.
Gildenhard I. and Zissos A. 2000 “Ovid's Narcissus (Met. 3.339-510) : echoes of Oedipus” AJPh 121, 129-147.
-------. eds. 2013 Transformative Change in Western Thought: A history of Metamorphosis from Homer to Hollywood London.
Gladhill B. 2013 “The domus of Fama and republican space in Ovid's Metamorphoses” J. Farrell and D. Nelis eds. Augustan poetry and the Roman Republic, Oxford, 297-318.

Glauthier P. 2009 “Phaedrus, Callimachus and the recusatio to success” ClAnt 28, 248-278.
Gould G. 1918 Virgil, Volume II : Aeneid Books 7-12, Appendix Vergiliana Cambridge, MA.
Gowers E. 1994 “Persius and the decoction of Nero” in J. Elsner and J. Masters eds. Reflections of Nero: culture, history and representation Chapel Hill, NC, 131-150.
Green S. J. 2004 Ovid, Fasti 1: a Commentary Leiden.
-------. 2010 “Undeifying Tiberius : a reconsideration of Seneca, Apocolocyntosis 1.2.” CQ 60.1, 274-276.
Griffin D. 1994 Satire: A Critical Reintroduction Lexington, KY.
Guaglione G. 1969 Phaedri Augusti Liberti Liber Fabularum Turin.
Hamm U. 2000 “Illitteratum plausum nec desidero: Phaedrus über sich als Dichter” in J. Styka ed. Studies in Ancient Literary Theory and Criticism (Classica Cracoviensia 5), Krakow, 275-296.
Hanell K. 1956 “Zur Problematik der alteren romischen Geschichtsschreibung” in Histoire et historiens dans l’antiquite: Entretiens sur l’antiquite classique 4, Geneva, 149-84.
Hardie P. 1988 “Lucretius and the delusions of Narcissus” MD 20-21, 71-89.
-------. 1990 “Ovid's Theban history : the first “anti-Aeneid”? “ CQ 40, 224-235.
-------. 1991 “The Janus episode in Ovid's Fasti” MD 26, 47-64.
-------. 1993 The epic successors of Virgil: a study in the dynamics of a tradition Cambridge.
-------. 1995 “The speech of Pythagoras in Ovid Metamorphoses 15 : Empedoclean epos” CQ 45, 204-214.
-------. ed. 2002a The Cambridge Companion to Ovid Cambridge.
-------. 2002b “Ovid and early imperial literature” in Hardie ed. 2002a, 34-45.
-------. 2002c “The historian in Ovid. The Roman history of Metamorphoses 14-15” in D. Levene and D. Nelis eds., 191-210.
Hardie P, Barchiesi A. and Hinds S. eds. 1999 Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid’s Metamorphoses and its Reception Cambridge.
Hardie P. and Moore A. eds. 2010 Classical literary careers and their reception Cambridge.
Harries B. 1990 “The spinner and the poet : Arachne in Ovid's Metamorphoses” PCPhS 36, 64-82.
Harrison S. 2014 “Ovid in Apuleius' Metamorphoses” in Miller and Newlands eds, 86-99.
Harvey R. 1981 A commentary on Persius Leiden.
Hausrath A. 1936 “Zur Arbeitsweise des Phaedrus” Hermes, 70-103.
Havet L. 1921 Fables Ésopiques Paris.
Hawkins T. 2014 Iambic Poetics in the Roman Empire Cambridge.
Helzle M. 1989 Publii Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto liber iv. A commentary on poems 1 to 7 and 16 Hildesheim.
Henderson J. 1999 “Phaedrus' Fables: the original corpus” Mnemosyne 52, 308-329.
-------. 2001 Telling Tales on Caesar: Roman Stories from Phaedrus Oxford.
Herbert-Brown G. 1994 Ovid and the Fasti : an historical study New York.
-------. ed. 2002 Ovid's Fasti : historical readings at its bimillennium Oxford.

Herescu N. ed. 1958 Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide, publiees a l'occasion du bimeillenaire de la naissance du poete Paris.
Herz P. 1978 "Kaiserfeste der Principatszeit" ANRW II.16, 2. 1135-1200.
