THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

# A CITY OF MARBLE, A CITY OF SONG:

# ROMAN MONUMENTS AND THE POETICS OF SPACE IN OVIDIAN POETRY.

**Dorothy Longley-Cook**

**Doctorate of Philosophy**

**University of Edinburgh**

**2020**

**Signed Declaration**

I declare that this thesis has been composed solely by myself and that it has not been submitted, in whole or in part, in any previous application for a degree. Except where stated otherwise by reference or acknowledgment, the work presented is entirely my own.

Dorothy Longley-Cook

# CONTENTS

**Abstract**............................................................................................................ 1

**Lay Summary**...................................................................................................... 3

**Acknowledgements**............................................................................................ 4

**List of Abbreviations**......................................................................................... 5

**Introduction** 6

**Chapter 1: The *Metamorphoses*** 34
Mapping the city within the cosmos in the tale of Phaethon (*Met.* 1.747-2.398)

**Chapter 2: The *Fasti*** 88
Calendrical monuments in Ovid's monumental calendar

**Chapter 3: The *Tristia*** 170
There's no place like Rome: Finding a reader in the city (*Tristia* 3.1)

**Chapter 4: The *Epistulae ex Ponto*** 196
A tale of two cities: Ovid and Severus in Rome (*Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8)

**Coda** 241
Ovid, the house of *Fama* and Rome

**Conclusion** 272

**Bibliography** 282

# ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the interaction between place and poetry in Ovid's poetic corpus. Throughout his works, the poet's repeated depictions of Roman urban space and monumental architecture confirm the fundamental importance of the city as a source of inspiration and a place of readership.

Taking into account the strong connection between text and architecture, encoded within the word *monumentum*, with its associations with memorialisation and lasting presence, this thesis questions what Ovid's poetry can tell us about Roman architecture and urban space, as he 'writes up', reconstructs and memorialises them in his poetry. Equally, it explores how the Roman architectural structures depicted by the poet can themselves appear as texts, which shed light on and help to preserve Ovid's literature.

In light of recent critical interest in space in ancient literature, this thesis provides an overview of Ovid's career arc in spatial terms. It examines the poet's changing relationship with, and depiction of, the city of Rome over the course of his career, as the genre and subject matter of his poetry alters and the location of his poetic composition changes. After establishing the firm connection between Ovidian love elegy and the city in the introduction, a different text is considered in each ensuing chapter. The different monuments and urban spaces depicted in Ovid's corpus are analysed in order to consider how and why the poet's relationship with the city remains at the forefront of his poetry, raising questions about the purpose of this poetry, the development of genre, the poet's interaction with other literature about Rome, and his relationship with his readers.

Chapter 1 explores how, in the *Metamorphoses*, the poet's urban interest, which was established within elegy, is translated to his new epic and global ambitions. As he punctuates his poem with monuments which, though mythological, also have Roman features and similarities, this chapter investigates how Ovid explores on a cosmic scale the concepts and events memorialised in Augustan architecture, eliding *urbs* and *orbis* in a way which suggests that the foundation of the universe anticipates the foundation of empire.

Chapter 2 discusses how, in the *Fasti*, the poet explores the relationship between urban architecture and his own text, as he responds to the Augustan building project in extended, aetiological elegy. As the poet writes about buildings and monuments in Rome which are associated with the calendar, constructing his own version of the city within his text, this chapter examines how Ovid's *Fasti* becomes a text which can be likened to the monuments which it describes. At the same time, it considers how, as his own text celebrates, and can be compared to, Roman monuments, the poet negotiates the well-established opposition between monumental architecture and poetry.

Chapter 3 examines how, in the *Tristia*, the poet's relationship with Rome and his readers there can be sustained when he is no longer physically present. As the poet

‘returns’ to Rome by means of his personified poetry book in *Tristia* 3.1, visiting monuments which evoke descriptions from previous texts, this chapter considers how Rome has become a space which is inscribed with literature including Ovid’s earlier works, perpetuating his presence in spite of his exile. Although rejected from these literary monuments of Rome, the book’s pleas to private readers for reception in their homes leads to  questions as to whether the success of a poet’s work is dependent on the libraries and literary monuments of the city or whether an alternative readership can be found elsewhere.

Chapter 4 analyses how, in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, the poet uses the familiar monuments and urban landscapes of Rome as a means of persuading his addressee that his exile must be mitigated. As Ovid writes to Cornelius Severus in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, recalling the peaceful leisurely life in Rome which he once enjoyed, in contrast with the harsh reality of Tomis, this chapter considers how Ovid adapts his landscape descriptions specifically to impress and persuade his addressee. It also questions the effects which Ovid’s new Rome-less existence has on his poetry and how important an existence in Rome is for poetic production.

Before concluding, one further monument is considered in a final coda. Ovid’s house of *Fama* in the *Metamorphoses* is one of the most frequently discussed monuments in Ovid’s poetic corpus and its Roman nature has been established, despite its fictional status and its placement in the *Metamorphoses* before the foundation of the city. This final discussion will consider how, in the case of the house of *Fama*, as in his other texts, Ovid explores the architectural and textual nature of a monument. At the same time, as the poet creates an architectural space which allegorizes the production, circulation and memorialization of texts, it explores how the poet presents the house of *Fama* as similar to Rome as a whole, indicating that it is the city itself, rather than one specific monument, which helps to inspire, disseminate and preserve literature.

Throughout Ovid’s literature and over the course of his career, Rome is the most prominent and constant feature. As the poet maps his poetry onto the urban landscape, imperial Rome becomes an Ovidian space. Yet, ultimately, it is the existence of Rome which perpetuates the existence of Ovid’s poetry.

# LAY SUMMARY

Publius Ovidius Naso (43BC - c.17AD) was a prolific Roman poet writing under the emperor Augustus, in a time which saw the rise and expansion of the Roman Empire, and the construction and renovation of a large number of monuments in the city of Rome. Born in Sulmo, most of Ovid's poems (written in elegiac and epic metre) were written in Rome. Exiled to the Black Sea in later life on the orders of Augustus, however, his last two collections of poetry were written from the harsh environment of Tomis (modern day Constanza in Romania). His poetry, which ranges from love poetry written in Rome to letters from his place of exile, shows a particular fascination with Roman monuments and the landscapes in which they were found. His works consider what it is to be a poet writing in the city of Rome for readers in the city of Rome. At the same time, they explore how one's identity as a Roman poet who writes about Rome alters when exiled from the city.

My thesis explores the relationship which Ovid establishes between his poetry and the monuments of Augustan Rome. To do this, I consider Ovid's depiction of a number of different monuments in his poetry over the course of his career. When I use the term monument, I mean not only the real, architecture of the Roman world but also imagined and fantastical buildings dreamed up by the poet, and also his poems, which stand as lasting memorials, as the poet (rightly) anticipates that his works will outlast the building structures of the imperial era. I explore the idea that Roman buildings can be 'read' as if they were texts, which conjure up different meanings for different viewers, and which have the ability to be edited and refashioned, much like Ovid's poems. Ovid 'constructs' different monuments, both writing about architecture in Rome in a way which allows the reader to vividly view them, and at the same time presenting his texts as lasting memorials of the city of Rome. As a consequence, Ovid should be viewed not only as a poet who writes about Rome, but a Roman architect, who presents a lasting version of the city to his readers and whose work means that we view the city itself differently.

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work would not exist if not for the help of two absolute gentlemen. My supervisors, Donncha O'Rourke and Calum Maciver, have been there not only for the last four years, but for the whole of my academic journey. I am indebted to them for all the wisdom shared and constructive criticism provided. This whole doctoral process has been an extremely happy one thanks to their patience, kindness and humour. Even with their many other commitments, they have given up so much of their time to help me pursue Ovid around Rome and into exile.

I also owe a great deal to Alex Hardie. He rigorously read a great amount of this thesis and sent me off in directions I would have never thought to go. I am grateful to Dominic Berry, Aaron Pelttari and Richard Rawles for their help with language tutoring during my PhD. Thanks to the Hardt Foundation for awarding me with a young researchers' scholarship, and to the Roman Society for funding a further stay there. These trips provided me with a *locus amoenus* in which to research and write chapters and to discuss my ideas with many fantastic researchers.

Thanks to the 12 o'clock postgraduate lunch group. Thanks to Rossana Zetti, Giulia Sagliardi, Ambra Allison Ghiringhelli, Inês Silva, Laura Donati and Celeste De Blois, who have been there through tears and laughter, for all the delicious dinners and excellent conversation. Blagovesta Atanassova kindly hosted me in Oxford so I that could use the libraries and joined me on a trip to Rome to visit Ovid's *monumenta*. Thaddeus Thorp listened to my many Ovidian theories and offered sage advice on matters of Roman history, even though the Punic Wars failed to make it into this thesis in the end! Adventures in the Hebrides, midwinter sea swims and wine and cheese nights with Hannah Lunniss, Anne Marie Hovland Aschim, Rachel Bussom and Christabel Barrowman brought great happiness and good distraction during difficult times. Rosanna Campbell and Charity Trimm offered sweet sustenance and weekend pep-talks – much of this work was fuelled by their cake, brownies and kind words. Lucy Grig and Damien Hayes let me use their lovely home as a writing retreat while Hamish-sitting. Rosa, Clem and Frieda Hayes provided so much joy and unlikely inspiration via croissants, lobsters and lego, *inter alia*.

Finally, thanks to my family, who have been my constant cheerleaders throughout this all. Thanks to my stepdad Andrew, who has provided much needed banter, coffee and constant encouragement, and to my sister Amy, who has been there for every mile of this particular marathon, in person and in spirit. My amazing mother Izzy introduced me to the wonders of the ancient world over 20 years ago with stories about the Pythian games, the decipherment of Linear B, and translating James Bond into Latin and *The Taming of the Shrew* into ancient Greek. Over the last four years, she has endured many, many Ovid-related panic phone calls, corrected many, many prepositions and malapropisms, and provided PhD support even while collecting swarms of bees. I could not be more grateful for everything she has done. This thesis is dedicated to her.

# MAIN TEXTS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED

Texts from Ovid's corpus are taken from the relevant Teubner, with the exception of Ovid's *Carmina Amatoria* which are taken from the Oxford Classical Text. I note other texts used when first quoted. All texts quoted are referenced in full in the bibliography. Translations are my own.

Journal abbreviations are taken from L'Annee Philologique. Abbreviations for ancient authors and texts generally conform to those set out in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary.*

**Abbreviations Used**

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Anderson, W.S. (ed.) (1998), *Publius Ovidius Naso Metamorphoses*, Berlin. |
| Hall | Hall, J.B. (ed.) (1995), *Publius Ovidius Naso Tristia*, Berlin. |
| Maltby | Maltby, R. (1991) *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies,* Leeds. |
| Owen | Owen, S.G. (ed.) (1915), *P. Ovidi Nasonis: Tristium Libri Quinque; Ibis; Ex Ponto Libri Quattuor; Halieutica Fragmenta*, Oxford. |
| Tarrant | Tarrant, R.J. (ed.) (2004), *P. Ovidi Nasonis: Metamorphoses*, Oxford. |
| Platner and Ashby | Platner, S.B., and Ashby, T., (1929), *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome,* Oxford. |

| | |
|---|---|
| *CIL* | *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* |
| OLD | *Oxford Latin Dictionary* |

# INTRODUCTION

Standing on the Palatine hill, readers of Ovid's poetry do not simply see the broken column drums of the Temple of Palatine Apollo and the grassy curves of the Circus Maximus, empty except for a few dog walkers and a lone jogger. Instead, before our eyes appears a monumental landscape of vast, glinting temples and shady porticos, bustling fora, and the rising dust and frantic shouts of the circus as the chariots speed around the turning post. Even today, a view of Rome can be affected and altered by the words of a 2000-year-old poet.

Modern readers are not only deprived of the monumental landscape which appears in the pages of Ovid's work, as a result of time, nature and man, but at the time of my writing this we find ourselves cut off entirely from Rome. The recent Covid-19 pandemic has left many Classicists and Italophiles in a situation much like Ovid's own in exile, unable to physically reach a beloved and well-known city, forced to rely on memories, and desperately seeking ways to experience Rome by whatever means possible, especially through literature.

The Guardian newspaper has, in recent weeks, provided a list of novels, set in Italy (alongside similar catalogues for other continental European countries), to 'take you there', allowing the locked-in and house-bound to travel to the Mediterranean through the words of famous novelists such as Eco, Ferrante, Andrea Camilleri and

E.M. Forster.[1] Such lists, classified by the newspaper as travel articles, are a clear recognition of the power of the written word to conjure up landscapes. In a time of fear, unknowing and forced introversion, literature has allowed many to escape their lives and to find themselves in other places, as the authors of these works have constructed an accessible version of these destinations in their texts. As much as I enjoyed reading this article, one question remained. Where was Ovid in this list? Not a novel by rights, but anyone wanting to visit Rome surely need look no further than the pages of his work.

This study of Ovid's poetic corpus explores the interaction between place and poetry. Throughout his works, the poet's depictions of Roman space confirm the fundamental importance of the city as a source of poetic inspiration and a place for texts to be read.[2] The poet's changing relationship with the city is used as a means of self-orientation; it allows him to reflect on the genre, subject and context of composition of each of his texts. Accordingly, study of the poet's interaction with the city and its monuments allows the reader to construe the nature of Ovid's work and to construct an identity for it based on this interrelation.

Those who study Roman space have illustrated a clear dynamic between texts and urban space,[3] a connection which is particularly encoded within the Latin term

[1] '10 of the best novels set in Italy – that will take you there', *The Guardian*, 05 May 2020, https://www.theguardian.com/travel/2020/may/05/10-best-novels-set-in-italy-travel-elena-ferrante-naples-umberto-eco-forster-tuscany (date accessed 12/06/2020).

[2] When I refer to Roman 'space' or the Roman 'landscape', I mean a collection of 'places' which are, as defined by Spencer (2009), 5, 'typically identified by toponyms, demarcated by walls or boundaries, and semiotically framed.' This space can be an area of Rome, such as the Palatine, or the city as a whole.

[3] Purcell (1989); Zanker (1988); Favro (1996).

*monumentum*. Cognate with the verb *monere*, a *monumentum* is a means of preservation and commemoration (Varro, *Ling*. 6.49). The noun can refer to both architectural and literary works, a public building structure or temple, or a written record or book.[4] The variant meanings of this term indicate that texts and architectural structures can equally become the means of lasting memorial.[5] Accordingly, a mimetic relationship exists between texts and architecture. The landscape and architecture of the city can be read as a 'text', or a repository of polyvalent narratives about the history of that place.[6] In turn, texts can stand as 'monuments' which memorialise, conjure up images of, [7] and add new meaning to a landscape.

A clear relationship between architectural and textual production can be identified in Augustan literature. The poetic concepts explored by writers, such as preservation and ruin, order and disorder, and the establishment and transgression of boundaries, were also key spatial considerations addressed by architects in the Augustan age as Rome was expanded and the Empire was ordered and mapped.[8] Two

---

[4] OLD s.v. '*monumentum*': 1, 2, 4, 5b.

[5] See Jaeger (1997), 15-29 on the role of the *monumentum*. Lowrie (2009), 119 on the presentation of texts as *monumentum*: 'materiality is sublated: abstraction cancels the merely physical literal monument, but preserves the image for a higher semiotic purpose.'

[6] Shaya (2013), 83: 'While monuments propagate the illusion of a single, eternal and unchanging past, their meanings evolve as viewers bring new concerns and understanding to them.' Edwards (1996) considers the relationship between the material city of Rome and Rome in written texts. She argues that Rome and literature are connected: she illustrates how the city offers up a multiplicity of meanings and associations for literary texts, while Rome itself also taking on meanings and associations from texts about it. See also Roller (2013), who argues that monuments, like texts, can have different 'genres' and that their competitive awareness of each other can be viewed as a kind of intertextuality.

[7] P. Hardie (2002), 3: 'Words conjure up for the reader the illusion of a real or fictitious world.'

[8] See Lindheim (2010), 163-77, who argues that the 'mapping impulse' ('an urge for ordering space, demarcating empire, counting people and resources') in Augustan poetry was caused by the expansion of the Empire, the imposition of territorial limits and the mapping of Roman world by figures such as Agrippa (Plin. *HN.* 3.17).

Roman spaces which saw major Augustan transformation, as detailed in the textual monument of Augustus' *Res Gestae,* were the Palatine and Campus Martius.[9] Both are repeatedly discussed in Augustan poetry. These spaces, which were the focus of Augustus' grand monumentalisation of Rome, and his imperial building project, are also constructed and preserved, in the mind of the reader, by the texts of the Augustan poets. As Augustus transformed Rome from a 'city of bricks' to a 'city of marble' (Suet. *Aug*. 28), Augustan authors were clearly inspired by, responded to, and even sought to rival the urban landscape developing before their eyes.[10]

Augustan architectural renovation and reconstruction, which signalled Rome's transformation into the capital of an empire, is celebrated in contemporary literature, such as *Aeneid* 8 (Aeneas' tour of the future site of Rome) and Propertius 4, which detailed the rise of Rome and the production of new monuments. Yet, at the same time as this architectural boom, many authors chose to discuss the ephemerality of physical monuments.[11] By contrast, they promoted the lasting nature of literature, a concept which was most famously seen in Horace's *Odes* 3.30.[12] A complex relationship between poetry and urban space can be identified,

---

[9] Aug. *RG*. 19-21 details this urban development. See Boyle (2003), 35-44 on the Julian and Augustan alterations to the city.

[10] While I would hesitate to go as far as suggesting, as Heslin (2015), 225 does, that certain buildings in Augustan architecture were built as a 'demand' for a poetic response and the composition of new Roman poetry, the urban development of Rome undoubtedly inspired and influenced writers of that time. On Augustan poetry as a response to Augustan architecture, see Morwood (1991), 38, 212-23; Nelis-Clement and Nelis (2013). On the 'rivalry' between structures and texts, most often as a means of memorial, see Edwards (1996), 6-7; Fowler (2000); Hardie (2012), 166-68.

[11] Lowrie (2009), 117: 'The *monumentum* is a complex and pervasive figure for literary works, both poetry and prose, in Latin literature. Material duration conveys longevity, though the tradition is sceptical that monuments can meet their promise.'

[12] Edwards (1996), 6-7 argues for the superiority of poetry to buildings as a lasting entity. Yet, while physical monuments are unstable, so too are textual monuments – in terms of lasting fixity of meaning and fame. See Fowler (2000), 211: 'The essence of the monument is paradoxically its lack of monumental stability, the way in which it is constantly reused and given new meaning.'

therefore, as poets negotiate the interdependence of, and rivalry between, poetic texts and architectural monuments.