Hexter R. 1986 Ovid and Medieval Schooling: Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's Ars Amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, and Epistulae Heroidum Munich.
-------. 2002 "Ovid in the Middle Ages: Exile, Mythographer and Lover" in Body ed., 413-42.
Hinds S. 1987a The metamorphosis of Persephone. Ovid and the self-conscious muse Cambridge.
-------. 1987b "Generalising about Ovid" Ramus 16, 4-31.
-------. 1992a "Arma in Ovid's Fasti, 1. Genre and mannerism" Arethusa 25, 81-112.
-------. 1992b "Arma in Ovid's Fasti, 2 : Genre, Romulean Rome and Augustan ideology" Arethusa 25, 113-153.
-------. 1998 Allusion and Intertext : dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry Cambridge.
-------. 2007 "Martial's Ovid/Ovid's Martial" JRS 97, 113-154.
-------. 2011 "Seneca's Ovidian loci" SIFC 4a, 5-63.
Hollander J. 1981 The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After Berkeley.

Hollis A. 2007 Fragments of Roman poetry, c.60 BC-AD 20 Oxford.
Holzberg N. 1991a "Die Fabel von Stadtmaus und Landmaus bei Phaedrus und Horaz" WJA 17, 229-239.
-------. 1991b "Phaedrus in der Literaturkritik seit Lessing: alte und neue Wege der Interpretation" Anregung 37, 226-242.
-------. 1995 Fasti = Festkalendar Zurich.
-------. 2002a The Ancient Fable: an Introduction Trans. C. Jackson-Holzberg. Bloomington.
-------. 2002b Ovid: the Poet and his Work trans. G. Goshgarian Ithaca.
Hooley D. M. 1997 The knotted thong : structures of mimesis in Persius Ann Arbor.
Hurley D. W. 1993 An historical and historiographical commentary on Suetonius'Life of C. Caligula Atlanta.
Hutchinson G. O. 2008 Talking books : readings in Hellenistic and Roman books of poetry Oxford.
Ingleheart J. 2006 "What the poet saw : Ovid, the error and the theme of sight in Tristia 2" MD 56, 64-86.
-------. 2011 Two thousand years of solitude : exile after Ovid Oxford.
Innocenti Pierini R. degl'. 1980 "Echi delle elegie ovidiane dall'esilio nelle Consolationes ad Heluiam e ad Polybium di Seneca" SIFC 52, 109-143.
-------. 1984 "Seneca emulo di Ovidio nella rappresentazione del diluvio universale. Nat. quaest. 3,27,13 sgg." A&R 29, 143-161.
-------. 1987 "Il concilio degli dèi tra Lucilio e Ovidio" A&R 32, 137-147.
-------. 2005 "Gli sparsa miracula di Ovidio (Met. 2.193) e Seneca (Epist. 90.43)" Prometheus 31.1, 59-64.
Jakobi R. 1988 Der Einfluss Ovids auf den Tragiker Seneca Berlin.
Janan M. 2007 "Narcissus on the text : psychoanalysis, exegesis, ethics" Phoenix 61, 286-295.

-------. 2009 Reflections in a serpent's eye: Thebes in Ovid's Metamorphoses Oxford.
Jennings V. 2009 “Borrowed plumes : Phaedrus' fables, Phaedrus' failures” in W. Dominik, J. Garthwaite and P. Roche eds. Writing politics in Imperial Rome Leiden, 225-248.
Keane C. 2006 Figuring Genre in Roman Satire Oxford.
-------. 2007 “Defining the art of blame: Classical satire” in R. Quintero ed. A Companion to Satire Oxford, 31-51.
Keith A. 2014 “Poetae Ovidianae: Ovid’s Metamorphoses in Imperial Roman Epic” in Miller and Newlands eds., 70-85.
Kenney E. J. 1982 The Cambridge history of classical literature, II : Latin literature Cambridge.
-------. 1994 Ovid Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris Oxford.
Kernan A. 1959 The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance New Haven.
Kissell W. 1990 Aules Persius Flaccus Satiren Heidelberg.
Klein F. 2012 “Les bouclettes d'Encolpe (Sat. 109.9): une critique pétronienne du néo-alexandrinisme ovidien?” Eugesta 2, 241-262.
Knoche U. 1966 “Das Bild des Kaisers Augustus in Senecas Apocolocyntosis” Wiss. Zs. Univ. Rostock Ges.- & sprachwiss. R. 15, 463-470.
Knox P. 1986 Ovid's Metamorphoses and the traditions of Augustan poetry Cambridge.
-------. 2009 A Companion to Ovid Sussex.
Kochhar-Lindgren G. 1993 Narcissus transformed : the textual subject in psychoanalysis and literature University Park, PA.
Koster S. 1988 “Der Barbier des Midas oder Persius und Nero” in Koster ed. Ille ego qui. Dichter zwischen Wort und Macht Erlangen, 69-81.
Krasne D. 2012 “The Pedant’s Curse: Obscurity and Identity in Ovid’s Ibis” Dictynna 9
Kurke L. 2011 Aesopic conversations : popular tradition, cultural dialogue, and the invention of Greek prose Princeton.
Lacan J. 1978 The Four Fundamental Concepts of Pscyho-Analysis trans. A. Sheridan, New York.
-------. 2004 “The Mirror Stage as formative of the function of the I as revealed in psychoanalytic theory” in Écrits : a selection trans. B. Fink, New York, 3-9.
Lamb R. 1998 Annales Phaedriani 1596-1996: A bibliography of Phaedrus Lowestoft.
Lamberti G. 1980 “La poetica del lusus in Fedro” RIL 114, 95-115.
Lasserre F. 1983 “La fable en Grèce dans la poésie archaïque” in Adrados ed. La Fable: Huit exposés suivis de discussions Entretiens sur l’Antiquite classique 30, 61-103.
Lateiner D. 1983 “Mythic and non-mythic artists in Ovid’s Metamorphoses” Ramus 13, 1-30.
Laurence R. and Smith C. 1995-96 “Ritual, time and power in ancient Rome” ARP 6, 133-151.
Leach E. 1974 “Ekphrasis and the theme of artistic failure in Ovid’s Metamorphoses” Ramus 3, 102-42.
Lefkowitz J. 2009 Aesop's pen: Adaptation, authorship, and satire in the Aesopic tradition Diss. University of Pennsylvania.
-------. 2014 “Aesop and Animal Fable” in G. Campbell ed., 1-23.

Levene D. and Nelis D. eds. 2002 Clio and the poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography Leiden.
Libby B. 2010 “The intersection of poetic and imperial authority in Phaedrus' fables” CQ 60, 545-58.
Lindheim S. 2003 Mail and female : epistolary narrative and desire in Ovid's Heroides Madison, WI.
Lovatt H. 2002 “Statius’ ekphrastic games: Thebaid 6.531-47” Ramus 31, 73-90.
Lucas G. 2005 “La réponse d'Ammon à Alexandre corrigée par Plutarque” in L. Basset and F. Biville eds. éd. Les jeux et les ruses de l'ambiguïté volontaire dans les textes grecs et latins Lyon, 189-205.
Luck G. 1963 Tristia, Epistulae ex Ponto Munich.
Lund A. 1994 Apocolocyntosis Divi Claudii (Wissenschaftliche Kommentare Zu Griechischen Und Lateinische) Heidelberg.
Lundstrom S. 1980 Ovids Metamorphosen und die Politik des Kaisers Stockholm.
Lyne R. O. A. M. 1978 Ciris. A poem attributed to Vergil Cambridge.
Magnani A. 2003 “Sensum tantum retinebam humanum”: Ovidio, Apuleio e la metamorfosi” 5, 3-37.
Manuwald B. 1975 “Narcissus bei Konon und Ovid. (Zu Ovid met. 3,339-510)” Hermes 103, 349-372.
Marks R. 2004 “Of Kings, Crowns and boundary Stones: Cipus and the hasta Romuli in Metamorphoses 15” TAPA 134, 107-131.
Marshall P. 1972 “Reviewed Work: Phaedri Augusti Liberti Liber Fabularum by Antonius Guaglianone” AJPh 93.506-07.
Martelli F. 2013 Ovid’s Revisions: The Editor as Author Cambridge.