A 'spatial turn' in recent literary criticism can be identified, as urban space in Roman literature has, in the last few years, become a prominent field of study. Notable works have included those of Jaeger and Edwards, who have both written on the portrayal of landscapes in Roman literature, including Augustan poetry, and how literature has helped to create the city of Rome as we know it.[13] Rimell, meanwhile, has provided a reading of the enclosed spaces in Roman works in order to analyse the inward spatial turn of imperial literature.[14] The recent edited volume of Fitzgerald and Spentzou also considers the engagement of Latin authors, including Propertius and Horace, with space, and the interdependence of the textual and spatial for urban and literary production and interpretation.[15]

Some critics focus on a specific author and their 'spatial turn'. Jaeger's later work on Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* considers the role of Roman monuments in Livy's narrative of the founding of Rome, as memorials of historical events in themselves.[16] Welch, meanwhile, has analysed the depiction of Augustan monuments and the creation of Roman identity in the fourth book of Propertius' elegies.[17] The work of Nelis on Vergil examines a number of urban spaces throughout the Vergilian corpus

---

[13] Jaeger (1990); Edwards (1996).
[14] Rimell (2015).
[15] Fitzgerald and Spentzou (2018). See also the edited volumes by Nelis and Royo (2014) and Fuhrer *et al*. (2015).
[16] Jaeger (1997).
[17] Welch (2012). See also the article by Keith (2015) on 'cityscaping' in the earlier books of the Propertian corpus.

in order to highlight the poet's interest in cityscapes and to show how the texts allow the reader to see mental snapshots of the city of Rome.[18]

Other studies have considered how a specific space or building influenced, and was 'written up' in, the works of multiple authors. Miller's study of Apollo in Augustan Rome considers the poets' reactions to and readings of the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine, while that of Heslin on the Portico of Philippus in Rome considers how this specific monument and the decoration featured within it provided an architectural resource for Augustan poetry.[19]

The multiple and varied depictions of space throughout Ovid's poetry make his work fruitful for an extensive exploration of the relationship between urban space and poetry. Throughout his corpus, Ovid's spatial descriptions offer up a vast array of different locations in glorious technicolour: from the shaded and book-filled rooms of the poet's home (*Am.* 1.5.1-12, *Tr.* 1.1.105-8), to the wave-washed turret from which Hypsipyle desperately watches the Argo sail away (*Her.* 6.65-72); from the flower carpeted hillsides of Aetna (*Met.* 5.385-408, *Fast.* 4.417-46) and ripe orchards on the Palatine hill **(***Met.* 14.622-36), to the wind battered Black Sea, on the shore of which the exiled and uninspired poet weakens and grows old (*Pont.* 3.1.1-24). Ekphrasis, traditionally used to describe material works of art, is often employed as a means of fleshing out these locations. In the *Metamorphoses,* for example, extended ekphraseis are used to describe a number of dwellings of allegorical personifications, such as the house of the Sun (*Met.* 2.1-30), inscribed with cosmological artwork, the

[18] Nelis (2015).
[19] Miller (2009); Heslin (2015).

Cave of Sleep (11.592-615), twilit and silent except for the murmuring of the Lethe, and the house of *Fama* (12.39-63), filled with the cavernous echoes of unseen crowds.

The place which appears most frequently throughout Ovid's corpus, however, is Rome itself. As a matter of fact, even when seemingly not writing about Rome, the city's pervasive presence can be felt within many of Ovid's spatial accounts. This can be seen in particular in the *Metamorphoses*, where mythological buildings such as the house of the Sun and the house of *Fama* possess similar decorative features and qualities to Augustan monuments. The house of the Sun (discussed in Chapter 1) stands as a monumental marker of solar and calendrical order, much like the Horologium of Augustus, while the house of *Fama* (discussed in the coda to this study), with its *atria* filled with noisy voices, has been compared to the grand house of a Roman patron, or even to the Roman forum, filled with *fama forensis*.[20]

Despite the now large body of research on the poetics of space, as yet there has been little extended or comprehensive research on the interaction between poetry and place in the Ovidian corpus as a whole. Boyle's work on Ovidian monuments is the most sustained study of the architectural structures in Ovid.[21] His book provides a detailed catalogue of the real Roman buildings referenced in the Ovidian elegiac works. Discussion of the *Metamorphoses* is brief,[22] however, and

[20] See Zumwalt (1977); Gladhill (2013); Hardie (2012), 161.
[21] Boyle (2003).
[22] Brief discussion of *Met*. 1.553-67 is included and the poet's presentation of *Romanitas* in his tales of the founding of Rome in the final books of the *Metamorphoses* is assessed. By contrast, the work by Segal (1969) on landscapes is an important overview of the settings in the *Metamorphoses*, but focusses only on the pastoral, *locus amoenus* settings in which erotic attacks occur.

does not make mention of the fictional, but clearly Roman-influenced buildings within the epic poem. The work discusses the political implications of the poet's inclusion and presentation of monuments in particular texts. For Boyle, Ovid's poetic works are entirely political entities: indeed, the poet's exilic status (and consequent relationship with the emperor) is the key consideration from the outset. The *Ars* is the reason for the poet's exile, and the exilic epistles and the (revised) *Fasti* are its product, while the *Metamorphoses* is left unrevised as a consequence of it. The texts are considered as a subversion of Augustan semiotics, which expose the ideology of the Augustan building programme as a 'violation' of *Romanitas*. Boyle does not, however, consider that buildings and places in poems can function as a means of discussing poetic considerations; so, his study does not pursue the metapoetic or otherwise symbolic potential of *monumenta* as textual as well as architectural entities. I intend to provide a more holistic overview of Roman space in Ovid's poetry, in particular in those texts which up to now have received less critical focus. My research will consider monuments both as physical architectural structures, but also bearers of meaning which can inform us about Ovid's texts.

This study of Ovidian poetry and Roman *monumenta* shall consider the poet's portrayal of urban space and his changing relationship with Augustan Rome over the course of his career. Much as Lynch has argued that people's images of cities differ from reality depending on their personal experiences,[23] it is possible to argue that Ovid's portrayal of urban topography and architectural constructs, along with their

[23] Lynch (1960).

political, historical and sociological associations, alters within the different texts which make up his poetic corpus. In each chapter, a different text will be considered, as a means of considering how and why the poet's relationship with the city remains at the forefront of his poetry. In each chapter, a different aspect of space related to Rome – from its urban architecture, inscribed monuments and gardens, to the lands on the far edge of the Empire, and the global cosmos - will be examined in order to analyse the poet's changing relationship with the city and its political system, the purpose and genre of his different texts, and his relationship with readers in the city.

It is possible to track the arc of the poet's career, and his generic ascent, according to his different descriptions of the city and the Empire (as *urbs* and *orbis* are interlinked). Beginning with the private house of the lover in the *Amores*, and the shaded porticoes of the *Ars Amatoria,* the poet ascends from erotic elegy to the cosmic and global landscapes of the epic *Metamorphoses*, and the grand, urban temples of the extended aetiological *Fasti.* Divided from the city by exile, the poet then finds himself back on the threshold in the *Tristia*, although now in front of the forbidding Palatine libraries and imperial abodes, and trying to return to the green spaces and gardens of Rome through memory while located on the war-torn boundary of empire in the *Epistulae ex Ponto.* Although previous criticism has clearly charted the generic ascent (and descent) within Ovid's career, this thesis aims to connect the course of Ovid's poetic development throughout his career with his exploration of space. The poet's negotiation of, or interaction with, urban space can be considered as a programmatic reflection of Ovid's text, as the poet uses space as a means of orientating himself and his poetic works.

The topic of generic ascent (a spatial metaphor in itself) over the course of Ovid's career has been well covered by Harrison, and this analysis might well be mapped on to the poetics of space as well.[24] The ideas of space and the advancement of age are linked by Jones, in his discussion of Roman gardens.[25] Jones highlights how, in the Roman world, as one advanced in age and status, one ventured further outside of the safety and intimacy of the family home, and into the city and political and civil life. In the same way, the spatial advancement seen over the course of Ovid's poetry can be linked to the progression of his career.

The most frequent area of study on monuments in Ovid is the presentation of Roman space in love elegy and the *Ars Amatoria*.[26] While amatory elegy will be discussed below in this introduction, the main focus of this study will be the later texts in Ovid's corpus: the *Metamorphoses, Fasti* and exilic epistles. These texts still have elements of erotic elegy. The version of Rome portrayed by Ovid in his amatory poetry, as a Roman lover in Augustan Rome, provides the basis for an understanding of how Ovid's relationship with Rome and its *monumenta* evolves over the rest of his career, both in terms of genre and subject matter.

---

[24] Harrison (2002).

[25] Jones (2014), 796-800.

[26] The PhD thesis by Shea (2011) focusses on monuments in the *Amores*, and the second poem of each revised elegiac *libellus*. Shea uses these poems to argue that the *Amores* is a 'triumphal monument to elegy' which is ordered and arranged much like an architectural structure would be, and which competes with the Augustan building programme. Most studies on the city of Augustan Rome and monuments in Ovidian texts focus on the *Ars Amatoria*, or the poet's discussion of the *Ars Amatoria* in the *Tristia*. In other studies, the buildings in *Ars Amatoria* have been read in political terms, either as a countercultural re-writing of the Augustan building project, or one which avoids political antagonism (On the *Ars*, which will be discussed in more detail in the next section of my introduction, see Labate (1984); Sharrock (1994a); Gibson (2003), 258-9).

## *Amor* and Roma: Ovid and amatory elegy

From the very beginning of his corpus, Ovid writes about a variety of different locations (both private and public) in the city of Rome. Like other Augustan love elegy, Ovid's *Amores* are centred around the house. His elegies take place in doorways and on hard thresholds in Rome, as the lover laments his inability to reach his beloved.[27] Even within the three books of the *Amores* themselves, however, some spatial advancement can be seen. *Amores* 1 is filled with interior and domestic scenes. In *Amores* 1.2, the poet describes the couch on which he struggles to sleep, due to the pangs of heartache. 1.4 sees him at a banquet with the *puella* and her husband, before he imagines the mistress's house, jealously guarded by her husband. In 1.5, the poet's own shaded room is described, as Corinna makes a dramatic entrance, before a sultry afternoon of lovemaking. 1.6 locates the poet on the doorstep of the *puella*'s house, lamenting in front of the harsh *ianitor,* while in 1.8, the poet eavesdrops on the conversion between the *puella* and the *lena* from behind her double doors. In 1.12, Ovid receives a negative reply to messages sent to the *puella*, as the maid servant Nape trips on the threshold of his home. In 1.14, another domestic scene can be imagined, as Ovid describes the *puella* surveying her ruined hair in the mirror, recalling when she lay on a purple couch with unkempt hair.

In *Amores* 2, the poet ventures into – and even outside of - the city, but poems about the household are seen once again. In *Amores* 2.2, Ovid sees Corinna in the

[27] Farrell (2014), 215: 'For Ovid, erotic elegy is a quintessentially urban genre. In the *Amores*, excursions outside the city are infrequent. Distance from the city generally equals distance from the beloved and so from the life of the lover.'

Portico of the Danaids and sends her a note. In 2.11, he describes the places Corinna will see on her journey outside the city, and in 2.16, the poet visits Sulmo himself. Yet, at the same time, 2.1 gives Corinna's closed doors as his reason for writing elegy, while 2.5 once again describes a banquet scene, where Ovid sees Corinna kissing another. In 2.11, despite Corinna's journey, the poet imagines her staying at home, reading books and playing the lyre. He also imagines a happy conclusion of her journey, with her returning to his couch, with wine on the side table, in order to relate the adventures she undertook. In 2.19, furthermore, the poet once again imagines the house of the *puella*'s husband, as he pleads with him to carefully guard his wife behind a locked door.

*Amores* 3 sees the poet depart the furthest from the house setting, an appropriate move, as Farrell argues,[28] for a poet anticipating the end of his traditional elegiac career, and a move to other types of elegy. Many of these settings are imagined or metaphorical. In *Amores* 3.1, the poet meets Elegy and Tragedy in a shaded grove of trees to discuss the inspiration for his work. In 3.5, he dreams of the fertile and shaded field in which the heifer and bull graze. Real, urban settings are also described, however. 3.2 sees a visit to the Circus with the *puella* to watch the horse racing. In 3.6, the poet struggles to cross the flooded river to meet his girlfriend. In 3.13 Ovid even describes a trip to Falerii and the festival of Juno. Nevertheless, familiar, intimate locations can still be seen. In 3.7 Ovid describes his inability to perform in the bedroom during an encounter with Corinna. 3.11 sees him once again

[28] Farrell (2014), 215 argues that the poem where Ovid visits Falerii 'seems to signal the end of Ovid's career as a literary lover and to predict his future as a poet of rituals and antiquities'.

describe the hard threshold and closed door of the beloved, while in 3.14 Ovid, inside the house again, criticises Corinna's brazen infidelity, as he suggests that wanton behaviour is appropriate only in the bedroom, before describing his suspicions about the marks on her couch, and notes being sent from and delivered to the house.

In traditional elegy, the concepts of *amor* and *Roma* clearly converge, as the city becomes a location for and a means of finding love. Ovid himself appears to connect genre and space consciously in his elegies. In *Amores* 3.1, he has the personified Elegy describe her own genre – in comparison to the weightier genre of Tragedy – as 'humble doors', in contrast to Tragedy's grander halls (*Am.* 3.1.39-41):

> non ego contulerim sublimia carmina nostris;
> obruit exiguas regia uestra fores.
> sum leuis, et mecum leuis est, mea cura, Cupido.
>
> I would not compare your lofty songs with mine. Your palace surpasses
> my humble doors. I am trivial, as Cupid, my care, is trivial also.

Ovid configures poetry in spatial terms, as amatory elegy is presented as a domestic genre. As Harrison has discussed, the interior household spaces which are the backdrop to Latin love elegy often emphasise the rejection of 'the conventional world of public achievement'.[29] In the *Amores,* the poet consciously chooses to write about private amatory experiences, and outwardly to reject more patriotic Roman themes, often by means of the *recusatio.* Indeed, in the *Ars Amatoria*, when the poet states that those who write poetry are more suited to love (3.533-34), he uses private domestic space to indicate this. The poet is better suited to love, Ovid claims, as he

[29] Harrison (2013), 144. See also Gardner (2010), 457-8 on the elegiac *domus* as a sphere distant from Augustan *patria potestas*.

rejects the forum in favour of the shaded couch (3.542 *contempto colitur lectus et umbra foro*). In this image of domestic leisure, reminiscent of Ovid's twilit afternoon encounter with Corinna (*Am*. 1.5.1-6), love and elegy become diametrically opposed to civil and political pursuits.

As Ovid's career progresses, however, he ventures out into the public world of the city, as an increased, or rather a more overt, involvement with the urban politics of Rome can be identified. The *Ars Amatoria*, with its lack of personal focus, its didactic function and its indecorous flirtation with contemporary politics and social conventions in urban Rome, advances from the intimate, private affairs of the *puella*'s household to more public themes. Urban monuments, particularly those constructed as part of the Augustan building project on the Palatine, are described by the *praeceptor amoris* as places which are advisable to visit when searching for love. The poet takes the reader on a tour of buildings and spaces in Rome, including the temples and porticoes constructed by the emperor, the forum, the theatre and the Circus (*Ars Am*. 1.55-176, 3.385-96). While a topographical walkabout is not new in Latin poetry, with tours of Rome seen in Vergil's *Aeneid* 8 and Propertius 4.1,[30] this is an erotically charged equivalent.[31]

Three extended descriptions of the city can be found in the *Ars Amatoria.* Two are used by the poet to advise readers where to meet potential lovers (*Ars Am.* 1.67-176, 3.387-96). In the third (3.113-28), Ovid reverses the traditional, nostalgic praise

[30] Tours of Rome will also be seen in Ovid's later poetry, including *Tristia* 3.1 (see Chapter 3).
[31] P. Hardie (2002), 1 argues that 'Ovid delights to present himself […] as a celebrant of the worldly and sensual abundance of post-Actian Rome'.

of Rome's simple and homely origins found in works such as Tibullus in order to praise the developed contemporary city in contrast to its rustic (or even coarse) beginnings.[32] Other elegists look back to the past, but Ovid centres himself and his readers firmly in this new city: his preference for the present day plays into the overall novelty and departure from earlier elegiac conventions which is seen in the *Ars Amatoria*.

Rome is figured with the same urbanity and sophisticated artifice (*Ars Am.* 3.127 *sed quia cultus adest*) which Ovid suggests is necessary for his prospective readers who wish to find love (3.107-12), suggesting that the Augustan city plays a part in determining the behaviour and actions of elegiac lovers. As Rome grows more modern and sophisticated, so, too, must those who seek to find love there (and, indeed, those who write about love there).[33] This alignment of the city and its lovers foreshadows Ovid's later elegiac works; in exile it will be the city which is Ovid's primary object of desire.

In a version of the familiar poetic criticism of lavish physical building structures,[34] Ovid then claims that the grand marble and gold used for urban development and monumentalisation of the city have no effect on his enjoyment of the contemporary age (3.123-8). He states that it is instead *cultus* (artistry and skill,

[32] Tib. 1.3.35-51. See Watson (1982), 240-1; Mader (1988), 368-73 on Ovid's evolution of Tibullan, Propertian and Horatian poetry.
[33] In a way the transformation of Rome and transformation of Ovidian poetry are parallel and interdependent. Gibson (2007a), 92-6 reads Ovid's remarks about *cultus* of lovers in modern Rome in the *Ars* as a poetological commentary on the nature of the *Ars.*
[34] See, for example, Hor. 3.1.41-6, Prop. 3.2.11. On this topic, see Gibson (2003), 142-3.

rather than materialism or luxury) which attracts him,[35] although one is led to wonder whether these statements are simply tongue in cheek.[36] Indeed, his other descriptions of Rome emphasise the fundamental importance of grand Augustan monuments, such as the gold and marble Temple of Palatine Apollo, [37] for elegiac love and his own success as *praeceptor amoris*. The poet's description of places to meet a lover in the *Ars Amatoria* focusses exclusively on buildings on the Palatine, in the Campus Martius and around the *Forum Iulium*. These locations have firm links to Augustus, as spaces in which he restored monuments and built temples. The buildings there are often associated with the imperial family.[38] The Temple of Palatine Apollo (*Ars Am.* 1.73-4), for example, with its portico depicting Danaus and his daughters, was founded by Augustus in 28BC, while the Portico of Livia (1.71-2, 3.391), constructed by Augustus in 15BC on the site of the house of Vedius Pollio, was dedicated by Augustus' wife in 7BC.[39] These monuments, presented here as the backdrop for his elegiac teaching, will be seen elsewhere in Ovid's corpus.

Ovid instructs hopeful lovers to visit these Augustan *monumenta* twice in the *Ars Amatoria*: once in his instructions to men in the first book (*Ars Am.* 1.67-176), and again, in the third book, when he provides amatory advice to women (3.387-96). For

---

[35] Watson (1982), 239 suggests that the emphasis on 'artistry rather than extravagance' allows him to advocate *cultus* without disassociating himself with the traditional image of the elegist as the impoverished poet.

[36] Gibson (2003), 141: 'The apparently anti-materialistic sentiments here allow the *praeceptor* momentary superiority over Augustus' beautification of the city, before it becomes clear that *cultus* refers to cosmetic adornment.' See also Mader (1988), 373-5.

[37] As Gibson (2003), 141 points out, surely the mining of gold and marble to which Ovid declares himself entirely indifferent refers to the Temple of Palatine Apollo, much as *aurea Roma* (113) does.

[38] *RG* 19-20.

[39] In the *Fasti*, the poet will refer to the involvement of Augustus in the construction of the portico (*Fast.* 6.639-48). Yet, in the *Ars Amatoria,* by solely naming Livia as the *auctor* of the building (*Ars Am.* 1.72 *Porticus Livia nomen auctoris habet*), Rome's first lady is placed firmly at the forefront.

either sex, these particular monuments of Rome (the Portico of Pompey, the Portico of Livia and the Circus, amongst others) are a key part of finding a partner. One has to wonder whether these passages are not set up in unison, engineering the meeting of Ovid's male and female readers.[40] In *Ars Amatoria* 3, Ovid states that there are places in Rome which are entirely for men, like the exercise area in the northern Campus Martius (*Ars Am.* 3.385-6). These sites are off limits to women, who lead restricted lives in the city (as the *Ars* brings out in reference to the *leges Iuliae*).[41] However, we as readers know from Ovid's instructions in *Ars Amatoria* 1 that he actually expects these men to be in Pompey's colonnade and at the Augustan monuments looking for girls. As Ovid steers his female readers away from masculine locations in Rome, he instead directs them firmly towards to the monuments to which he has already sent his male readers.