Martindale C. ed. 1988 Ovid Renewed: Ovidian Influences on Literature and Art from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century Cambridge.
-------. 1993 Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception Cambridge.
Massaro M. 1981 “Una caratteristica dello stile di Fedro. La variatio sermonis” QuadFoggia I, 49-61.
Masselli G. 2002 Il Rancore dell’ Esule: Ovidio, l’Ibis e I modi di un’invettiva Edipuglia.
Mayer R. 1999 “Love it or leave it : Silver Latin literature” in Braund and Mayer eds. Amor, roma : love & Latin literature Cambridge, 143-57.
Mazzilli C. 2006 “Petronio, Satyricon 79-82: implicazioni metanarrative nello stereotipo della “relicta” Aufidus 20, 51-82.
-------. 2011 “Dedalo e Pigmalione: la parodia dell'ékphrasis nel Satyricon” Argos 34, 31-53.
Mazzoli G. 1970 Seneca e la poesia Milan.
------- 2007 “Le Metamorfosi tra Ovidio e Apuleio” Athenaeum 95, 7-20.
McGowan M. 2009 Ovid in exile : power and poetic redress in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto Leiden.
McNelis C. 2009 “Ovidian strategies in early Imperial literature” in Knox ed., 397-410.
Michels A. 1967 The calendar of the Roman republic Princeton.
Millar F. 1993 “Ovid and the Domus Augusta: Rome Seen from Tomoi” JRS 83, 1-17.
Miller J. F. 1983 “Ovid's divine interlocutors in the Fasti, III” in C. Deroux ed. Studies in Latin literature and Roman history, III (Coll. Latomus 180) Brussels, 156-192.

-------. 2002 “Ovid's Liberalia” in G. Herbert-Brown ed. Oxford, 199-224.
Miller J.F. and Newlands C. eds. 2014 A handbook to the reception of Ovid Chichester.
Milowicki E. 1996 “Reflections on a Symbolic Heritage: Ovid's Narcissus” Syllecta Classica 7, 155-66.
Morgan L. 2003 “Child's play : Ovid and his critics” JRS 93, 66-91.
Müller D. 1987 Ovid, Iuppiter und Augustus Gedanken zur Götterversammlung im ersten Buch der Metamorphosen Berlin.
Munari F. 1960 Ovid im Mittelalter Zurich.
Murgatroyd P. 2008 “Amycus’ cave in Valerius Flaccus” CQ 58, 382-86.
Myers K. 2014 “Ovid’s self-reception in his exile poetry” in Miller and Newlands eds., 8-21.
Nagle B. 1980 The Poetics of exile. Program and polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid Brussels.
Newlands C. 1995 Playing with time : Ovid and the Fasti Ithaca.
-------. 1997 “The role of the book in Tristia 3.1” Ramus 26, 57-79.
Nicaise S. 1991 “Je meurs de soif aupres de la fontaine: Narcisse, Echo et le problematique du double chez Ovide” Etudes classiques 59, 67-72.
Niklas P. 2002 Die Bestandigkeit des Wandels: Metamorphosen in Literatur und Wissenschaft Hildesheim.
Nojgaard M. 1967 La fable antique, II: les grands fabulistes Copenhagen.
Nouvet C. 1991 “An impossible response: the disaster of Narcissus’ Ovid” Yale French Studies 79, 103-34.
Oberg E. 2000 Phaedrus-Kommentar Stuttgart.
O’Gorman E. 2005 “Citation and authority in Seneca's Apocolocyntosis” in Freudenburg ed. The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire Cambridge, 95-108.
Osgood J. 2011 Claudius Caesar : Image and Power in the Early Roman Empire Cambridge.
Otis B. 1966 Ovid as an epic poet Cambridge.
Owen S. 1963 Ovid Tristia, Ibis, Epistulae ex Ponto, Halieutica, Fragmenta Oxford.
Parkes R. 2009 “Hercules and the centaurs: reading Statius with Virgil and Ovid” CPh 104, 476-94.
Pasco-Pranger M. 2006 Founding the year : Ovid's Fasti and the Poetics of the Roman Calendar Leiden.
Peirano I. 2012 The rhetoric of the Roman fake : Latin pseudepigrapha in context Cambridge.