One might wonder, retrospectively, how much Ovid's statements that these Augustan structures are prime locations for romance confirms the pre-established erotic status of these monuments, as the poet would claim, and how much they anticipate the success of his own didactic instructions about love in Rome. Have the lovers there come of their own accord or are they Ovidian readers who have followed the advice of the *praeceptor*?

The possibility of Roman monuments as a backdrop for erotic acts is brought up in earlier elegy, but the *Ars Amatoria* is the first time when it is so overtly and

[40] Gibson (2003), 257: 'Under the *praceptor*'s directions, the sexes are bound to meet.'

[41] On Ovid's female readers and the poet's interaction with the *leges Iuliae*, see Gibson (2003), 25–37, 334–5, (2007b). On the establishment of female restrictions in the *leges Iuliae* and *Ars Amatoria*, see Barchiesi (2007).

consistently presented to the reader. Tibullus, for example, presents a visit to the Bona Dea shrine (a place to which the *puella*'s husband cannot follow) as an alibi for an adulterous affair (1.6.15-24). Propertius, meanwhile, suggests that Pompey's portico was visited by women of a certain reputation, and is an ideal place for unfaithful Cynthia to frequent (2.32.11-16). What is remarkable about the *Ars Amatoria*, however, is the systematic development of Rome into an erotic space,[42] as monuments are consistently encoded by the poet within teachings of his eroto-didactic work, emphasising the city's crucial role in love and elegy.[43] In the same way, a reading of the whole corpus will highlight that Ovid is unique in his consistent depiction of Rome throughout his texts, bringing the city to the forefront in a way that no author has done before, as he emphasises the importance of the city for his poetic composition and, ultimately, his existence.

The portrayal of the city in Ovid's text has led readers to question the motives behind it.[44] Ovid's catalogue of Roman monuments as potential places for erotic encounters clearly involves the imperial household in his poem about love and sex in the city. The Augustan family tree is used in *Ars Amatoria* 3 as a means of architectural recognition when naming the Portico of Octavia, the Portico of Livia, and Agrippa's Portico of the Argonauts as prospective date spots (*Ars Am*. 3.391-2):

---

[42] Even places like the northern end of the Campus Martius, which Ovid recommends avoiding (*Ars Am.* 3.385-6), become involved in the erotic colouring of the city, as they stand as a foil for the date spots on the Palatine, setting up an erotic/non-erotic binary which nevertheless associates them with love and elegy. This is no longer a space of 'patriotism and manly attractiveness' as seen in Horace's earlier poems (Gibson 2003, 256) but is now simply a place where one is not going to achieve amatory results.

[43] Gibson (2003), 257: 'This prominence of the city contrasts with the conventions of earlier elegy.'

[44] Gibson (2003), 260: 'Is this a subversive mockery of […] the Augustan programme, or a new participation of lovers on their own terms in the life of the city?'

quaeque soror coniunxque ducis monimenta pararunt,
    naualique gener cinctus honore caput.

And the monuments which our leader's sister and wife have obtained, and his son in law, with his head wreathed by naval glory.[45]

The buildings become locations which enable the occurrence of amorous affairs, just as the text itself fosters romantic liaisons, and the imperial family become (unwittingly) agents in the elegiac affair.[46] Ovid uses the familial and marital connections of a leader who promoted familial and sexual morality with legal legislation such as the *lex Iulia* to promote these as spaces with erotic potential, introducing public places and contemporary politics into the private, internalised genre of elegy.

Some critics have argued that Ovid's presentation of the city and its imperial monuments as a playground for lovers undermines Augustus and disrupts the imperial narrative inscribed within the Roman monuments.[47] Others have argued that the poet's discussion of the city is less rebellious than might be believed, however, as the interaction with the city may in itself be a kind of acceptance of the Augustan city.[48] Ovid himself becomes a commentator on the *Ars Amatoria* in *Tristia* 2.[49] Here, the exiled poet defends his earlier text by suggesting that all things,

---

[45] See also Ovid's description of the Portico of Octavia at *Ars Am.* 1.69: *aut ubi muneribus nati sua munera mater*.

[46] This idea will be seen in the *Ex Ponto,* when Livia will become an agent in the romance of Ovid and his wife, as the poet will charge his wife to seek Livia's help in persuading her husband to lighten Ovid's punishment on behalf of the separated lovers (*Ex Pont.* 3.114-59).

[47] Néraudau (1985); Spentzou (2018), 35; Pandey (2018), 170. On reading the political involvement of the *Ars* in general*,* see Sharrock (1994a), who argues that political subversion is identifiable in the *Ars Amatoria.*

[48] Williams (1978), 80 views the poet's work as bearing no suggestion of 'anti-Augustanism'. See also Labate (1984); Conte (1994), 345; Gibson (2003), 258-9, (2009), 99. On the *Ars Amatoria* as flippantly indifferent, or even opposed to, the Augustan regime as a whole, see Davis (1995), 181-94.

[49] Gibson (1999), 19 who views *Tristia* 2 as 'a document of literary criticism'.

including Augustan monuments (*Tr.* 2.277-302), are able to corrupt those who wish to derive erotic meaning from them (2.301-2),[50] emphasising the variant ways in which Roman monuments, and texts about monuments, can be 'read' and interpreted. Yet, at the same time, as Ovid defends the *Ars* by pointing out possible amatory readings of these monuments, the erotic associations of the city which were originally evoked in that very text are perpetuated. The refiguring of Roman settings from the *Ars Amatoria* in the *Tristia* have, therefore, been seen both as a countercultural re-writing of the Augustan building project, and also one which seeks to avoid political antagonism.[51] Both Sharrock and Boyle, however, have argued that the reader is the ultimate definer of the meaning in Ovid's texts.[52] Whatever Ovid's intentions were when writing about these monuments, it is also ultimately necessary to remember, as Sharrock points out, that without the *princeps*, there would be no Augustan Rome about which Ovid could write.[53]

Thus, one can see that Ovid firmly establishes his poetry's relationship with Augustan Rome from the very beginning of his career, in his amatory elegy. This continues throughout the rest of his corpus, even when he alters, manipulates and moves away from traditional elegy.

---

[50] See Gibson (1999) on Ovid's views on readership in *Tristia* 2.
[51] See Ciccarelli (2003), 191-206; Ingleheart (2010), 246-66 on the buildings in *Tristia* 2 and the poem's response to the depiction of Rome in the *Ars Amatoria*.
[52] Sharrock (1994a), 98: 'A text itself cannot be pro- or anti-'Augustan', only readings can be.' Boyle (2003), 49: 'What Ovid is doing is drawing attention to the multiplicity of meanings immanent in Rome's monuments and the relationship of that multiplicity to Roman cultural identity.' See also Gibson (2003), 257-59.
[53] Sharrock (1994a), 100: 'The audience cannot escape the equation Rome = Augustus.'

**After love elegy: Rome and Ovid's later texts**

The *Metamorphoses* sees a departure from Roman elegy in terms of its genre, as the poet ascends to epic, as well as in terms of its content. Ovid begins the *Metamorphoses* by stating that his universal epic will map time and space from the beginning of the world until recent times (*Met.* 1.3-4). Yet, throughout this epic, the topography of Rome, as a city and an empire, is mapped on to the text. Indeed, in more recent years, there has been increased discussion about the Romanocentric nature of the *Metamorphoses* and analysis of the ekphrastic episodes with an awareness of Roman settings and topography.[54] Following this line of argument, one can suggest that, in spite of an ambitious exit from elegy and private space, as the poet of the *carmen perpetuum* graduates from *urbs* to *orbis,* the *Metamorphoses* still remains very much concerned with Rome.

Chapter 1 will focus on the *Metamorphoses*, which has a range of buildings and landscape features identifiable as Roman *monumenta*. The main focus of this chapter will centre on the Phaethon episode (*Met.* 1.747-2.400), which includes description of the house of the Sun, one of these quasi-Roman *monumenta,* and the ride of Phaethon. This episode emphasises Ovid's poetic ambition and outward movement from urban elegy to global epic, while also confirming the continuity of his interest in Rome. As Ovid relates the (re)formation of the universe through fiery chaos, one can identify references to the formation of the Empire through the chaos of civil disorder. As he punctuates his poem with cosmic, mythological monuments, Ovid explores

[54] See Barchiesi (2009); Hardie (2012), 150-77; Gladhill (2013).

concepts and events which were memorialised in architecture in Augustan Rome, that is, the creation of empire and the establishment of peace and stability, in the context of a cosmological landscape. In the Phaethon episode, Ovid ascribes to the fictional house of the Sun decorative imagery which recalls the Temple of Palatine Apollo and the Temple of Mars Ultor, monuments erected by the emperor after the end of the civil wars. At the same time, this mythological building also promotes the concepts of temporal stability and cosmic order which were celebrated in the monuments of the Campus Martius, such as the Horologium of Augustus.

Ovid highlights the intermedial relationship between the textual monument of the house of the Sun and Roman architecture. This intermediality offers up a number of possible and shifting connections between Ovid's text and Roman *monumenta*, eliciting variant meanings for different readers. In contrast to the ornate, ordered house of the Sun which appears to reflect post-Actian values, the ride of Phaethon through the cosmos can be compared to the chaos and utter disorder of the civil wars. The destruction wreaked on the earth can be read as a mythological equivalent of the ruin and disarray in Rome before the rise of imperial power, the Augustan building project and the *princeps*' recalibration of solar time.

As the poet reaches the medial point of his career, and ascends to the genre of epic, one can see the boundaries of his work expanding to become a cosmic epic which competes with, and goes beyond, the earlier epics of Ennius and Vergil about the creation of Rome. Yet, as the narrative warns against the dangers of reaching too high, it is very easy to contemplate the poet's own fall: his future exile to the edges of the Roman world. In retrospect, the mythological tale of Phaethon can be read not

only as a reminder of Roman civil strife, but also an anticipation of the chaos and rupture in the poet's own life.

In the *Fasti,* Ovid's elegy confirms and brings to the forefront his interest in Roman monumental space, as the poem takes in the whole of the urban landscape. In six books of extended elegy, Ovid describes the religious aetiology of Augustan Rome, in a poem which has for its subject matter the *ara Caesaris*, and Augustus' development of urban religion. As Volk has shown, deictic markers and descriptions of monuments allow the reader to imagine the poet walking around the city as he speaks of the architectural topography and urban reformation.[55] Influenced by both Callimachean aetiological and Roman annalistic poetics, elegy is developed and elevated into a record of Roman history and public achievements.

When it comes to scholarship on Roman space in the *Fasti,* critics have tended to either focus on the depiction of one specific monument in the text,[56] or to use Ovid's presentation of the cityscape as part of a general assessment of how the poet's depiction of Roman religious and civic events align with or resist the imperial ideology of the Augustan building project.[57] It has even been suggested that spatial descriptions are actually lacking in the poem, for political reasons and due to the poet's exilic re-working of the poem.[58]

The second chapter of my thesis will consider how, in light of the interconnection between architecture and texts as *monumenta*, the *Fasti* becomes

---

[55] Volk (1997).
[56] See Newlands (1994); Barchiesi (2002); A. Hardie (2007); Rohr Vio (2017).
[57] See Green (2004b); Herbert-Brown (1994); Barchiesi (1997a); Pasco-Pranger (2006), 79-86.
[58] Green (2004b).

its own textual construction which imitates those which the poet describes in his narrative of Rome. The poet compares the ordering and arrangement of the poem to the construction of calendrical monuments, as he himself becomes an architect of his own, poetic *fasti,* and of the city of Rome. In the same way, the city itself can be read as a textual space, which can be negotiated and explored by reading Ovid's poetry.

The main focus of the chapter will be the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, as a temple which is already a textual structure, containing as it does the *fasti* of Fulvius Nobilior. This temple is, furthermore, already written about in the *Annals* of Ennius. Ovid's description of this temple, which stood as a victory monument after Fulvius' Greek campaign, invites comparisons to textual victory monuments written about in a poetic tradition begun by Callimachus and continued by Latin poets including Propertius. Similarities can be identified between the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* and these monuments which, particularly in elegy, stand as alternative and more lasting monuments to concrete, urban constructions. This leads to questions as to how the *Fasti* aligns itself with other Roman and Hellenistic elegiac poetry, and whether the Augustan building project and the poet's own elegiac work can be reconciled.

The final poems of Ovid's career are spatially and generically distant to his earlier poetic works. Banished to Tomis, the poet finds himself in an entirely new landscape, both in physical and poetic terms. As the poet hovers on the boundaries of the Empire, he also hovers on the boundary between known and unknown poetic genres. His elegies are now persuasive epistles which seek to return to Rome, through memory, imagination, and persuasion. They also detail the harsh, inhumane, and war-torn conditions of Tomis, while lamenting a loss of poetic inspiration.

Descriptions of war, portraits of barbarian peoples, and accounts of the weather, topics which have not appeared in traditional elegy, now feature among the contents of these letters. To quote Rimell, 'the land of exile represents undiscovered psychic or imaginary territory, and is code for going where no writer has gone before.'[59]

At the same time, the poet repeatedly returns to Rome and the type of poetry he composed there. The literary devices by which the poet evokes images of Rome are discussed by critics.[60] In the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, Rome itself is seen to become the unattainable object of the poet's desire and the obsessive subject of his epistles (*Tr.* 3.2.21 *Roma domusque subit desideriumque locorum*), portraying the poet's situation in familiar elegiac terms.

Chapter 3 of my thesis will consider *Tristia* 3.1 and the poet's discussion of his 'return' to urban space by literary means, as the poem is narrated by the voice of Ovid's personified book. *Tristia* 3.1, and the little book's tour of Rome recalls other literary tours of immigrants and exiles in literature. The book's visit to well-known monuments on the Palatine, which appear in earlier literature, highlights how Roman monuments are now clearly part of the literary landscape of epic and elegy. The book's search for a reception from Roman religious and literary monuments on the Palatine can be read as an example of an evolved *paraclausithyron*, as the elegiac scenario is now played out on an urban scale, and the poet seeks a reception from Rome itself rather than the house of the beloved.[61] It also recalls scenes of religious

---

[59] Rimell (2015), 284.
[60] Reitz (2013); Claassen (2013). See, in particular, P. Hardie (2002), 307-14.
[61] See Nagle (1980), 43; O'Gorman (1997), 116; Miller (2004), 211-12; Spentzou (2005), 319 on the *paraclausithyron* in elegy.

(and poetic) initiation as presented in Horace and Callimachus. Yet, the book fails to find a place on the Palatine. This rejection is viewed generally as an expression of the poet's fears that he will fail to acquire a Roman readership in exile.[62] One can, however, equally argue that the book's rejection from public monuments and search for a reception from private households leads to questions as to the type of poetry which the little book represents and the kind of readership which the exiled poet is really seeking. The reader is invited to re-evaluate the poet's relationship with Rome and his audience there, as it is the general public, rather than the imperial literary institutions and religious monuments which offer the book the chance of an enduring readership.

Chapter 4 will investigate the relationship between poetry and place in Ovid's final letters from Tomis, the *Epistulae ex Ponto.* These poems, unlike the *Tristia*, are specifically addressed to named recipients. The poet informs friends in Rome about the negative effect of the new Rome-less landscape of Tomis on his poetry in order to increase his attempts at persuasion, in spite of the self-evident literary production occurring there. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 the poet's description of his past life in Rome, including the green space in the northern end of the Campus Martius and his gardens outside of Rome, is juxtaposed with his present reality in Tomis. He provides an origin tale for one of the cities nearby, and laments his inability to cultivate any kind of garden or pastoral scene in a war-torn landscape. By contrast, Ovid imagines

[62] Walker (1997), 200; Miller (2002b), 138; Dupont (2009), 157-158; Rimell (2015), 278.

the peaceful, leisured life of his addressee in Rome, as he enjoys the places which the poet cannot.

This chapter will explore how both urban and exilic landscapes are depicted as a means of impressing and persuading his specific, named addressee that a move to a place nearer Rome is essential. The natural world which flourishes in Rome and cannot be attained in Tomis is read as a metaphor for the poet's production of work in these two different locations before and after exile. Themes from earlier triumviral poetry, which depicted the effect of life in and outside of the city, are included within this elegy, but with a painful, personal reality, leading to questions as to the nature of the relationship of the poet with an imperial figure of power who once granted land to poets. As Ovid writes to a number of poets and writers within his final epistolary work, he considers the effect which the city has, not only on his own poetry, but on the poetry of others, as he suggests that a move to a milder, more peaceful environment is necessary if he is to continue writing poetry which is worthy of being read in Rome.

This study will illustrate that an understanding of the relationship between Ovid and Roman monuments is vital to an understanding of the Ovidian poetic project as a whole. In turn, to understand Augustan Rome, it is vital read the works of Ovid. An extended reading of Ovid's texts will illustrate that Ovid not only writes about Rome and adds new meanings to its monuments, but, in a way, becomes involved in the construction of the city, as he uses his poetry to 'write up' a version of the landscape as he depicts Rome in his texts. At the same time, Ovid's texts themselves become monuments which act similarly to the physical structures around him. I will show that

Ovid's texts are not just *monumenta*, such as Horace's *monumentum aere perennius* (*Od.* 3.30.1-5),[63] but unmistakeably Roman *monumenta*, which are firmly tied to Augustus' own architecture and which monumentalise the city itself. The division between the architectural and textual in earlier poetry is no longer present, as Ovid indicates the firm interdependence between the two.

Ovid inherits canonical literature about Rome and its monuments and reformulates it, consolidating multiple texts and adding his own nuances. In so doing, he transforms Rome through his writing, with the result that we see the city through his eyes rather than through anyone else's. The poet appears to have a far more personal relationship with Augustan Rome than those who have written about it before him, due to a number of factors: the influence of elegy (a personal, urban genre), a consistent revisiting of the city and its monuments, and a harsh separation from the city which brings Rome to the forefront even more. For modern readers, at a physical and historical distance from Rome, this allows us to see the city in exactly the same way the poet does. Augustan Rome is not just a city of monuments, but a city overwritten with Ovid's texts.

[63] Texts from Horace are taken from Garrod (1901).

# CHAPTER 1

# The *Metamorphoses*

## Mapping the city within the cosmos in the tale of Phaethon (*Met.* 1.747-2.400)

### Introduction

Ironically, for a study of Ovid's portrayal of Rome and Roman *monumenta*, this first chapter will begin with a poem written about a world in which, for the most part, Rome did not yet exist. It will consider how, even in an epic about events which took place before the founding of the city, Rome is central to the understanding of Ovid's poetry.

The *Metamorphoses* stands at the centre of Ovid's career, after love elegy and before exile from Rome. It is anomalous in Ovid's corpus as the only extended, epic work of universal history. The *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria* tell of life and love in Rome, the *Fasti* describes the creation of Roman religious festivals and monuments, and the exilic epistles look back on the city, as the poet desperately tries to return there. As the poet ascends to epic, however, horizons are extended. In the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid widens the focus of his subject matter from city to cosmos. Spanning the events from the beginning of the world until his own time (3-4 *ab origine mundi…ad mea tempora*), the broad spatial perspective of the *Metamorphoses* is an indication of Ovid's grand poetic ambitions.

In spite of these poetic ambitions, however, the poet's *tempora* and Augustan Rome are present throughout the poem, much as they are in the other works of his corpus. Ovid's poem anticipates the death of Julius Caesar and the rise of Augustus to power from the outset, although these events will not occur in the chronological scheme of the poem until the final book (*Met.* 15.816ff). The gods' outrage at the crimes of Lycaon is compared to Augustus' horror at the death of his adoptive father (*Met.* 1.199-205). Meanwhile, Apollo's prophecy to the newly metamorphosed Daphne about the prominence of the laurel in Rome, including on the emperor's own doorposts, foresees the rise of Augustus to power (*Met.* 1.560-5). As Feeney has noted, more overt references to contemporary Roman politics trail off after the first two books of the *Metamorphoses*.[64] At the same time, it is possible to identify anachronistic traces of Roman urban space and architecture throughout the poem, which act as a continuous reminder – or anticipation – of the poem's *telos*, and the *tempora* of the poet.

Roman spatial concepts can be identified early on in the poem. As Keith has posited, Atlas' closure of the mythical garden of the Hesperides (*Met.* 4.646-7 *id metuens solidis pomaria clauserat Atlas / moenibus*) in *Metamorphoses* 4 recalls the marking out of the *pomerium* around the Palatine, the city, and then the Empire.[65] This is due to the pseudo-etymological connection between *pomaria* and *pomerium* and the mention of walls (*moenibus*) around the orchard, as Varro explains that the *pomerium* (or *postmoerium*) was the circle around the back of the city walls (Varro,

[64] Feeney (1999), 27.
[65] I diverge here from Anderson's reading of *montibus* at *Met.* 4.647, in favour of *moenibus* as printed by Tarrant.

*Ling*. 5.143 *post murum*).[66] Atlas exhibits a 'mapping impulse',[67] as he marks out the boundaries of his territory.[68] One can argue that his actions anticipate the drawing of the boundaries of empire, long before the rise of the city.

The buildings in Ovid's mythological world also bear qualities and features similar to those found within the urban centre. The homes of mythological figures, from Cepheus (*Met*. 4.762-4) to Circe (*Met.* 14.260), are figured as Roman atrium houses. Achelous' cave, meanwhile, in which the story of Philemon and Baucis is related, appears similar to a Roman maritime villa or grotto-nymphaeum with its shell-panelled *atria* (*Met.* 8.562-4):[69]

> pumice multicavo nec levibus atria tofis
> structa subit: molli tellus erat umida musco
> summa lacunabant alterno murice conchae.
>
> He entered the atrium, built from porous pumice stone and rough tufa. The floor was damp with soft moss, and conches and murex shells panelled the ceiling.

Meanwhile, the golden temple (8.701 *aurata tecta*) into which Philemon and Baucis' humble hovel (8.699 *casa parva*) is transformed is believed to bear similarities to the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine,[70] with its marble columns, gold roof and carved doors (*Met.* 8.699-702):

> illa vetus dominis etiam casa parva duobus
> vertitur in templum: furcas subiere columnae,
> stramina flavescunt adopertaque marmore tellus
> caelataeque fores aurataque tecta videntur.

---

[66] Text taken from Kent (1938). See also Pomona's pomerium at *Met.* 14.635, and the marking of the pomerium by Romulus at *Fast.* 4.819.
[67] Lindheim (2010), 167.
[68] Keith (2007), 7-9; Lindheim (2010), 176-77.
[69] Solodow (1988), 78-9.
[70] See Gowers (2005), 334; P. Hardie (2007), 99.

> That old hut of theirs, small for two occupants, was changed into a temple. Columns replaced wooden poles, the thatch grew yellow and the pavement was covered with marble. The doors were carved, and the building seemed golden.

Even before its metamorphosis, this house can be likened to structures within Rome. Similar in size and simplicity (*Met.* 2.699 *casa parva*) to the hut of Romulus (*Fast.* 1.198-99 *parva casa*), the straw roof (*Met.* 2.701 *stramina*) has been seen to recall the rustic nature of this famous early Roman structure (Prop. 2.16.19-20 *atque utinam Romae nemo esset diues, et ipse / straminea posset dux habitare casa*).[71] Not only does the home of Philemon and Baucis bear features akin to Roman structures both before and after its transformation, but the architectural transformation itself is also notable. This metamorphosis mimics the rise of Rome, from a simple village to a grand empire, as charted in aetiological poetry.[72] This narrative at the centre of Ovid's epic indicates that, even as he expands the boundaries of his poetic subject matter and genre, the architecture of Augustan Rome remains at the heart of his poetry. The *translatio imperii*, and rise of Rome, is clearly anticipated throughout.

In spite of the cosmological and mythological subject matter of Ovid's epic poem, the topography of Rome can be identified within this text, as the founding of the city is anticipated even from the very beginning of the poem. The ideas of *urbs* and *orbis* are conflated as Ovid highlights that the universe should be viewed as a

---

[71] Texts from Propertius are taken from Heyworth (2007a). See Gowers (2005), 357 on this passage. See also *Am*. 2.9.17-18: *Roma, nisi inmensum uires promosset in orbem, / stramineis esset nunc quoque tecta casis.*

[72] This progression is seen, for example, in Propertius 4 when the poet describes the rise of *aurea templa* from humble beginnings (4.1.5-6). One also might compare the hut of Evander in *Aeneid* 8, on the future site of the regia, with the cattle grazing outdoors in what will be the forum, as a similar anticipation of Rome's future even before its foundation (8.359-61).

Roman, urban concept.[73] In the next section, the tale of Phaethon (*Met.* 1.747-2.400), which straddles the end of Book 1 and the beginning of Book 2, will be used as an extended case study to show further how the poet uses space as a means of connecting the mythological past and the Roman present.

### The Phaethon tale and its Roman *telos*: An overview of recent scholarship

In the *Fasti,* Ovid suggests that the tales of Deucalion and Pyrrha (related at *Met.* 1.313-415) and Phaethon might be presumed by some to be the origin behind the Parilia, Rome's founding festival (*Fast.* 4.793-4):

> vix equidem credo: sunt qui Phaethonta referri
> credant et nimias Deucalionis aquas.
>
> I can scarcely believe it, but there are some who believe Phaethon and
> the flood of Deucalion are referred to.

Here, Ovid dismisses these Greek tales as a possible origin for the Parilia, offering an alternative, Romulean aetiology for the festival.[74] In the *Metamorphoses,* however, one could argue that the Phaethon story is connected to Rome and its empire. As a mythologised retelling of the Stoic theory of *ekpyrosis* as the beginning of a new age,[75] the Phaethon tale stands at the very beginning of the linear progress of time which will end with imperial Rome. The landscapes within the Phaethon narrative can

[73] Varro, *Ling*. 5.143 *post ea qui fiebat orbis, urbis principium*; *Fast.* 2.684 *Romanae spatium est Urbis et orbis idem.*
[74] The Roman mythologies of Romulus and Aeneas are cited as possible causes of the Parilia (*Fast*. 4.799-820).
[75] See Gale (1994), 33-4; Schiesaro (2014), 84 on Lucr. 5.396-405, a passage to which Ovid's Phaethon episode appears to allude.

also be read as a backdrop which allows Ovid, as an epic poet, to use the narrative of the creation of the universe to explore the establishment of imperial Rome.

The tale spans *Metamorphoses* 1 and 2, and begins with Phaethon seeking confirmation of the identity of his father, Sol. Sent by his mother Clymene to meet his father, Phaethon enters the house of the Sun, which is described in a detailed ekphrasis. This cosmic palace, which bears images of the earth, the sky, and the zodiac on its doors, is filled with the personified seasons and temporal markers (day, month, year, age, hours), amongst which Phaethon's father is seated. Offered a gift to prove his true parenthood, Phaethon demands from Sol a ride in his chariot. His father, troubled by this, explains the dangers of the chariot's course, proclaiming that the sky is filled with monsters rather than divine cityscapes. Yet Phaethon, unperturbed, takes the chariot and begins his course through the sky. Out of control, and unable to guide the horses, the son is unable to take his father's advice and steer the correct course through the sky. Terrified by the looming constellation of Scorpio, the chariot veers off course, inflaming the world. Jupiter, appealed to by Earth on account of this destructive conflagration, exterminates Phaethon with a thunderbolt, leading him to fall into the Po river. In their grief, his sisters are transformed into the poplars which weep amber, and his father hides his face, eclipsing the light in the world.

Those who have previously discussed this passage have noted that Ovid anticipates the creation of the Roman world at the ending of this cosmological tale.[76]

[76] Feeney (1999), 27; Gildenhard and Zissos (2004), 47.

The poet finishes his narrative with the metamorphosis of Phaethon's grieving sisters into amber which will be worn by Roman brides (*Met.* 2.364-6):

> inde fluunt lacrimae, stillataque sole rigescunt
> de ramis electra novis, quae lucidus amnis
> excipit et nuribus mittit gestanda Latinis.
>
> From that point on their tears flow and oozing from their new branches
> they grow hard in the sun, as amber, which the bright river receives and
> sends it to be worn by the brides of Rome.

The metamorphosis of Phaethon's siblings becomes a mythological explanation for one of the customs of the Roman contemporary world, the wearing of amber jewellery, much as would occur in Ovid's aetiological *Fasti*.[77]

A further reference to the Italian landscape within the Phaethon narrative also acts as an anticipatory reference to Rome. The poet describes the utter chaos which Phaethon's ride brings about, and the incendiary effects of the out of control chariot. Crops are burnt, the land becomes cracked and split, and rivers dry up (*Met*. 2.201-71). A number of rivers which suffer the effects of this catastrophic event are named (*Met.* 2.254-9):

> Nilus in extremum fugit perterritus orbem
> occuluitque caput, quod adhuc latet: ostia septem
> pulverulenta vacant, septem sine flumine valles.
> fors eadem Ismarios Hebrum cum Strymone siccat
> Hesperiosque amnes, Rhenum Rhodanumque Padumque
> cuique fuit rerum promissa potentia, Thybrin.

---

[77] Indeed, Ovid uses the same expression (*nuribus…Latinis*), when he describes how Roman brides founded a temple for Juno, in his aetiological explanation of the Matronalia festival (*Fast*. 3.246-9). There may be a further link as the ***lucidus*** *amnis* (*Met.* 2.365) carries the river to Roman brides, while Roman brides worship at the festival at the shrine of Juno **Lucina**. See Maltby s.v. '*luceo*' on the etymological connection between *luceo* and Lucina. Feldherr (2016), 40: 'The stream that sends it down to be worn by Roman brides is *lucidus*, another Latin translation of the root in Phaethon's name (2.365).' According to Juvenal (*Sat.* 9.50-54), amber was a gift given for the Matronalia.

> The terrified Nile fled to the end of the earth and hid its head, which still lies hidden: seven dusty mouths lay empty, seven channels without a stream. The same accident dries up the rivers of Thrace, the Hebrus, and the Strymon, the western rivers, the Rhine, the Rhone, the Po and the Tiber, to whom had been promised power over things.

This geographic catalogue is given a Roman *telos*, moving from Eastern to Italian water sources. The inclusion of Tiber within this list, as Feeney has pointed out, is a metonymic reference to the future power of the Roman world.[78] The *translatio imperii* and rise of Rome, as prophesied by Pythagoras in the final book of the *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 15.431-2 *nunc quoque Dardaniam fama est consurgere Romam, / Appenninigenae quae proxima* ***Thybridis undis***) has already been decreed even before this early stage of history, indicated by the perfect passive *fuit…promissa*.

A number of scholars believe these overt references to the Roman world to be merely an 'offhand and quirky anticipation' of Rome,[79] but they can also be viewed as part of a wider awareness of the Roman world which can be identified throughout the Phaethon episode. Indeed, Schmitzer has argued that a connection can be made between the tale in *Metamorphoses* 2 and the end of *Georgics* 1,[80] which lists the portents forewarning the civil strife following the death of Caesar. This connection is established by the similarity of the events which occur before and after Phaethon's death to the portents which Vergil describes occurring after the death of Caesar. Phaethon's conflagration causes utter agricultural chaos: the fire causes drought, rivers

[78] Feeney (1999), 27.
[79] Gildenhard and Zissos (2004), 47. Feeney (1999), 27, too describes the references to Rome in the Phaethon episode as 'almost casual glances forward to Roman dominion and custom'.
[80] Schmitzer (1990), 89-107.

dry up, the Nile flees, and the earth splits so widely that daylight can be seen in Tartarus (*Met*. 2.260-1), much as Vergil describes drought drying up rivers and causing the earth to gape (*Georg*. 1.479). Sol's extreme grief at his son's death, furthermore, as he refuses to rise (*Met.* 2.329-31), also recalls Vergil's description of the grief of the Sun after Caesar's death and the subsequent solar eclipse (*Georg.* 1.466-8). Both cover their face and deny the world its usual light.[81]

In *Georgics* 1, Vergil also describes the disorder and strife unleashed into the world after the death of Caesar (*Georg.* 1.511-4),[82] comparing it to a charioteer who struggles to control his steeds. This description has led critics, including Schmitzer, to compare Vergil's charioteer to the mythological figure of Phaethon.[83] Reading the Phaethon tale in comparison with the ending of *Georgics* 1, Schmitzer has argued that Phaethon is an Octavian figure. He argues that each of the locations mentioned within the young charioteer's destructive ride can be linked to specific moments within Augustus' career, particularly in the civil wars.[84] Accordingly, Phaethon's disastrous journey in his father's chariot is viewed as a political allegory for the *princeps*' failed attempts to live up to his predecessor.[85]

It is certainly important to take the political undertones which can be identified in the episode into consideration, but this chapter will not connect Phaethon or Sol to one specific figure in history when considering the Roman nature of the narrative,

---

[81] See also *Met.* 15.785-6: *solis quoque tristis imago / lurida sollicitis praebebat lumina terris.*
[82] Lyne (2007), 57: 'The chariot begins to seem the state helpless in the grip of war – for there is no effective *auriga*.'
[83] Lyne (1987), 139-40 believes that 'implicit myth' is used at the end of *Georgics* 1, leading readers to think of Phaethon when reading about the *auriga.* See also Nelis (2008), 507-8; Barchiesi (2009), 169.
[84] Schmitzer (1990), 89-107.
[85] Schmitzer (1990), 106.

or read it as a particularly positive or negative representation of Augustan politics. Instead, it will discuss the two very different landscape settings in the tale: the cosmos through which Phaethon travels and the house of the Sun. These settings highlight the chaos and order reminiscent of the pre- and post-Augustan world, as portrayed within the monumental landscape of Rome. Rather than trying to link the geographic places on Phaethon's journey to Roman historical events, as Schmitzer has,[86] this chapter will focus on relating events and spaces in the tale of Phaethon to monuments within the city as a case-study of Ovid's wider strategy in the *Metamorphoses.* Amplifying the work of Barchiesi,[87] I shall attempt to map the cosmological descriptions of the Phaethon tale onto the topography of Augustan Rome.

Barchiesi seeks to connect the flight of Phaethon to a number of different monuments around Rome, in order to argue that the mythological episode is filled with cosmological semblances of Rome's urban panorama. He views the house of the Sun as a cosmic equivalent to the Temple of Palatine Apollo, with its rooftop quadriga. Meanwhile, the ride of Phaethon through the monstrous zodiac is seen as a reshaping of the spectacles and beast fights which occurred within the Circus Maximus. He briefly mentions that the tale includes astrological material which can be related to the Horologium of Augustus,[88] a connection which will be further expanded upon here.

---

[86] Schmitzer (1990), 94-102.
[87] Barchiesi (2009).
[88] Barchiesi (2009), 167n6.

Barchiesi reads the cosmic landscapes in the ride of Phaethon as similar to those in Augustan Rome, but he refrains from commenting on why such references to contemporary Roman monuments might be inserted into a tale of chaos, disorder and death.[89] However, an awareness of the ideology and politics behind Augustan buildings can help to establish further the connection between the house of the Sun and the landscapes in the tale of Phaethon and the urban monuments and topography in Rome. In what follows, I aim to show how the house of the Sun and Phaethon's ride can also be connected to the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Augustan monuments in the Campus Martius, such as the Horologium and Mausoleum, which promoted Augustan order and celebrated the peace and prosperity of imperial rule after the chaos and disorder of the civil wars. The connection of the mythological and the monumental also sheds light upon Ovid's relationship with the city as he departs from Roman elegy and writes this universal epic.

**The house of the Sun and the Temple of Mars Ultor: Intermediality and Augustan monuments**

At the end of *Metamorphoses* 1, Phaethon sets out to the Sun's house to seek recognition from his father (*Met.* 1.773-9). The story of Phaethon visiting his father is long established before Ovid.[90] However, much like the description of the '*Palatia Caeli*' (*Met.* 1.168-76), the ekphrasis describing the house of the Sun (2.1-30) appears to include features found in Augustan architecture.

[89] Barchiesi (2009), 169-70.
[90] See Diggle (1970), 3-27 on the Phaethon tale in Greek and Latin literature.

The celestial structure described at the opening of *Metamorphoses* 2 seems particularly inspired by monuments in Rome. Phaethon goes to seek his father, and arrives at the house of the Sun, a space which is finely ordered and ornately decorated, and which strikes fear into the young man (*Met.* 2.1-7, 17-18, 24-32):

regia Solis erat sublimibus alta columnis,
clara micante auro flammasque imitante pyropo,
cuius ebur nitidum fastigia summa tegebat,
argenti bifores radiabant lumine valvae.
materiam superabat opus: nam Mulciber illic 5
aequora caelarat medias cingentia terras
terrarumque orbem caelumque, quod imminet orbi.
[…]
haec super inposita est caeli fulgentis imago, 17
signaque sex foribus dextris totidemque sinistris.
[…]
in solio Phoebus claris lucente smaragdis.
a dextra laevaque Dies et Mensis et Annus 25
Saeculaque et positae spatiis aequalibus Horae
Verque novum stabat cinctum florente corona,
stabat nuda Aestas et spicea serta gerebat,
stabat et Autumnus calcatis sordidus uvis
et glacialis Hiems canos hirsuta capillos. 30
inde loco medius rerum novitate paventem
Sol oculis iuvenem, quibus adspicit omnia, vidit

The palace of the Sun was tall with lofty columns, bright with gleaming gold and with flame-like bronze. Shining ivory covered the highest pediments. The folding double doors shone with silver light. And the craftsmanship outshone the material: for there Mulciber had carved the seas which surround the earth in the middle, and the circle of the lands, and the sky which overhangs the land […]. Above these scenes was placed an image of the flashing sky, six signs of the zodiac on the right-hand door, and six on the left. […] Phoebus [sat] on the throne, gleaming with bright emeralds. To his left and right stood Day and Month and Year and Age and the Hours placed at equal distance. New Spring was standing crowned with a flower garland, and naked Summer wearing a crown of corn, and Autumn stained with crushed grapes, and icy Winter with rough white locks. In the middle of this place, with eyes that see everything, the Sun saw the young man who trembled at the novelty of these things.

The grand and extravagant setting described in the ekphrasis appears similar to the previously described *Palatia Caeli* (1.168-76) due to the careful positioning of different figures within the space.[91] In the *Palatia Caeli*, it is the gods who are arranged in order of rank. In the house of the Sun, the personifications of time are set out in careful symmetry.

Critics have also noted similarities between the Sun's home and a specific location on the Roman Palatine: the Temple of Apollo Palatinus, which was promised in 36BC to celebrate Octavian's victory over Pompey and built in 28BC after Actium.[92] This temple was frequently celebrated in Roman poetry and the house of the Sun is not the only mythological epic structure to bear resemblance to this temple. This can also be seen in the case of Daedalus' temple to Apollo in *Aeneid* 6, another structure which, constructed by the father of an errant son, bore intricate artwork on its doors.[93]

Barchiesi, in particular, has suggested that the architectural description in *Metamorphoses* 2 can be read as an imitation of the Temple of Apollo, on the roof of which stood the quadriga of the sun god.[94] He points out that the language used in Ovid's ekphrasis recalls that which is employed by Propertius to describe the temple (Prop. 2.31.9-12):

tum medium claro surgebat marmore templum,

---

[91] Barchiesi (2009), 173 sees Ovid's tour of the cosmos as a 'magical mystery tour' of the Palatine, as he twins the *Palatia Caeli* with the House of Augustus and the house of the Sun with the Temple of Palatine Apollo. Yet, connections can also be made between the two cosmic structures themselves.
[92] Bömer (1969), 236; Dufallo (2013), 164.
[93] See Pandey (2014), 88-92 on Daedalus' temple as an evocation of the Temple of Palatine Apollo. See Wheeler (2000), 37n107; Dufallo (2013), 161 on the similarities between the two fictional structures and between Icarus and Phaethon.
[94] Barchiesi (2009), 174-5. See also Faber (2018), 6.

uel patria Phoebo carius Ortygia:
in quo Solis erat supra fastigia currus,
et ualuae, Libyci nobile dentis opus.