Pellizer E. 1988 “Reflections, echoes and amorous reciprocity: on reading the Narcissus story” in J. Bremmer ed. Intrepretations of Greek Mythology Totawa, NJ, 107-20.
Perry B. E. 1962 “Demetrius of Phalerum and the Aesopic fables” TAPhA 93, 287-346.
-------. 1965 Babrius and Phaedrus Cambridge, Mass.
Picone S, Michelangelo A. and Zimmermann A. eds. 1994 Ovidius redivivus: von Ovid zu Dante Zurich.
Pieper C. 2010 “Phaedrus' Ironie : Anmerkungen zum Prolog des dritten Fabelbuches” Gymnasium 117, 33-48.
Pitcher R. 1998 “Martial’s debt to Ovid” in Grewing ed. Toto notus in orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation Stuttgart, 59-76.
Plaza M. ed. 2009 Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Persius and Juvenal Oxford.

Powell J. 1992 “Persius' first satire : a re-examination” in A. J. Woodman and J. Powell eds. Author and Audience in Latin literature Cambridge, 150-172.
Putnam M. 1995 Virgil's Aeneid: Interpretation and Influence Chapel Hill.
Rand E. 1925 Ovid and his Influence Boston.
Reckford K. J. 1962 “Studies in Persius” Hermes 1962 90, 476-504.
-------. 2009 Recognizing Persius Princeton.
Relihan J. 1989 “The confessions of Persius” ICS 1989 14, 145-167.
-------. 1993 Ancient Menippean Satire Baltimore and London.
Richmond J. 1981 “Doubtful works ascribed to Ovid” ANRW 2.31.4, 2744-83.
-------. 2002 “Manuscript traditions and the transmission of Ovid’s works” in Weiden Boyd ed., 443-83.
Rimell V. 2002 Petronius and the anatomy of fiction Cambridge.
Roberts M. 2002 “Creation in Ovid’s Metamorphoses and the Latin Poets of Late Antiquity” Arethusa 25, 403-15.
Robinson M. 2003 “Festivals, fools and the Fasti : the Quirinalia and the Feriae stultorum : (Ovid, Fast. II 475-532)” Aevum(ant) 3, 609-632.
Robinson T. 2005 “In the court of time : the reckoning of a monster in the Apocolocyntosis” Arethusa 38.2, 223-257.
Roller L. 1983 “The legend of Midas” Cl. Ant. 2, 299-313.
Roller M. 2012 “Politics and invective in Persius and Juvenal” in S. Braund and J. Osgood eds., 283-311.
Roman L. 2001 “The representation of literary materiality in Martial's Epigrams” JRS 91, 113-145.
-------. 2006 “A history of lost tablets” ClAnt 25, 351-388.
Ronconi A. 1984 “Fortuna di Ovidio” A&R 29.1-16.
Rosati G. 1983 Narciso e Pigmalione: Illusione e spettacolo nelle Metamorfosi de Ovidio Florence.
-------. 1999 “Form in motion : weaving the text in the Metamorphoses” in P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi and S. Hinds eds., 241-53.
-------. 2005 “Elegy after the elegists: from opposition to assent” in Cairns ed. Papers of the Langford Latin Seminar. 12, Greek and Roman poetry, Greek and Roman historiography Leeds, 133-150.
-------. 2014 “Ovd in Flavian Occasional Poetry (Martial and Statius)” in Miller and Newlands eds., 55-69.
Rosen R. M. 1988 “Hipponax and His Enemies in Ovid's Ibis” CQ 38, 291-96.
2007 Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire Oxford.
-------. 2012 “Satire in the Republic: From Lucilius to Horace” in S. Braund and J. Osgood eds., 19-40.
Rosiello F. 2002 “Semantica di error in Ovidio” BStudLat 32, 424-462.
Ross D. 1975 Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome Cambridge.
Rüpke J. 1995 Kalender und Öffentlichkeit : die Geschichte der Repräsentation und religiösen Qualifikation von Zeit in Rom Berlin.
-------. 2011 The Roman calendar from Numa to Constantine : time, history and the Fasti transl. by D. Richardson, Chichester.