Then, in the middle, the temple with shining marble rose, dearer to Phoebus than his homeland Ortygia: upon the roof of which stood the chariot of the sun, and the doors, a renowned work of Libyan ivory.

Propertius' description of the gleaming marble, the doors made from ivory (Prop. 2.31.12 *ualuae*), and the chariot of the Sun on the gables of the temple (11 *fastigia*) seem to highlight the influence of this Roman construct on Ovid's depiction of the heavenly home of the Sun, its ivory pediments (*Met.* 2.4 *fastigia*) and decorated double doors (2.3 *valvae*). Ovid's description of the shining gold, bronze, and the bright, white marble of the house may also lead to comparisons being drawn between the two structures, as Apollo's temple was constructed from yellowy gold *giallo antico* and white Luna marble. Accordingly, it seems perfectly plausible to argue that the house of the Sun appears to use qualities and characteristics of the Temple of Palatine Apollo.

The house of the Sun certainly possesses similar architectural qualities to the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine. Yet, the ordered symmetry of the structure, as well as the focus on time and space within its decoration, also allows one to draw comparisons with other monuments in the city of Rome. The intermediality between Ovid's textual structure and the monuments in Rome, much like intertexuality, offers plural and productive possible connections, not singular and limited.[95] The buildings

[95] Classical scholarship has recently been incorporating intermediality. See, for example, Squire (2009); Dinter (2011, 2013); Faber (2018).

might be said to shift and morph into one another, just as different texts might come into and out of view.

As Bömer suggests, it is possible to identify similarities to the Temple of Mars Ultor in the forum, a structure which is also described in Ovidian poetry.[96] In *Fasti* 5, Mars surveys the lofty pinnacles of the Temple of Mars Ultor (*Fast.* 5.559 *perspicit armipotens operis fastigia summi*), much like the ivory pediment of the house of the Sun (*Met.* 2.3 *summa fastigia*). The god of war surveys the decorated doors of this structure (*Fast.* 5.561-2), just as Phaethon surveys the artwork on the doors of the house of the Sun. The doors of the Temple of Mars Ultor are adorned with weapons from conquered lands, rather than the images of the earth, sea and sky which decorate Helios' doors (*Met.* 2.8-16). Nevertheless, Ovid's description of the *signa* on the doors of the house of the Sun (the signs of the Zodiac) may also be linked to the Temple of Mars Ultor,[97] as *signa* can also refer to military standards,[98] such as those rescued from the Parthians which were placed on the doors of the temple (*Fast*. 5.480-90). Indeed, the ambiguous definition of *signa*, as a military and cosmic term, is repeatedly explored within the aetiological elegy.[99]

[96] Bömer (1969), 236.
[97] Furthermore, as Wheeler (2000), 39n115 and Dufallo (2013), 164 both suggest, the sea imagery of Triton and dolphins found on the doors of the house of the Sun is similar to the iconography which celebrated Augustus' martial victory at Actium, suggesting a presence of martial themes within the house's decoration.
[98] OLD s.v. '*signum*'.
[99] See Green (2004a), 144 on the noun *signa* and its cosmological and military meanings. Ovid himself raises the different meaning of *signa* in the *Fasti,* for example, as he describes how Romulus and his subjects held onto their weapons much better than they grasped astronomy (*Fast.* 1.111-12 *non illi caelo labentia signa tenebant, / sed sua, quae magnum perdere crimen erat*).

Further similarities can be seen between the house of the Sun and the topography surrounding the Temple of Mars Ultor. Much like the ordered division of the personifications of time on either side of Sol's throne in the house of the Sun, as Mars surveys his temple he also sees the statues of great men in the forum, some placed on one side, some on the other (*Fast.* 5.563-6). The *summi viri* within the *Forum Augustum* were placed on either side of the atrium-like space.[100]

Barchiesi has connected the house of the Sun to the Temple of Palatine Apollo due to the fact that the Roman temple had a quadriga on its gables.[101] This connection enables a further parallel (overlooked in previous considerations of the Phaethon tale's link to Roman space) with the Temple of Mars Ultor, given the presence before it – in the *Forum Augustum* – of a quadriga. Much as the house of the Sun and Sol's chariot stand as reminders of Sol and Phaethon's uneasy and only newly acknowledged parental relationship, so did the quadriga in the forum, along with the Temple of Mars Ultor itself, celebrate a parenthood of a more terrestrial kind. In 2BC Augustus was granted the honorific title of *pater patriae* (*RG* 25). This title was inscribed around the city, including on the quadriga which was erected for Augustus by the senate.[102] The Temple of Mars Ultor was constructed after a vow to avenge his adoptive father's death (Suet. *Aug.* 29.2. *pro ultione paterna*) and constructed in 2AD,[103] having been promised by the *princeps* at the battle of Philippi.

---

[100] Platner and Ashby s.v. '*Forum Augustum*'.
[101] Barchiesi (2009), 183.
[102] Platner and Ashby s.v. '*Forum Augustum*'.
[103] Text taken from Rolfe (1914).

Within this Augustan landscape, themes of parenthood and the succession of power are clear to see. The tale of Phaethon also explores the themes expressed in this Roman architecture. The poet narrates how Phaethon came to the house of the Sun to seek acknowledgement from his father, addressing his father with honorific titles and asking if he might address him using the title of '*pater*' (*Met.* 2.35-9):

> ille refert: 'o lux inmensi publica mundi,
> Phoebe, pater, si das usum mihi nominis huius
> nec falsa Clymene culpam sub imagine celat
> pignora da, genitor, per quae tua vera propago
> credar, et hunc animis errorem detrahe nostris.'

> That boy said: 'Oh public light of this vast world, Phoebus, father, if you shall grant me the use of this name, if Clymene is not hiding her shame under some false pretence, grant me proof, parent, by which I shall be recognised as your true offspring, and take away this uncertainty from my mind!'

The Sun's quadriga, moreover, is sought by Phaethon as visual proof of his parentage (*Met.* 2.47 *currus rogat ille paternos*), even though his father advises against it. Thus, while the quadriga on top of the Temple of Palatine Apollo stands as a Roman monumental version of the chariot of the Sun, the Temple of Mars Ultor, which celebrates the parental relationship between Augustus and Caesar, as well as the quadriga in the forum beside the temple, which celebrated Augustus' paternal and filial roles in Rome, can also be connected to the tale of Phaethon. Both Roman monuments are physical proof of established familial relationships, something which Phaethon desperately seeks from his father. As a matter of fact, it is this search for parental acknowledgement which is the catalyst for the whole tale.

Semblances of the ideology surrounding the Temple of Mars Ultor can be identified not only in Ovid's description of the house of the Sun, but in his narrative

of the ride of Phaethon, due to the astrology surrounding the temple's dedication. The Temple of Mars Ultor was dedicated, according to the *Fasti* (5.545-98), on the 12th of May. This day was the date of the heliacal setting of the constellation Scorpio, an astrological indication of forthcoming peace well suited to the ideology of the temple.[104] In the *Fasti*, the ekphrasis detailing the Temple of Mars Ultor immediately follows Ovid's narrative about Orion's death and catasterism, which is caused by a scorpion (*Fast.* 5.540-544). Newlands has connected these two passages in *Fasti* 5, suggesting that, in the ekphrasis describing the Temple of Mars Ultor, Mars takes on the Scorpion's normal role (once transformed into a constellation) as the pursuer of Orion's constellation.[105] The god of war puts the stars, including Orion, to flight by his arrival in Rome (5.545-50).

One should note that Scorpio is very much in evidence in the Phaethon tale, too. As they converse in the halls of his house, Sol warns his son of the Scorpion and the other beasts of the zodiac which he will face (*Met*. 2.82-3 *saevaque circuitu curvantem bracchia longo / Scorpion*). It is the sight of the Scorpion in the zodiac which terrifies the young charioteer and throws him off his celestial course and into disaster (*Met.* 2.195-200):

> est locus, in geminos ubi bracchia concavat arcus
> Scorpius et cauda flexisque utrimque lacertis
> porrigit in spatium signorum membra duorum:
> hunc puer ut nigri madidum sudore veneni
> vulnera curvata minitantem cuspide vidit,

[104] Rahek (2006), 145. Manilius describes Scorpio as a bellicose sign with its powerful sting. Those who are born under this sign are desirous of bloodshed and carnage and engage in martial pursuits even in war (Man. 4.217-229).

[105] Newlands (1995), 114. She suggests that the *bellica signa* which Mars brings with him (*Fast.* 5.550), as 'standards' or 'constellations' facilitates this. See also Nonnus, *Dion*. 38.264-5, 274, 373-5 on the Scorpion and Orion.

> mentis inops gelida formidine lora remisit.
>
> There is a place where the Scorpion bends his claws out in two arcs, and tail and arms, bent on both sides, stretches out over the space of two signs. As he sees this monster, drenched in black sweat and threatening to sting him with his curved tail, the boy, mindless with cold fear, drops the reins.

Becoming an Orion-like figure, Phaethon is put to flight by the Scorpion. This creature is described in terrifying, militaristic terms: with his bow-like arms (195 *geminos arcus*) and savage, weapon-like sting (199 *curvata cuspide*), his vastness encroaches upon the space of two constellations (197 *signorum duorum*). The poet once again uses the noun *signa*, further emphasising the constellation's martial qualities: Scorpio is a weaponised constellation, embodying both facets of the term *signa*.[106] Barchiesi has viewed the overwhelming presence of Scorpio as Ovid's means of commenting on the lack of Libra, Augustus' own birth sign, in the cosmos.[107] At the same time, the presence of Scorpio, as a martial entity in the cosmos, can itself be seen as a means of linking Phaethon to Rome in another way.

The erection of the Temple of Mars Ultor heralded an era where civil war and chaotic strife was finally at an end, and the heliacal setting of Scorpio, the war sign in astrology, on the day of the temple's dedication emphasised this.[108] In the same way, the fall of Phaethon, which is caused by catching sight of Scorpio, initially causes a chaos

---

[106] The Scorpion that Phaethon is pursued by is much like the *bellica signa* which Mars brings when surveying his temple in *Fasti* 5 (see previous footnote).

[107] Barchiesi (2009), 168-69 connects Ovid's description of the Scorpion to Vergil's depiction of the rise of Libra from the claws of the Scorpion (*Georg.* 1.32-5).

[108] There might also be a subtle reference to Phaethon in the ekphrasis of Mars Ultor. As the poet begins to describe the astrological signs surrounding the day, he asks why the day rises faster than usual (*Fast.* 5.547-8 *quid solito citius liquido iubar aequore tollit / candida, Lucifero praeveniente, dies*?), indicating Mars' arrival. This description of the progress of the day moving too swiftly might lead some to recall the unaccustomed speed of Phaethon's flight in the chariot of the Sun, and the disorder he causes to the natural course of the day.

emblematic of civil strife, but ultimately brings about the return of order to the universe, much as occurred at the end of the civil wars.[109] Thus, much as the house of the Sun can be compared to the Temple of Mars Ultor, the ride of Phaethon appears to provide mythological reference to events surrounding the construction of this temple.

It is also possible to view the aftermath of this episode, as Jupiter examines and repairs what chaos has been done to the walls of heaven and earth, as a mythological equivalent to the Augustan building project (*Fast.* 2.57-64; *RG* 19). Much as the ride of Phaethon has been seen by critics as similar to the chaos surrounding the birth of empire, much like Actium and Philippi,[110] so, too, can the aftermath of his death and the return of the world to normality be seen as similar to the establishment of empire, an inherent part of which was the Augustan building project in Rome, with temples such as that of Mars Ultor constructed after being promised during the civil wars.

After the death of Phaethon, Jupiter surveys the world as he seeks to repair the damage done by the fiery chariot (*Met.* 2.401-7):

> At pater omnipotens **ingentia moenia** caeli
> circuit et, ne quid labefactum viribus ignis
> corruat, explorat. quae postquam firma suique
> roboris esse videt, terras hominumque labores
> perspicit; Arcadiae tamen est inpensior illi
> cura suae; **fontesque** et nondum audentia labi
> **flumina** restituit.

[109] While Phaethon's skyride does burn crops and destroy the fertility of the earth (*Met.* 2.210-13), his fall, as Schmitzer (1990), 106 points out, allows the earth to return to normality: 'sein Tod ist eine Erlösung für das Weltall.'

[110] See Schmitzer (1990), 96. On Phaethon as similar to the charioteer at the end of *Georgics* 1, who is described just after the poet's mention of the 'second Philippi', see Gale (2013), 288-9.

> But the all-powerful father travelled around and inspected the walls of the vast heavens, lest any be ruined, shaken by the strength of the fire. When he sees that these are firm from their own strength, he surveys the lands and labours of men. Yet Arcadia is the greatest care to him: he restores the fountains and rivers, not yet daring to flow again.

Many compare the *ingentia moenia caeli* which Jupiter inspects to Lucretius' *flammantia moenia mundi* (1.73).[111] In the *Fasti*, however, Rome's future walls are also described as *ingentia moenia*, as Carmenta prophesies the rise of the city to Evander, beginning with the events of the *Aeneid* (*Fast.* 1.515-16 *fallor, an hi fient* ***ingentia moenia*** *colles, / iuraque ab hac terra cetera terra petet*?). Carmenta suggests that this city will arise from a pastoral, Arcadian landscape (*Fast.* 1.511 ***fluminaque*** *et* ***fontes****, quibus utitur hospita tellus*) of the kind for which Jupiter also cares (*Met.* 2.406-7). The huge walls which Jupiter surveys, as he seeks to restore anything damaged by the destruction of Phaethon, thus recall the images of Rome presented as an immortal city which has risen from and been founded upon strife and warfare, with many of its buildings constructed or restored after the chaos of the civil wars.

Elsewhere in the *Fasti,* Augustus, the *pater patriae*, is celebrated as a figure who takes care of Rome's walls (*Fast.* 2.131-4):

> hoc tu per terras, quod in aethere Iuppiter alto,
> nomen habes: hominum tu pater, ille deum.
> Romule, concedes: facit hic tua magna tuendo
> moenia.

> You have on earth the title which Jupiter has in the heavens: you are father of men, he father of the gods. Concede, Romulus: this man by his care makes your city walls great.

[111] Barchiesi (2005), 270; Schiesaro (2014), 84.

Here, Ovid describes how Augustus takes on the title of father of the nation (*Fast.* 2.132 *hominum tu pater*), as the earthly equivalent to Jupiter, the *omnipotens pater* (as he is described at *Met.* 2.401). While Jupiter's domain includes both heaven and earth in the *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 2.401-5 *ingentia moenia caeli…terras hominumque labores*), in the *Fasti* Ovid describes how Jupiter now looks after the heavens and Augustus takes on the role of guardian of the earth. The role which the *princeps* plays in post-civil war Rome, which is celebrated within the architecture of the city, is similar to that which Jupiter takes on in *Metamorphoses* 2: both exist as global architects after disorder and disaster.[112]

It is thus possible to identify similarities between the reordering of the world in the *Metamorphoses* after the fiery ride of Phaethon and the rebuilding of Rome by Augustus after the inception of empire. The aftermath of the tale of Phaethon leads to the recreation and restructuring of the world, much as the aftermath of the civil war led to the revival and construction of monuments in Rome, including religious architecture such as the Temple of Palatine Apollo and the Temple of Mars Ultor.

**Ordering and mapping time in the house of the Sun and Horologium**

Reference to Ovid's own *tempora* can be seen within the earliest books of the *Metamorphoses*. Ovid's description of the architectural features and decoration in the house of the Sun brings to mind, or even is intermedial with, a variety of key

[112] Interestingly, the proclamation of Jupiter as Arcadian renovator and Augustus as preserver of the walls of Rome are also both followed by narratives relating the rape of Callisto (*Met*. 2.409-495; *Fast.* 2.153-92). On the similarities between the narratives of Callisto in *Metamorphoses* 2 and *Fasti* 2, see Gee (2000), 174-87; Newlands (1995), 157-9.

Augustan *monumenta.* As Phaethon traverses the cosmos, the landscape through which he travels also anticipates the landscape of Rome, in particular its 'cosmological centre',[113] the Campus Martius. The southern end of this open space outside of Rome saw the construction of buildings including the Pantheon, the Horologium of Augustus, and the Mausoleum and Ustrinum, developed by Agrippa and Augustus. These buildings celebrated the divine world, catasterism and life after death, and the regulation of the astrological and cosmological worlds. They also stood as monumental expressions of the establishment of imperial power and the peace and order of the Augustan age. This section of my chapter will consider how the tale of Phaethon contains imagery and themes which are also displayed within, or which were the inspiration behind, the monuments of the Campus Martius.

In a poem which is concerned with the linear passage of time throughout history, Phaethon's celestial wanderings can be viewed as a fictional exploration of the temporal interests and concerns of Ovid's own age, which were monumentalised in the architecture of Rome. The choice of the monumental house of the Sun and the cosmic ride of Phaethon as subject matter in Ovid's epic poem reveals the poet's own interest in solar and astrological time, an interest which is more openly expressed in his *Fasti*. Both poems appear to respond to the acquisition of astrological knowledge during the late Republic and early Roman Empire, which saw the construction of monumental *fasti*, the creation of the Caesarean calendar in 46BC, the later adjustment of temporal order by Augustus, and the building of Augustus' own solar

[113] Rehak (2006), 144.

monument, the Horologium. In this section, I will argue that Ovid's Phaethon narrative explores this contemporary interest, as expressed in the monuments of Rome, so that the house of the Sun can be viewed as a monument which is influenced by solar architecture in Rome. The symmetrical decoration in the house of the Sun and the images of the sky painted on its walls or ceiling (*Met.* 2.17 *haec super inposita est caeli fulgentis imago*), will be shown to be comparable to the monumental expressions of imperial solar and astrological ordering in Rome. Alignment of solar and calendrical time in the house will be identified, allowing connections between Ovid's epic monument and a specific Augustan solar monument in the Campus Martius, the Horologium. By extension, Phaethon's ascent to the heavens and ride in the chariot of the Sun will be considered in comparison to descriptions of astrologers and figures of power, and their (not always successful) attempts to control time.

The alignment of solar and calendrical time was undertaken by Julius Caesar in 46BC, as he brought the number of days in the year to 365 ¼, with an intercalary day added every four years. In spite of these calendrical reforms, time once again became disordered after Caesar's death. This was down to the incorrect intercalation by the pontifices and the addition of an extra day every three years, rather than every four. Planned from around 13BC and dedicated in 10/9BC,[114] the Horologium of Augustus was constructed in the Campus Martius, indicating that calendrical time had now come under Augustus' control. The year after the Horologium was constructed, the erroneous intercalation by the pontifices was publicised by the *princeps* (who was

[114] See Davies (2000), 76; Rehak (2006), 89 on the dating of this monument.

now Pontifex Maximus).[115] Augustus subsequently undertook the reorganisation of solar and calendrical time.

With the help of the Horologium, the new, imperial control over time was highlighted and celebrated. Heslin's suggestion that the Horologium was a symbolic rather than precise means of catching errors, such as improper intercalation, may be correct, but the monument surely reflects, nonetheless, the Augustan interest in time.[116] It stands clearly in the background to his calendrical regulation. The Horologium was made up of a gnomon, an obelisk from Heliopolis dedicated to the sun god, which was erected in the Campus Martius. The Horologium is believed by some to have been a giant sundial (Plin. *HN.* 36.72-3), with the shadow of the obelisk passing across a bronze grid on the pavement below throughout the course of the day. This grid was believed to have been decorated with letters relating to, or even images of, the seasons and the zodiac.[117] Excavations have shown that this was the form that the Hadrianic pavement below the monument took,[118] but it is uncertain whether or not the Augustan grid would have been the same. Others have argued the monument was merely a solar meridian, as the shadow of the obelisk would pass over the meridian line at midday, lengthening and shortening in relation to the winter and summer solstice.[119]

---

[115] See Schütz (1990), 447-8; Heslin (2007), 5-6 for a breakdown of the timeline of events.

[116] Heslin (2007), 6. Davies (2000), 93: 'The Horologium, seen through Roman eyes, was not merely a gauge of time passing, but also a reassuring confirmation of eternal time, reflected in the ordered movements of the cosmos. As commissioner of the instrument, Augustus in a sense regulated time himself.'

[117] Buchner (1982); Wallace-Hadrill (1987), 224-5; Rehak (2006), 81.

[118] Rehak (2006), 81. Rehak suggests that the decoration found in this upper pavement was a 'resetting' of the original bronze strips and letters marking out seasons and signs.

[119] Schütz (1990), 432-57; Heslin (2007).

Study of the Horologium has led some to consider the possibility that this shadow of the obelisk would have reached the *Ara Pacis* at the equinox, and so on Augustus' birthday on the 23rd of September.[120] While this idea is often questioned, there is still clearly a triangulated relationship between the Horologium, *Ara Pacis* and Mausoleum in terms of the layout and sight lines of these monuments in the Campus Martius.[121] The Horologium, like the *Ara Pacis* and Mausoleum, was constructed as a monumental indication of the era of peace and prosperity, as well as the civic and cosmic order brought to Rome by Augustus.

One can draw similarities between Ovid's house of the Sun and monumental markers of time like the Horologium. I am not the first to note a comparison between the Phaethon tale and the Horologium. Barchiesi has suggested that the Sun's discussion of his chariot's course through the day, passing through the creatures of the zodiac in the cosmos (*Met.* 2.76-83), recalls the format of this calendrical monument.[122] He identifies that the path of the Sun mimics elements of this monument, but Barchiesi does not consider the monumental house's connections to this cosmological monument. He does discuss the obelisk, but as a means of

---

[120] Buchner (1982); Rahek (2006), 69. Hannah and Magli (2011), 506-7: 'The obelisk, at almost 30m in height, was able to cast a shadow about 66m long at noon on the winter solstice, to judge from Pliny's assertion that 'a stone pavement was laid out in accordance with the height of the obelisk, equal to which was the shadow at the sixth hour on the day of the full winter solstice'. At the equinox, the shadow of Augustus' obelisk would theoretically stretch about 89.5m in the direction of the *Ara Pacis*, which was 83m away.' Hannah (2013), 97: 'Whether or not the Altar stood at the end of a physical equinoctial line on an enormous grid, as Buchner thought, the general effect at the equinoxes would still hold, as the shadow pointed in the direction of the Altar, and may indeed have reached it.'

[121] Heslin (2007), 15: 'So it is clear that this trio of monuments was deliberately arranged in the form of a right-angle triangle, and that the orientation of the individual monuments emphasised this mutual relationship.' Newlands (1995), 24: 'Whether or not Buchner's precise calculations are correct, a strong symbolic relationship linked the [Horologium, *Ara Pacis* and Mausoleum].' See also Davies (2000), 19.

[122] Barchiesi (2009), 167n6.

discussing the twin obelisks from Heliopolis which stood in the Circus Maximus,[123] linking the racetrack and cosmos, as he views Phaethon's own course through the cosmos as the cosmological equivalent to the Circus Maximus.[124] Complementary to that analysis, this section of my chapter will explore the relationship between the Phaethon narrative and the Horologium, by considering how the artwork in the house of the Sun reflects the architectural trends of Augustan Rome and how aspects of Phaethon's chaotic ride can be aligned with events surrounding the construction of the Horologium.

The Sun's house stands as an architectural expression of the order and the alignment of solar and calendrical time. This is indicated within the artistic depiction of the twelve signs of the zodiac, which are laid out symmetrically on the left and right doors (*Met.* 2.17-8 *haec super inposita est caeli fulgentis imago*, / *signaque sex foribus* ***dextris*** *totidemque* ***sinistris***), and the presence of the temporal personifications set out in perfectly balanced, symmetrical order on the left and right of Sol's throne (2.25-6 *a* ***dextra laevaque*** *Dies et Mensis et Annus / Saeculaque et positae spatiis aequalibus Horae*).[125] A careful mirroring is thus seen in these descriptions of solar and temporal time. Just as the images of the zodiac are themselves an imitation of the constellations (*caeli…imago*), the signs of the zodiac

[123] Barchiesi (2009), 183-5.
[124] Barchiesi (2009), 170-88.
[125] Barchiesi (2009), 175: 'The reader cannot separate the symmetrical pedimental figures of the Zodiac (six to the right, six to the left) from the symmetrical 'real' figures of Days, Months, Year, Centuries, and the regularly spaced *Horae*.'

are arranged in the same way as time's personifications, aligning solar and astrological time.

In the house of the Sun, all four seasons are present in personified form, in a description which emphasises the orderly arrangement of these figures (*Met.* 2.27-30):

> Verque novum stabat cinctum florente corona,
> stabat nuda Aestas et spicea serta gerebat,
> stabat et Autumnus calcatis sordidus uvis
> et glacialis Hiems canos hirsuta capillos.
>
> New Spring was standing there crowned with a floral garland, and naked Summer, wearing a crown of corn, and Autumn stood, stained with crushed grapes, and icy Winter, bristling with white hair.

Symmetry can be seen within the four lines as the two central lines begin with *stabat.* Each season is assigned a single hexameter line, bringing equality to the length of the seasonal descriptions and to the four parts of the year.[126] This layout of the personifications in Ovid's metre reflects the ordered layout of the house and the careful arrangement of time.[127] Much as Ovid's text mimics the aesthetic of the monument, Sol's house is itself a textual construction which, in its organisation of time in its decoration, responds to architecture in Augustan Rome.

In a city of monuments celebrating calendrical order, such as the *fasti* carved and painted on arches and in temples, the Horologium itself was the ultimate monument of temporal regulation.[128] If, much like the later, Hadrianic pavement, the

---

[126] See *Met.* 1.116-18 and Ovid's description of how Jupiter divided the seasons equally, after an age of perpetual spring.

[127] Poetic metre is itself the organisation of time (OLD s.v. '*tempus*': 13 'A unit of length of sound.').

[128] On the Horologium as a marker of calendrical and solar alignment, see Wallace-Hadrill (1987), 224; Newlands (1995), 23; Schütz (1990), 432-57; Heslin (2007), 5.

Augustan bronze grid below the obelisk really did bear some artistic or alphabetical representation of the seasons and the signs of the zodiac, then the bronze and gold house of the Sun, with its vivid depictions of time, could be viewed as an Ovidian literary equivalent to the Horologium. Equally, even if the Horologium was simply a solar meridian, one could still view the house of the Sun as an epic visualisation of calendrical and solar time and Ovid's poetic re-imagining of a new Roman monument which tracked the course of the sun.[129]

The temporal personifications within the house of the Sun, and the path which the Sun takes through the sky, can also be connected to the Horologium as a solar meridian. The placement of hours at equal points in the house of the Sun (*Met.* 2.26 *positae spatiis aequalibus Horae*) recalls the equal length of hours of day and night during the equinox. At the time of the equinox, the shadow of the solar meridian would be at the middle point between its longest (at the winter solstice) or shortest (at the summer solstice) possible length. Just as the house of the Sun presents an image of time at the medial point between two solar extremes (the solstices), the house's inhabitant directs his son to take the medial course through the cosmos. The Sun advises that, as Phaethon takes charge of the chariot, he should follow his own well-worn track through the sky (*Met.* 2.133-7):

> hac sit iter, manifesta rotae vestigia cernes;
> utque ferant aequos et caelum et terra calores,
> nec preme nec summum molire per aethera currum.
> altius egressus caelestia tecta cremabis,
> inferius terras; medio tutissimus ibis.

---

[129] See Rehak (2006), 74-7 on the fashion of artistic representations of solar time in Greek and Latin literature.

> Let this be the way – you'll see clear tracks from my wheels – and so that the sky and the earth are equally warm, don't go too low, nor propel the chariot through the high heavens! Going too high, you will burn the sky, too low, and you'll burn the earth. You'll travel most safely in the middle.

The balanced 'middle course' is the safest way through the sky and the astrological *monstra* of the zodiac, as the chariot of the sun passes through the day. As Barchiesi suggests, the progress of the sun through the whole zodiac in one day reflects the format of the Horologium.[130] This middle course taken through the cosmos is also particularly reminiscent of the solar meridian which was generated by Augustus' Horologium. The shadow cast by the obelisk took the form of a single line which would have marked the middle of the day (Varro, *Ling*. 6.4. *meridies ab eo quod* ***medius*** *dies*).[131] As Heslin highlights, this line was an indication of solar balance and order: it was used as a means of checking the alignment of the solar and calendrical year.[132] If solar and temporal time were correctly calibrated, the shadow of the obelisk would reach a particular point, according to how close one was to the solstice,[133] on the meridian line at midday. The Sun's habitual path from his house, through the very middle of the zodiac, can be viewed as similar to the meridian line cast by the Horologium, which followed a repeated and regular course.

The Sun's daily course throughout the sky is one of habitude and regularity. Indeed, Ovid appears to set up a pseudo-etymological connection between Sol and

---

[130] Barchiesi (2009), 167n6.

[131] Rehak (2006), 92: 'The globe atop the Horologium obelisk imitated the globe of the sun as it moves through the zodiac in the sky and, in shadow, on the pavement.'

[132] Heslin (2007), 5: 'The observer can check to make sure that the shadow of the sun reaches the correct point on the meridian at noon on the correct day of the civil calendar.'

[133] It is notable that the tale which Ovid tells on the day of the summer solstice in the *Fasti*, the day on which the shadow on the meridian line would be shortest, is one with clear similarities to Phaethon: the fall of Hippolytus from his chariot (*Fast*. 6.733-762).

*solitus* when describing how Phaethon's ride differs from the usual experience of the horses pulling the chariot of the Sun (*Met*. 2.162 ***Solis** equi, **solita**que iugum gravitate carebat*). Like his well-ordered house, the Sun's path through the day and through the zodiac is an accustomed route which expresses repetition and regularity. By contrast, Phaethon's disorderly path in the chariot of the sun, which transgresses from its accustomed course, indicates the disruption of solar time, much as would be expressed by the obelisk's shadow losing its accustomed place on the meridian line.[134]

**Phaethon's Ride: When time goes wrong**

By constructing his own astrological monument, Ovid's text responds to the astral interest of the Roman leaders of his time and the consequent architectural construction.[135] Phaethon's ascent to this celestial monument, and his attempts to control the chariot of the Sun, might also be likened to those in Rome who sought astrological knowledge. Phaethon's search for acknowledgement in his father's cosmological home has been seen by Schiesaro as a version of the attempts by thinkers and philosophers to attain extra-terrestrial knowledge, much like the quest of Epicurus.[136] One can also consider how Phaethon's ascent to the house of his father in the sky is similar to those astrologers, or the *felices animae*, described in the

---

[134] Indeed, Heslin (2007), 18 has viewed the shadow of the meridian in this very way, although he does not specifically refer to Ovid's narrative: 'The erroneous position of the meridian's shadow could thus have been read as a visual representation of the sun swerving from its path, as happened in the myth of Phaethon.'
[135] Herbert-Brown (2002), 115 appears correct in arguing that 'Augustus' astral aspirations and the popularity of astrology received endorsement in literature'.
[136] Schiesaro (2014), 74-5.

*Fasti*.[137] The poet describes the astrologers' lofty ambitions as they seek celestial knowledge (*Fast.* 1.297-8):

> felices animae, quibus haec cognoscere primis
> inque domus superas scandere cura fuit!
>
> Fortunate minds, who first cared to learn these things and climb up to heavenly homes!

Ovid praises the achievements of these astrological figures, and suggests that others, too, will be able to map the sky (*Fast.* 1.309-10):

> nos quoque sub ducibus caelum metabimur illis
> ponemusque suos ad vaga signa dies.
>
> Under these leaders, we too shall measure the sky and allot wandering signs their own days.

Schiesaro quotes this passage in order to discuss Ovid's relationship with Lucretius, but does not fully discuss it in the context of *Metamorphoses* 2.[138] This passage can, however, shed light on the portrayal of Phaethon. The astrological study which the *felices animae* inspired is similar to Phaethon's mental conception of the length of the sun's course through the sky as he travels in the chariot (*Met.* 2.187-8):

> quid faciat? multum caeli post terga relictum,
> ante oculos plus est: animo metitur utrumque.
>
> What should he do? Much of the sky is behind his back, more is before his eyes. He measures each with his mind.

[137] On these figures as astrologers, see Herbert-Brown (2002), 104: 'His '*felices animae'* were the founders of the heavenly calendar which is woven into the overall fabric of the *Fasti*.'
[138] Schiesaro (2014), 91-4.

Using similar language, both instances describe attempts to measure (*metabimur, metitur)* and comprehend the cosmos (*caelum*).[139] Yet, while the astrologers spoken of in the *Fasti* are praised for their fortune (1.297 *felices animae*), Phaethon is an *infelix anima* (2.179 *infelix Phaethon*) who fails in his attempts to navigate and comprehend the astrological world. He is terrified by astrological signs, failing to understand that they are not wild beasts (*Met.* 2.193-4):

> sparsa quoque in vario passim miracula caelo
> vastarumque videt trepidus simulacra ferarum.
>
> Terrified, he sees miraculous figures scattered everywhere in the sky and
> the forms of vast wild beasts.

Phaethon stands as the very antithesis to such astrologers, or thinkers and philosophers, who, as Manilius states, ascended to the heavens by means of rational knowledge (Man. 1.97) and did not wonder at miraculous portents (Man. 1.103 *solvitque animis* ***miracula*** *rerum*).[140]

Phaethon's celestial interest and search for his father's home also appear to bear similarities to Ovid's description of Julius Caesar's astral interest. Critics have already drawn comparisons between Phaethon and Caesar. Schmitzer, for example, has pointed out the likeness between the death of Phaethon and the death of Caesar,

---

[139] Ovid's description of astrologers uses the verb *metor*, and his narrative of Phaethon uses *metior*. Newlands (1995), 39 and Gee (2000), 61-2 both comment on the fact that the use of *metor* in *Fasti* 1 is the only passage which uses the verb in this astronomical context, except for Cicero (*N.D.* 2.155), but if one allows for this pseudo-etymological connection, *Fast*. 1.269 and *Met*. 2.189 both appear to describe a similar concept. These two passages are similar, too, as in *Fasti* 1 Ovid says he promised to tell of falling stars (1.295-6 *Quid vetat et stellas, ut quaeque oriturque caditque, / dicere*?). In *Metamorphoses* 2, the poet does just that, and chooses to tell of a figure who seems very much like a falling star (2.321-2 *stella…cecidit*). These passages are the only two in the Ovidian *corpus* that use *stella* and *cadere* together.
[140] Text taken from Goold (1998).

including the eclipses and general chaos which followed (*Met.* 2.329-31, *Georg.* 1.466-8),[141] but further similarities can be identified. As was argued above, Phaethon's chariot ride depicts a chaos like that seen after Caesar's death, for which monuments such as the Temple of Mars Ultor stood as a reminder. In addition, certain similarities between the two figures highlight how the cosmic disorder caused by Phaethon reflects the kind of temporal chaos into which calendrical time was plunged after Caesar's death and which was remedied by Augustus, as demonstrated by the Horologium.

Like the astrologers in *Fasti* 1 who reached the heavens by their solar knowledge,[142] Caesar himself used astrology in an attempt to ascend to the homes of the gods (*Fast.* 3.155-62):

> sed tamen errabant etiam nunc tempora, donec
>     Caesaris in multis haec quoque cura fuit.
> non haec ille deus tantaeque propaginis auctor
>     credidit officiis esse minora suis,
> promissumque sibi voluit praenoscere caelum
>     nec deus ignotas hospes inire domos.
> ille moras solis, quibus in sua signa rediret,
>     traditur exactis disposuisse notis.

> But even now time was wandering, until Caesar took charge of it, along with other things. That god, author of such a great progeny, did not believe these matters to be beneath him. He wished to know the heaven promised to him and, as a god, not to enter unknown homes as a stranger. He is said to have organised, in a precise table, the intervals in which the sun returned to its constellations.

[141] Schmitzer (1990), 89-107.
[142] See Heyworth (2019), 113 on the similarities between this passage and the encomium to the *felices animae.*

Reading about Phaethon in the *Metamorphoses* and Caesar in the *Fasti*, one might identify similarities in the acts of the young charioteer and the Roman leader. Phaethon, unknown to his divine father, ascends to the home of the Sun as a means of gaining recognition, and seeks to control the path of solar time for a single day (*Met.* 2.48 *inque* ***diem*** *alipedum ius et moderamen equorum*). Ovid states that Caesar, as yet unknown to the gods or their homes (*Fast.* 3.160 *nec deus ignotas hospes inire domos*), sought their recognition and to determine his entry into heaven, much as Phaethon does. Caesar aimed to secure his apotheosis and recognition as a god by regulating solar time and organising the calendar, including adding an intercalary day (3.166 *una dies*) to every fourth year.

Caesar's attempts to prevent time from wandering as it once did (*Fast.* 3.155 *sed tamen* ***errabant*** *etiam nunc tempora*), by drawing up a table of the sun's course through the zodiac, might be considered as an attempt to find the same kind of cosmic order which the Sun promotes. Sol gives Phaethon directions for the correct path through the zodiac (*Met.* 2.80-86), so that his course should not wander (2.79 *utque viam teneas nulloque* ***errore*** *traharis*). In spite of this, following his father's ordered path is too much for Phaethon (2.187-92) and causes disaster. Phaethon loses control over the chariot, and cannot follow the ordered path of his father through the zodiac, due to his lack of knowledge of the workings of the chariot (*Met.* 2.167-70):

> quod simulac sensere, ruunt tritumque relinquunt
> quadriiugi spatium nec, quo prius, ordine currunt.
> ipse pavet, nec qua commissas flectat habenas
> nec scit qua sit iter nec, si sciat, imperet illis.

> When they feel this, the four horses run wild and leave the well-trodden track, and they do not run in their previous order. That boy is terrified and does not know how to handle the reins, nor where the path is, and even if he did know he would not be able to control the steeds.

Ovid's description of the chariot of the Sun veering from its usual path (2.168 *relinquunt / quadriiugi* ***spatium***) appears to suggest the disorder of time, a very different image to the kind of careful temporal order which was exhibited in the house of the Sun (2.26 *positae* ***spatiis*** *aequalibus Horae*), and which Caesar attempted to bring about in his calendar*.* Considering the suggestion that Phaethon's ride is evocative of the disorder of the civil wars, it is also possible to see Phaethon's ride as similar to the temporal disarray seen after Caesar's death, caused by the pontifices' inability to comprehend Caesar's temporal organisation and calendrical intercalation.