Sailor D. 2008 Writing and Empire in Tacitus Cambridge.

Salzman-Mitchell P. 2005 A Web of Fantasies: Gaze, Image and Gender in Ovid's Metamorphoses Columbus, OH.
Sampson C. 2012 "A note on Archilochus fr. 177 and the anthropomorphic facade in early fable" CQ 62, 466-475.
Saylor C. 1999 "Lucan and models of the introduction" Mnemosyne 52, 545-53.
Schenkl K. 1863 "Beitrage zur Kritik des L. Annaeus Seneca" Sitzber. Akad. Wiss. Wien, PhiI.-hist. KI. 44, 21-30.
Schiesaro A. 2003 The Passions in Play: Thyestes and the Dynamics of Senecan Drama Cambridge.
-------. 2011 "Ibis Redibis" MD 67, 79-150.
Schlegel C. 2005 Satire and the threat of speech : Horace's satires, book 1 Madison, WI.
Schmeling G. 1996 "Genre and the Satyricon: Menippean Satire and the Novel" in Klodt ed., Satura Lanx: Festschrift für Werner Krenkel, Hildesheim, 105-117.
Schmeling G. and Setaioli A. 2011 A commentary on the Satyrica of Petronius Oxford.
Schmitzer U. 1990 Zeitgeschichte in Ovids Metamorphosen : mythologische Dichtung unter politischem Anspruch Stuttgart.
Schoonhoven H. 1992 The pseudo-Ovidian Ad Liviam de morte Drusi : (Consolation ad Liviam, Epicedium Drusi) : a critical text with introduction and commentary Forsten.
Schubert W. eds. 1999 Ovid: Werk und Wirkung. Festgabe fur Michael von Albrecht zum 65. Geburtstag Frankfurt.
Scivoletto N. 1976 Musa Iocosa. Studio sulla poesia giovanile di Ovidio Rome.
Segal, C. 2001-02 "Jupiter in Ovid's Metamorphoses" Arion 9.1, 78-99.
Setaioli A. 2010 "La poesia in Petr. Sat. 135.8" Prometheus 36, 241-256.
Sharrock A. 1994 "Ovid and the politics of reading" MD 33, 97-122.
Skulsky H. 1981 Metamorphosis : the mind in exile Cambridge, MA.
Skutsch O. 1985 The Annals of Q. Ennius Oxford.
Spahlinger L. 2008 "Künstleranekdoten bei Phaedrus : zum Selbstverständnis des kaiserzeitlichen Fabeldichters" Gymnasium 115, 251-281.
Sondag J. 2011 "L'emploi de la fable dans les Satires et les Épîtres d'Horace" in J. Boivin, J. Cerquiglini-Toulet and L. Harf-Lancner eds. Les fables avant La Fontaine Geneva, 73-84.
Spoth F. 1992 Ovids Heroides als Elegien Munich.
Stampacchia G. 1968 Mida rex in Persio e in Petronio Rome.
Strootman R. 2010 "Literature and the kings" in Claus and Cuypers eds. A Companion to Hellenistic Literature Chichester, 30-45.
Sullivan J. P.1968 The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study Bloomington.
-------. 1978 "Ass's ears and Attises. Persius and Nero" AJPh 99, 159-170.
-------. 1991 Martial, the unexpected classic : a literary and historical study Cambridge.
Sullivan M. 2007 The Horatian fable Diss. Harvard.
Syme R. 1979 History in Ovid Oxford.
Talbert R. 1984 The Senate of Imperial Rome Princeton.
Tarrant R. J. 2002 "Chaos in Ovid's Metamorphoses and its Neronian influence" Arethusa 35.3, 349-360.
-------. 2004 P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses Oxford.
-------. 2006 "Seeing Seneca whole?" in K. Volk and G. D. Williams eds., 1-17.
Taylor L. R. and Holland L. A. 1952 "Janus and the Fasti" CPh 1952 47, 137-142.

Thiel A. 2000 Midas : Mythos und Verwandlung Heidelberg.
Thomas R. 1986 “Virgil’s Georgics and the art of reference” HSCPh 90, 171-98.