Phaethon's lack of control when passing through the sky and zodiac is described as a stark contrast to his father's ordered path. The chariot runs without guidance and crashes through the zodiac (*Met.* 2.203-9):

> quaque impetus egit,
> hac sine lege ruunt altoque sub aethere fixis
> incursant stellis rapiuntque per avia currum.
> et modo summa petunt, modo per declive viasque
> praecipites spatio terrae propiore feruntur,
> inferiusque suis fraternos currere Luna
> admiratur equos.

> Wherever the impulse leads them, wildly they rush there. They run into the stars fixed in the deep firmament, and carry the chariot off through trackless places. Now they seek the highest heights, now downwards on a headlong course, they are carried nearer to the earth. Luna marvelled to see her brother's horses run below her own.

Phaethon's ride is so out of the ordinary, transgressing the established path of the chariot, that the Moon is stunned to see the horses of the Sun running below her own.[143] In *Fasti* 3, Ovid describes the proper path of the horses of the Sun and Moon through the sky, once again describing them as brother and sister. The poet speaks of their chariots as he describes the Roman people's lack of interest in the zodiac, meaning that the solar time was left unchecked, before the imposition of calendrical order on the solar year by Numa (*Fast.* 3.109-112):

> signaque quae longo frater percenseat anno,
> ire per haec uno mense sororis equos?
> libera currebant et inobservata per annum
> sidera.

> [Who then had noticed that] the signs which the brother travels through in the long year are those traversed by the horses of the sister in one month? The stars ran freely and unobserved through the year.

In *Fasti* 3, the celestial chariots of the sun and moon are both described (109-10 *frater…equos sororis*). These horses pass through the same signs of the zodiac in different lengths of time. Metrical representation of cosmological order is seen, as Ovid's placement of the sun's longer path in the six-foot hexameter line above and the moon's shorter course in the five-foot pentameter below shows the careful order of their related, yet separate paths. As he takes a course below (2.208 *inferius*) the horses of the moon,[144] Phaethon disrupts the careful order of time which is

[143] Gildenhard and Zissos (1999), 36: 'Here the two celestial bodies whose movements regulate all three 'natural' divisions of time (solar year, lunar month, and day) are shown to be wholly out of kilter.'
[144] Metrical play, as the organisation of words in the metre mimics what is occurring in the cosmos, can be seen once again in this description of Luna seeing the horses of the sun below her, as the word *equos* (referring to Sol's horses) is placed immediately below the word *suis* (referring to Luna's horses). Both words have the first short syllable in the foot and the second, long syllable in the third foot, placing one above the another at identical points.

established in the cosmos, such as is indicated within this elegiac couplet in the *Fasti.*[145] His journey through the sky does not follow the usual path of the sun through the cosmos, as if he were, in fact, one of the early Romans who paid little attention to the related paths of the sun and moon through the zodiac. Phaethon's ride shows no awareness of the astrological understanding acquired by leaders in the late Republic/early Empire which was conceptualised in Augustan monuments, but, instead, can be likened to the periods of time in Roman history which saw scientific incomprehension and temporal disorganisation.

Phaethon's ignorance of the workings of the chariot and how to control the horses leads to a chaotic and untracked journey through the sky (*Met.* 2.204 *sine lege ruunt*) and disruption of the normal path of solar day. Accordingly, one might compare Phaethon's unchecked progress to the movement of the stars in the early Roman world. In *Fasti* 3, Ovid describes how Romulean astronomical ignorance (in believing the calendar was made up of ten months) led to an incorrect calendrical year and the misalignment of solar and calendrical time (*Fast.* 3.111 *libera currebant […] sidera*). The etymology of *currere* appears to suggest that the stars which ran freely moved like an out of control chariot (*currus*), much like the vehicle of the Sun which crashes through the stars (*Met.* 2.205 *incursant stellis*).[146] Unlike the stars in the *Fasti,* which move of their own accord, the stars through which Phaethon rides

[145] Gildenhard and Zissos (1999), 36: 'The phrase [*sine lege ruunt*] points to the loss of uniform periodic motion by which the heavenly bodies made possible the measurement, and even the existence of time.'
[146] See Maltby s.v. '*curro*'. This line may be a gloss of the Greek etymology of πλανήτης (planet) from πλανάω (to wander, to roam).

do not move (2.204 *altoque sub aethere fixis*), but Phaethon threatens to upset this fixity as he crashes through them.

In contrast to the house of the Sun, and the projected image of solar order, Phaethon can be seen as an almost prehistoric force who threatens to disrupt the established order of the cosmos. This is further highlighted by Tellus who, seeking help from Jupiter to stop Phaethon's temporal transgressions, fears that Phaethon will cause the world to degenerate into cosmic disorder (*Met.* 2.298-300):

> 'si freta, si terrae pereunt, si regia caeli,
> in **chaos antiquum** confundimur. eripe flammis,
> si quid adhuc superest, et rerum consule summae!'
>
> 'If the sea, the land, the heavens perish, then we are confounded in ancient Chaos. Seize from the flames whatever still remains, and take care of the greatest matters!'[147]

The very same collocation is used in *Fasti* 1 to describe the state that Janus, the god who now heralds the beginning of the twelve-month year, once held (*Fast.* 1.103-6):

> me **Chaos antiqui** (nam sum res prisca) vocabant
> aspice, quam longi temporis acta canam.
> lucidus hic aer et quae tria corpora restant,
> ignis, aquae, tellus, unus acervus erat.
>
> The ancients called me Chaos (for I am an old being): see the events of the long ages of which I shall sing. This clear air and the three bodies which stand firm, fire, water, and earth, were one lump.

In the *Metamorphoses*, the Earth faces the possibility that Phaethon will cause the world to regress back to the kind of unscientific chaos (299 *Chaos antiquum*) from which the Saturnian god Janus was said to be originally formed (103 *Chaos*

[147] *eripe flammis* (2.299) may be an allusion to Verg. *Aen*. 2.289 (*heu! fuge, nate dea, teque his,' ait, 'eripe flammis*) and Hector's plea that Aeneas should leave the besieged Troy, leading to the rise of Rome.

*antiqui…vocabant).* In the *Metamorphoses*, Tellus speaks of the threat to the tripartite universe (298), as Phaethon threatens to destroy all, sending the world back to the state it was in before the division of sea, earth and sky, as described by Janus in the *Fasti* (105-6).[148] As Hardie argues, Janus illustrates a transformation from a chaotic, original state to a figure of rational order, much like the progression of the universe over time.[149] Janus presides over the comings and goings in the world, and regulates the year, accompanied by the very *Horae* who find a place in Sol's well-ordered home in *Metamorphoses* 2. Phaethon, by contrast, threatens to undo the solar and temporal order, which Sol's house exhibits and which has been established in the world, plunging the newly imposed cosmic system back into chaos.[150]

Phaethon's journey through the cosmos can thus be compared to periods of temporal disruption in Rome, as described in the *Fasti*. While the house of the Sun can be seen to be similar to Augustus' Horologium, as a poetic monument which promotes temporal regulation, the chaotic course of Phaethon highlights the potential dangers of placing the control over solar time in the wrong hands and stands as a reminder of the world which existed before Augustan imperial power in

---

[148] This is a highly Lucretian sentiment. Cf. Lucretius on the end of the world (5.91-96): *Quod superest, ne te in promissis plura moremur, / principio maria ac terras caelumque tuere: / quorum naturam* ***triplicem, tria corpora,*** *Memmi, /* ***tris species*** *tam dissimilis,* ***tria talia texta****, una dies dabit exitio, multosque per annos sustentata ruet moles et machina mundi.* (Text taken from Bailey 1921).
[149] Hardie (1991), 129: 'The *Horai* are very suitable companions for Ovid's Janus, for in Greek thought they come to symbolise the regular and harmonious order of both the natural and the socio-political worlds.'
[150] Feeney (1999), 24: 'At the beginning of Book 2, with the help of allusions shuttling back and forth between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, Ovid reveals that this primal chaos is lurking at the heart even of established natural time.'

Rome, both in the early ages of the city and in the time during the transition from republic to empire.

Ovid's epic narrative seems to highlight the chaos lurking behind the order which the Roman world and monumental structures in the city sought to embody. At the same time, the ride of Phaethon, as an expression of temporal disruption, may be an indication of the wider underlying chronological disorder in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, as well as in Rome's metamorphic world. Ovid's poem is in danger of diverging from the established chronological order of events, as one can see clear references to the epic's *telos*, and the city of Rome. Even in the early books of the *Metamorphoses*, the poet can be seen to be racing towards his own *tempora*, much like an out of control chariot.[151]

Phaethon's ride is often commented on as an image of poetic disorder. As the chariot is often used as a metaphor for poetry, Phaethon's journey through the sky has been viewed as the poet veering from the traditional topics of epic.[152] Accordingly, Phaethon's course, which is a divergence from the Sun's instructions to

---

[151] See Sharrock (1994b), 98-100 and Volk (2002), 19-24 on the chariot ride as a metaphor for the poet's journey through the text. In *Fasti* 6, as the poem reaches its premature conclusion, a metaphor of the chariot is similarly employed as the poet describes how time slips unceasingly by (6.771-72 *tempora labuntur, tacitisque senescimus annis / et fugiunt freno non remorante dies*). The days are like horses that cannot be controlled or restrained, as the poet indicates how time can easily run away with itself. As he describes how the *tempora* slips by, using a term which has been used as an alternative title for the poem (Littlewood 2006, 223), he seemingly indicates a loss of control over the narrative of his calendrical poem, and the *fasti dies* which are his subject matter, as the poet approaches the premature ending of his calendar. Newlands (1995), 205 has compared this description to the mythological narrative of Hippolytus in *Fasti* 6 who has a chariot accident. In the same way, one could see the mythological narrative of Phaethon as indicative of the disruption of the poem's expected progression towards its *telos.*

[152] Lovatt (2005), 36: 'The strong metaphorical associations between the journey of Phaethon and the paths of song, the chariot of the sun and the chariot of song, suggests that the Phaethon story could be read as a model of poetry out of control.'

take a balanced middle course, has been read as reflective of taking the 'Callimachean path' in poetry. Schiesaro has offered up the possible interpretation of the middle course as a reference to the different styles of oratory,[153] while also considering how the Sun's instructions about Phaethon's path, and his son's transgression from his father's track, may have Callimachean implications, and shed light on Ovid's own handling of the Phaethon narrative.[154]

It certainly does seem that one can draw comparisons between the Sun's instructions to Phaethon about which road he should take (*Met.* 2.133-7), following in the well-worn tracks of his chariot (*Met.* 2.133 *manifesta rotae vestigia*), and Apollo's advice on which path the poet should take (*Aet*. 1.1.25-8), not least because they are both sun gods. Yet, the Sun advises the very opposite of Apollo's instructions to Callimachus, advocating for the accustomed and well-trodden track through the sky. By contrast, the description of Phaethon veering from the Sun's well marked path casts the young charioteer as a Callimachean figure (*Met.* 2.167-8):

> quod simulac sensere, ruunt tritumque relinquunt
> quadriiugi spatium nec, quo prius, ordine currunt.
>
> When they sense this, the four horses rush off and leave the well-worn track, and they no longer run in their previous course.

This line seems to specifically allude to Callimachus' *Aetia* (fr. 1 Pf. 27-8 δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶν μηδ᾽ οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους / **ἀτρίπτο]υς**),[155] as the past participle

[153] Schiesaro (2014), 87-91.
[154] Schiesaro (2014), 96: 'Pursuing *avia* may well be dangerous, but can we really expect Ovid to forsake *nova* and opt for the safety of a highly un-Callimachean beaten path, as Sol recommends (2.167 *tritum*)?'
[155] Text taken from Harder (2012).

*tritum*, from *tero,* is the Latin equivalent of the participle (ἀ)τρίπτους from τρίβω.[156] Rather than following his father's instructions, Phaethon diverges from the well-known course.[157] As he begins his universal epic, Ovid, too, becomes a kind of Phaethon figure. He veers off the well-worn path of epic history taken by his poetic predecessors,[158] to provide an innovative mythological narrative with Rome at its heart. He upsets the well-ordered chronological narrative of universal time, diverging from the expected sequence of events by incorporating references to the city of Rome.

Ultimately, Ovid's narrative highlights the multiple ways in which Phaethon's ride can be read. It can be viewed as a programmatic discussion of poetics, or a fictional anticipation of events and themes also depicted and memorialised in Roman architecture. This journey through the cosmos can be viewed as a reflection of the poet's course through the epic and his navigation of epic themes, in contrast to his epic predecessors. At the same time, Phaethon's ride can be viewed as a mythologised depiction of the improper management of time, to which the house of the Sun stands as a contrast, as the narrative of Phaethon stands as a textual

---

[156] OLD s.v. '*tero*'.

[157] Phaethon's divergence from the well-worn path can, however, be viewed as a failure rather than a conscious act. It is his inability to steer the horses properly which causes him to veer off course, rather than an intention to do something different. Other texts about chariot racing, which may have influenced Callimachus' work (see Maciver 2020 171-2) could help to interpret this text. Advice from a father to a son about how to ride chariot and steer horses goes back to the prototype in *Iliad* 23: Nestor instructs his young son Antilochus and suggests that losing or disaster can only be averted with skill (*Il.* 23.311-25). Antilochus learns from his father's instructions about how to handle the horses on a narrow path (23.414-16) ('as a type of Callimachus learning to deal with traditional material differently', Maciver 2020, 172 argues). Phaethon, meanwhile, fails to gain any control over the chariot. Thus, is Phaethon taking a Callimachean route, or is his ride a clumsy attempt to handle epic themes which ends in disaster?

[158] Feldherr (2016), 27: 'The figure of the mortal offspring failing to follow in his father's footsteps suggests a Bloomian anxiety of influence on the part of Ovid as a successor poet whose distinctiveness comes precisely from the disorder he brings to the epic tradition.'

equivalent to the artistic depiction of the cycle of civil and cosmic chaos and order in the monumental architecture of Rome.

**Phaethon's tomb and the Mausoleum of Augustus**

The tale of Phaethon appears to bear close similarities to architectural decorative features and themes found in the monuments of Rome, including the Horologium in the Campus Martius. Yet, the Horologium is not the only structure within this Roman space which Phaethon's narrative evokes. The epitaph, which is erected to commemorate Phaethon after his climatic journey and tragic fall, also bears similarities to two others within the Campus Martius, the Mausoleum of Augustus and the Ustrinum.

After Phaethon dies in a far-off land, having fallen into the Po, the narrator describes how the river washed his face, and the Naiads buried his body (*Met.* 2.323-28):

> quem procul a patria diverso maximus orbe
> excipit Eridanus fumantiaque abluit ora.
> Naides Hesperiae trifida fumantia flamma 325
> corpora dant tumulo, signant quoque carmine saxum:
> HIC · SITVS · EST · PHAETHON · CVRRVS · AVRIGA · PATERNI
> QVEM · SI · NON · TENVIT · MAGNIS · TAMEN · EXCIDIT · AVSIS.

> Eridanus receives him, far from his native land in a distant territory, and washes his smouldering face. The Western Naiads place his body, still smoking from the flames of the forked bolt, in a tomb and mark the rock with this epitaph:
> HERE LIES PHAETHON, CHARIOTEER OF HIS FATHER'S CAR. EVEN THOUGH HE COULD NOT CONTROL IT, HE FELL WITH GREAT DARING.

The tomb of Phaethon stands as a memorial for the cremated charioteer, bearing the traditional Roman epigraphic formula found on tombstones (327 *hic situs est*). It is to this space that Phaethon's family come to mourn the young charioteer and at this spot that Phaethon's sisters are transformed into poplar trees (2.340-66).

The image of Phaethon's family mourning at his marble sepulchre appears to recall the ideology of familial grief and succession surrounding the Mausoleum and Ustrinum of Augustus in the Campus Martius. The Mausoleum of Augustus was erected as a dynastic burial place for Augustus and his family around 28BC.[159] It was, according to Strabo, erected beside the river and surrounded with black poplar trees (Strab. 5.3.8). The ashes of the imperial family were buried inside the monument, having been cremated in the Ustrinum.[160] Inscriptions recording the burials of members of the imperial family were found between the Mausoleum and the Via Flaminia, bearing the formulaic phrases *hic crematus est* or *hic situs est*.[161] It is thus not difficult to draw comparisons between the topographic location of Phaethon's burial place, beside a river and shaded by poplars, and the Mausoleum in Rome. Having been burnt by Jupiter, Phaethon is buried in a tomb beside a river (although this is the Po rather than the Tiber) and shaded by poplars. There may even be similarities between Phaethon, whose epitaph is grieved over by his father (2.329-330), and those buried in the Mausoleum. Marcellus, who was placed within

[159] Platner and Ashby s.v. 'Mausoleum Augusti'.
[160] Noreña (2013), 52-3.
[161] Noreña (2013) 52. *CIL* 6.888, 6.889, 6.890, 6.891, 6.892.

Augustus' grand monument, for example, died at a young age, before his adoptive father.[162]

Some critics have discussed how Phaethon's narrative raises the anxieties of succession, which can be related to imperial power, as Phaethon perishes before his father.[163] It would be easy, therefore, to read Phaethon's connection to the Mausoleum as a similar image of instability and familial anxiety, as this was a burial place built for an emperor, yet, in actual fact, acted as a monument for his successors. The monuments in the Campus Martius, including the Mausoleum and the Ustrinum, equally act as a monumental representation of death and renewal, as a lasting reminder of those who had died. They are an ever-present reminder of the mortality of the emperor, and of the insecurity of dynastic power, particularly as heirs were buried there before the emperor.[164] Yet, at the same time, they stand as a memorial to Augustus' imperial role, including as architect of Rome, a reminder that his monumental restoration and expansion of the city will last long beyond his death. In the case of Phaethon, too, his failure and fall is the cause of his own monumentalisation, in both the form of his tomb and in Ovid's poetry, while his death allows the restoration of the world around him.

[162] While Phaethon's death is followed by Eridanus washing the young boy's face (2.324), Prop. 3.18.9-10 describes Augustus' heir lowering his face into the Stygian waters.

[163] Critics have discussed how the Phaethon narrative may reveal problems of paternity and succession, and the anxieties of the succession of imperial power. Rebeggiani (2013), 189 argues that 'Ovid's narrative of Phaethon, even if we do not admit that it features allusions to historical figures, owes its appeal precisely to how it reflects on issues central to the newly born Empire: namely problems of paternity and succession, as well as the disastrous consequences of a son's inability'. See also Barchiesi (2005), 230-31.

[164] Noreña (2013), 55 argues that the monuments were 'imbued with the complementary symbolisms of dynasty, deification and cosmic power'.

Themes of death and memorialisation through death can also be related to the poet himself. It is after his death that Ovid will successfully be able to undertake his own astrological ride, brought about by poetic *fama*. In the poem's sphragis, Ovid addresses the topic of poetic fame and anticipates his existence after death, carried beyond the stars by the fame of his poetry (*Met.* 15.875-6 *parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis / astra ferar*). In both the Phaethon tale and the sphragis, as in Augustus' Mausoleum, death is seen as a means of memorialisation. Although Phaethon dies, his chaotic ride and fall through the sky leads to the memorialisation of his name (2.326 *corpora dant tumulo, signant quoque carmine saxum*) in verse on a tombstone.[165] Ovid, too, as he anticipates his ascent to the sky and his afterlife, states that he will be memorialised in poetic form, as his poetry will be spoken of after his death (15.878-9).