Tissol G. 2002 “Ovid and the exilic journey of Tuilius Namatianus” Arethusa 35, 435-46.
Todini U. 1995 “Ovidio lascivo in Quintiliano” in Gallo and Nicastri eds., 77-119.
Tomkins L. 2011 “The myth of narcissus: Ovid and the problem of subjectivity in psychology” G&R 58, 224-39.
Toohey P. 2004 Melancholy, Love and Time: Boundaries of the Self in Ancient Literature Ann Arbor.
Thumiger C. 2014 “Metamorphosis: Human into Animal” in G. Campbell ed., 384-413.
Traube L. 1911 Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen Munich.
Trinacty C. 2007 Character is destiny : Senecan tragedy and Ovid Diss. Brown University.
-------. 2007-8 “Seneca's Heroides : elegy in Seneca's Medea” CJ 103.1, 63-78.
Tzounakas S. 2005 “Persius on his predecessors : a re-examination” CQ 2005 55, 559-571.
Vance E. 1981 “Sylvia's pet stag. Wildness and domesticity in Vergil's Aeneid” Arethusa 15, 127-138.
Van Dijk G. 1997 Ainoi, logoi, mythoi : Fables in Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic Greek Literature, with a Study of the Theory and Terminology of the Genre Leiden.
Viarre S. 1966 La survie d’Ovide dans la literature scientifique des XIIe et XIIIe siècles Poitiers.
Van Rooy C. 1965 Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory Leiden.
Van Tress H. 2004 Poetic memory : allusion in the poetry of Callimachus and the Metamorphoses of Ovid Leiden.
Volk K. 2002 The poetics of Latin didactic : Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius Oxford.
-------.2009 Manilius and his intellectual background Oxford.
Volk K. and Williams G. D. eds. 2006 Seeing Seneca whole : perspectives on philosophy, poetry, and politics Leiden.
Wahlberg S. 2008 Ovid's Fasti and the tradition of Callimachus' Aetia in Rome Diss. University of Pennsylvania.
Wallace-Hadrill A. 1987 “Time for Augustus : Ovid, Augustus and the Fasti” in M. Whitby, P. Hardie P. and M. Whitby eds. Homo viator. Classical essays for John Bramble Bristol, 221-230.
Walsh P.G. 1978 “Petronius and Apuleius” in Hijmans and van der Paardt eds., Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass Groningen, 17-24.
Weiden-Boyd B. 2002 Brill’s Companion to Ovid Leiden.
Weinbrot H. 2005 Menippean satire reconsidered : from antiquity to the Eighteenth Century Baltimore.
Wheeler S. 1999 A discourse of wonders : audience and performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses Philadelphia.
-------. 2000 Narrative Dynamics in Ovid’s Metamorphoses Tubingen.
-------. 2002 “Toward a literary history of Ovid’s reception in antiquity” Arethusa 35.3, 341-47.
-------. 2004-2005 “Before the Aetas Ovidiana: the early reception of Ovid” Hermathena 177, 5-26.

Wheeler S. and Tissol G. eds. 2002 Receptions of Ovid in Antiquity Arethusa 35.3, Baltimore.
Wilkinson L. P. 1955 Ovid Recalled Cambridge.
Williams G. W. 1978 Change and decline. Roman literature in the early Empire Berkeley.
Williams G. D. 1992 “On Ovid's Ibis : a poem in context” PCPhS 38, 171-189.
-------. 1994 Banished voices : readings in Ovid's exile poetry Cambridge.
-------. 1996 The Curse of Exile: A Study of Ovid’s Ibis Cambridge.
-------. 2002 “Ovid’s exile poetry: Tristia, Epistulae ex Ponto and Ibis” in Hardie ed., 233-48.
-------. 2012 *The Cosmic Viewpoint: A Study of Seneca’s Natural Questions* Oxford.
Wilson M. 2004 “Ovidian Silius” Arethusa 37, 225-49.
Wood S. 1995 “Diva Drusilla Panthea and the sisters of Caligula” AJA 99.3, 457-482.
Zwierlein O. 1999 Die Ovid- und Vergil-Revision in tiberischer Zeit Berlin.
-------. 2000 Antike Revisionen des Vergil und Ovid Wiesbaden.