**Phaethon in exile: A retrospective reading**

The Campus Martius was a key location in Augustan Rome as a 'cosmological centre', connected to deified ancestors, the heavens and the sun through its monuments.[166] Just as the Campus clearly relates to the cosmos, so can one relate the cosmological tale of Phaethon to the monuments in Rome. As a vast space on the edge of the city, the Campus Martius stood outside of the original pomerium, a part of Rome, and yet

[165] The inscription leads Feldherr (2016), 41 to argue that 'the epigram itself manages to be simultaneously an object preserved in Ovid's text and a miniaturised reflection of the narrative within which it occurs'.
[166] See Rehak (1996), 143-5 on the monuments in the Campus Martius as 'a concentration of cosmic reference points'.

one which was also geographically separate from the city.[167] Ovid provides, in the tale of Phaethon, cosmological landscapes which appear to be separate from the city, yet at the same time bear a clear resemblance of Rome (and the Campus Martius) and narrative themes pertaining to the ideology promoted there.

This space will also be described in Ovid's exilic experience, when the poet will revisit the Campus Martius in his exile poetry (*Pont.* 1.8), as he seeks to return to Rome. In exile, too, Ovid will become a Phaethon figure, whose forced exit from Rome leaves him far from his homeland.[168] A reading of the poet's references to Phaethon and his own exilic experience in the *Tristia* helps to provide a retrospective reading of the Roman monumental imagery in the *Metamorphoses.*[169]

Phaethon in the *Metamorphoses* becomes in death a figure deprived of his homeland, just as Ovid is in exile. Phaethon's fall into the Po leaves him far from his eastern homeland, but near to Rome (*Met.* 2.323: *procul a patria diverso maximus orbe*). For Ovid, exile will place him far from his homeland *and* from Rome. As Putnam has pointed out, the language used to describe Phaethon's resting place is regularly reproduced in Ovid's description of his exile, even leading him to question whether the Phaethon episode might have been edited in exile.[170] Ovid's descriptions of the

---

[167] Favro (2005), 257-8.

[168] Ovid describes his exile as a bolt to the head (*Tr.* 1.1.72), much as Jupiter's lightning bolt caused Phaethon's demise.

[169] The way in which mythological figures are used in exilic poetry, usually in order to portray his exilic experience, can help to inform a reading of these characters in Ovid's earlier texts. For example, *Tr.* 3.10.41-2 and Ovid's reference to Leander, hypothetically swimming in the icy Black Sea, which provides a retrospective exilic reading to *Heroides* 18-19 (for such a reading, see Thorsen 2018, 268-70). Similarly, the exilic potential of Daedalus and Icarus, who feature in *Ars Amatoria* 2 and *Metamorphoses* 8, is realised in the *Tristia* (see Sharrock 1994b, 168-73; Harrison 2007b, 136-37).

[170] Putnam (2001), 185-6. He states that [186] 'whether or not it was revised after Ovid's own exile, the episode of Phaethon also reflects his deep concern with the meaning of exile even if not yet experienced at first hand'.

journey one must make to reach him (*Tr*. 4.2.69 *aque* ***procul*** *Latio* ***diuersum*** *missus in* ***orbem***), and his own distance from Rome (*Pont.* 1.3.84 *tam* ***procul a patria*** *est horridiorue locus*) both contain language that aligns the extremity of his location in Tomis with Phaethon's resting place. The Phaethon tale introduces themes, therefore, which will be explored personally by Ovid in his exilic poetry.

In *Tristia* 1.1, as the poet speaks to his little book which he is sending back to Rome, he compares himself to Phaethon.[171] The similarity between the two works is cemented, as the poet of *Tristia* 1.1 then describes his fear of harm when returning to Rome, much as Phaethon, with hindsight, would fear the sky (*Tr.* 1.1.79-80):

> uitaret caelum Phaethon, si uiueret, et quos
> optarat stulte, tangere nollet equos.
>
> Phaethon would avoid the sky, if he were alive, and would not wish to touch the horses which he foolishly sought.

This passage has led most critics to focus on the similarities between Phaethon/Jupiter and Ovid/Augustus.[172] Huskey, for example, has argued that it is the *Ars Amatoria* (1.4-8), in which the poet presents himself as a charioteer, which is the cause of Ovid's fall from grace, aligning the poet with Phaethon.[173] There are, however, other similarities between *Metamorphoses* 2 and *Tristia* 1.1. One could also read the discussion of Ovid's relationship with his 'children' (his poems) in comparison with Sol's dysfunctional relationship with Phaethon. Comparison between the *Tristia* and Phaethon episode in *Metamorphoses* 2 also sheds light on

[171] See also *Tr.* 4.3.65-6.
[172] See Putnam (2001), 184-187; Huskey (2006b), 346-349.
[173] Huskey (2006b), 347.

Ovid's relationship with the city to which he sends back his books. The situation described in *Tristia* 1.1 is similar to the Phaethon episode, in that it is a speech of a father to his child which is also a propemptikon before a long journey.[174] The author is fearful of what might occur to his little book in Rome, much as the Sun fearfully advises Phaethon, anxious as to what Phaethon will face in the cosmos. Phaethon's ride is focalised by Ovid (*Tr.* 1.1.79-80 ***quos / optarat*** *stulte*), as he speaks to his literary offspring,[175] in a way which is similar to the Sun's reaction to Phaethon's request, as he suggests Phaethon seeks too much (*Met.* 2.54-6 *magna petis, Phaethon […], non est mortale,* ***quod optas***). Ovid stands as a Phaethon figure in exile, a fool who reached too high and suffered for it by the 'thunderbolt' of exile. Yet, he also becomes a Sol figure, as a parent who fearfully sends his offspring off on a journey he cannot control, to a destination which is fraught with dangers.[176]

Sol worries that his son might mistake the cosmological landscape through which he travels for the urban and developed landscape, warning instead that his path will be a journey through *monstra* of the zodiac (*Met.* 2.76-77):

> forsitan et lucos illic urbesque deorum
> concipias animo delubraque ditia donis
> esse? per insidias iter est formasque ferarum.
>
> Do you imagine that there are groves and cities of the gods there, and shrines rich with offerings? The way is through traps and the forms of wild beasts.

---

[174] See Barchiesi (2009), 166 on Phaethon's speech as an 'inverse propemptikon'.

[175] On the book as Ovid's child, see *Tr.* 1.1.115.

[176] In *Tristia* 3.4, the poet criticises Merops as a poor parent (*Tr.* 3.4.29-30 *nec natum in flamma uidisset, in arbore natas, / cepisset genitor si Phaethonta Merops*), characterising Phaethon's step-father's actions in a similar way to his own behaviour, which led to his exile and the need for one of his 'children' (the *Metamorphoses*) to be burnt (*Tr.* 1.7.19-20). On the *Metamorphoses* as a poetic child, see *Tr.* 1.7.35-6.

In the *Tristia*, the poet will disabuse the little book of any expectation that it will be sent to the Palatine or the home of Caesar so that it might avoid rejection (*Tr.* 1.1.69-72):

> forsitan expectes, an in alta Palatia missum
>    scandere te iubeam Caesarumque domum.
> ignoscant augusta mihi loca dique locorum!
>    uenit in hoc illa fulmen ab arce caput.
>
> Perhaps you're waiting to see whether I'll send you to the high Palatine or to ascend to Caesar's house. May those places, and the gods of those places, grant me pardon. From that citadel the thunderbolt hit my head.

In both passages, the father figure speaks of the landscape their offspring imagines visiting before explaining the reality. Both passages open with the use of *forsitan*, followed by a verb of expecting/thinking in the 2nd person (*concipias, expectes*) in the same line. Furthermore, the landscape which Sol describes, the groves and cities of the gods, can be equated to the *Palatia Caeli* which Ovid described at *Metamorphoses* 1.168-76. In *Tristia* 1.1, Ovid speaks of the Palatine itself, but he also suggests that this is a divine or cosmic space (1.71 *dique locorum*), perhaps also recalling his description in *Metamorphoses* 1. The landscape of imperial Rome and the sky which Phaethon traverses are equated, once again linking Rome and the cosmos. Yet, while Sol suggests that the flight of Phaethon will pass through much more dangerous places than the cities and groves, for the exiled poet, it is now the cities and groves which ostensibly become places which are a potential threat to him and his offspring.

One can consider the poet who wrote about Rome in his earlier corpus (not only in the *Ars Amatoria* but also the *Metamorphoses*) as a Phaethon figure: one who

reached too high and transgressed the established boundaries. At the same time, exilic poetry will also highlight Rome as a space which is like the remote cosmos about which the Sun warns, a place to which the poet fears to send his new poetry, afraid similar consequences will befall his new work. While in the *Metamorphoses,* Ovid's ascent to the cosmos is seen as a reflection of his great poetic ideas, in the exilic epistles, Rome will be seen as a place as difficult to reach as the cosmos, as the poet's ambitions to go beyond Rome are played out in a much more negative manner.

**Conclusion**

Even in the earliest stages of the formation of the world, the existence of imperial Rome is firmly anticipated in the *Metamorphoses*. As Ovid moves away from more urban subject matter and ascends from elegy to epic, the cosmos which he describes nevertheless appears to be an indication of Rome's future rise to greatness. As with elegy, the city remains central to the *Metamorphoses*. Augustan Rome stands as the *Urbs Aeterna* in the *Metamorphoses*, as traces of its landscape, and the events and interests which inspired that landscape, can be seen from the very beginning of the poem and the creation of the world. Yet, while Augustus was keen to promote 'notions of continuity, stability and fixity' in presenting Rome as an eternal city,[177] Ovid's epic poem shows that the foundations of Rome, like the world, are rooted in turmoil and disorder. His early tales about the formation of the world present

[177] Hardie (1992), 61.

opposing images of order and chaos; appropriately for a poem about metamorphosis, the world (and Rome) is never in a fixed state.

The tale of Phaethon foregrounds the poet's *tempora* and the beginning of Rome at the beginning of the world. The house of the Sun resembles different monuments from the Augustan era, celebrating the establishment and regulation of empire, as Ovid uses his text to create his own fictional monument which responds to contemporary Augustan architecture. Ovid's text shows a kind of intermediality, where his textual descriptions of buildings recall a number of real Roman architectural structures, each one identified depending on how the reader views the poet's text.

The orderly structure of the house of the Sun stands in firm opposition to the chaotic and disorderly ride of Phaethon, mimicking the process of chaos and order which occurred within the post-Actian world of Rome and the progress from republic to empire, which was celebrated within Augustan monuments. The chaos of Phaethon's ride, in contrast to the order and regularity of the house of the Sun and the usual course of Sol's chariot, can also indicate how, as Ovid begins his own epic journey and composes a poem which concludes with the creation of the Roman Empire, there is inherent disorder and a departure from the expected. Ovid diverges from well-established epic traditions, disrupting the linear path of Roman time, just as he will at the end of the *Fasti*. By doing this, a likeness can be seen between the poet and Phaethon, a likeness which will be expressed in the exilic elegies, with Augustan Rome overtly taking the place of the *Metamorphoses'* cosmic/Roman landscape and providing the backdrop to the poet's fall.

# CHAPTER 2

## *The Fasti*

### Calendrical monuments in Ovid's monumental calendar.

### Introduction

After establishing a clear relationship with Rome in the *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid continues to refer to the city in his epic *Metamorphoses*, as a constant presence in and influence on his work, despite the mythological narrative and universal epic subject matter. In the *Fasti*, as the poet returns to elegy, he returns to Augustan Rome for real, as the single and central focus of his work.[178] Picking up where the final books of the *Metamorphose*s left off, the *Fasti* tells of the founding of Rome. The poet describes the creation of the calendar and the religious festivals within it, which are the reason for Rome's religious architecture, as is set out in the early lines in the poem (*Fast.* 1.13-14):

> Caesaris arma canant alii: nos Caesaris aras,
> et quoscumque sacris addidit ille dies.
>
> Let others sing of Caesar's arms. I'll sing of Caesar's altars, and those days which he added to the sacred calendar.

Whereas indirect reference to urban monuments, such as the Horologium*,* was made in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* by means of mythological tales and allegorical buildings, his *Fasti* directly addresses the real buildings and monuments of his city, including

[178] On elegy as a particularly urban genre with a Romanocentric gaze see Welch (2005); Harrison (2013); Pinotti (2015), 37-57.

those created and restored by the imperial family. As Ovid 'writes up' these buildings, his elegiac poem should be considered as a kind of Roman construction itself. This chapter will argue that, like the inscribed monuments found in the Augustan city,[179] the *Fasti* is a monumental text inscribed with reminders of the monuments of Rome. As critics have commented, the epigraphic monuments in the city must have provided great inspiration for Augustan poets.[180] The *Fasti* in particular appears to respond to this architectural trend. Indeed, the poet creates his own poetic equivalent to the monumental calendrical *fasti*. Like these inscribed calendars in Rome, Ovid's elegy is a calendrical *monumentum*.[181]

In this consideration of how the text of the *Fasti* is a monumental poetic structure about Roman time, I shall analyse the different ways in which Ovid's calendrical poem maps onto and reflects the Augustan ordering and restoration of the religious calendar and the architecture associated with it. My reading of the poet's presentation of architectural structures within his Roman calendrical text will show how the text of the *Fasti* imposes its own poetic order and design on the city. Recent scholarship has discussed how Ovid navigates Rome and interacts with its

---

[179] Many have already argued the case that monuments are textual objects. Boyle (2003), 48 states that 'Rome's monuments were not only the texts of Rome's history […] but the archives of the city's defining memories'. See also Purcell (1989), 165; Vasaly (1993), 25. Meanwhile, for discussion on texts as Roman monuments see Fowler (2000), 193-217; Simpson (2002), 60-66.

[180] See Ramsby (2007); Dinter (2011, 2013). Welch (2005), 4: 'Augustan literature – richly self-conscious, politically aware, and sensitive to the nuances of all forms of art – reads and responds to the emerging city.' Nelis-Clement and Nelis (2014), 126-7: 'Occupés, comme Auguste, à construire leur propre monumentum littéraire, et en quête eux aussi d'une audience universelle, les poètes se sont montrés vivement concernés par la question de l'immortalité de leur nom et de leur œuvre. De ce fait, on ne saurait s'étonner qu'ils aient eu pleinement conscience de ce qu'Auguste était en train de faire et qu'ils aient réagi, dans leur propre medium, aux changements qu'ils voyaient se mettre en place autour d'eux.'

[181] On the multiple meanings of *monumentum,* eliding the architectural and the textual, see Introduction.

monuments within his elegiac-didactic text.[182] This reading of the text shows that Ovid in fact goes further, transforming the city into an elegiac, Ovidian landscape, as he ultimately creates his own textual structure which complements the monuments within Rome's urban topography.

Building on Lieberg's theory of the '*poeta creator*', which argues that a poet is doing himself what he describes in his text,[183] I shall study how the poet presents himself in the city and amongst the monuments which he describes. The Ovidian narrator's tour of Rome, as he relates different religious origin tales, will be considered as an active reflection of the poet's composition of a poem about Rome. As he discusses the architectural growth and advancement in Rome at the hands of imperial figures, in conjunction with the calendar, the poet himself takes on the role of his characters in that he creates his own Ovidian version of the city in his calendrical poem.

In the *Fasti*, Ovid sets himself at the very centre of Rome, almost as if he were one of its architects. Yet, one must question the implications of this as Ovid returns to the genre of elegy. As discussed in the Introduction, elegy is very much an urban

---

[182] Scholarship on the *Fasti* either focusses on the presentation of a specific monument (see Newlands 1994, Barchiesi 2002; A.Hardie 2007; Rohr Vio 2017), or as part of a study of the *Fasti* as a whole, most often as an assessment of how the poet's depiction of Roman religious and civic buildings aligns with or resists the imperial ideology of the Augustan building project. See Green (2004b); Herbert-Brown (1994); Barchiesi (1997a); Pasco-Pranger (2006), 79-86.

[183] Lieberg (1982) has posited the theory of the '*poeta creator*', a literary convention where the poet is described as doing that which he describes his characters doing. In his piece on the religious aspects of the '*poeta creator*' (1986, 23-32), he considers how poets are represented as poetic characters, in 'architectonic' terms, as representation of the 'poetic persona in action'. He discusses how Dracontius' poetry (17-21) puts into practice the creative process, discussing how Vergil is described entering Troy, sacking the walls and killing Priam by means of Neoptolomus. He also then considers how the later poet Ugo Foscolo depicts his poetic labour and creative inspiration by describing how he erected an altar to the Muses and comparing himself to a sculptor of the Graces and the reality of creative production.

genre. The poet's preoccupation with the city continues in the *Fasti,* as the poet who pointed out the amatory possibilities of the city's topography in the *Amores and Ars Amatoria* now celebrates, in extended aetiological elegy, the civic and religious function of Rome's urban landscape. One can find, in this, parallels with other elegiac works such as Callimachus' *Aetia,* and Propertius 4. What is unusual about the *Fasti* is the alignment of the poet's work with the monuments of Rome. Although elegists often present themselves as quasi-architects in that they create their own poetic *monumenta*, a division is established between text and architecture, as it is suggested that their poetry will outlast the architecture around them. Ovid's presentation of himself as a Roman *conditor*, his celebration of the monumental building structures in Rome*,* and his depiction of his *Fasti* as a textual equivalent to these structures will raise questions about how Ovid deals with this traditional contrast between architectural and poetic *monumenta*.

## PART 1: TIME AND SPACE IN OVID'S *FASTI*

Much like Ovid's other works, the *Fasti* responds to the architecture of the Augustan age. The *Fasti* can be viewed as its own kind of monumental form, as it takes for its subject matter calendrical time, which was presented in the Augustan age as a structural concept. In the Roman Empire, time was tracked by and expressed through architecture, as was discussed in the case of the Horologium in Chapter 1. The calendar was monumentalised, for example, in the form of the *fasti Capitolini*, the yearly calendar and list of consuls, which were inscribed on the Arch of Augustus in

the Roman forum.[184] Ovid's reference to the 'painted *fasti*' (*Fast.* 1.11 *pictos fastos*), in which Augustus and Tiberius featured, recalls the painted black and red letters demarcating the different days, and the names included in the *fasti* which were inscribed on monuments.[185]

The textual nature of *fasti* monuments, the arches, temples and boards on which the calendar was inscribed, is emphasised by the poet, making it possible to liken these Roman structures to his own elegiac *Fasti*. In Book 6, for example, Juno explains how she is honoured with a month named after her in a whole range of local calendars, including the Lanuvian, Laurentine and Arician and Tiburean calendars (6.59-61). She also speaks of one specific calendar in Praeneste (*Fast.* 6.59-63):

> inspice, quos habeat nemoralis Aricia fastos
> et populus Laurens Lanuviumque meum;
> est illic mensis Iunonius. inspice Tibur
> et Praenestinae moenia sacra deae;
> Iunonale leges tempus.
>
> Examine the *fasti* which wooded Aricia has, and the calendars of the Laurentine people and my Lanuvium; the month of June is there. Inspect the Tiber and the sacred walls of Praeneste's goddess. You'll read Juno's time there.

Juno's orders, to look at the sacred walls of the Praenestine goddess, allude to the marble *Fasti Praenestini*, inscribed with annotations by grammarian Verrius Flaccus,[186] which stood in the forum there (Suet. *Gram. et Rhet.* 17.1.1). The image

[184] See Taylor and Holland (1952) on the placement of the Capitoline *fasti* in Rome.
[185] See Feeney (2007), 176-78 and the inclusion of Augustus in the consular *fasti* as consul and tribune of the plebs.
[186] Newlands (1995), 11n39 considers the possibility of a calendrical commentary separate to the annotations. See also Pasco-Pranger (2006), 37 who argues that the calendar is an abridged version of a longer prose commentary. If this is the case, we can see a clear example of a calendrical text becoming a structure.

of ‘reading time’ (*Fast.* 6.63 *leges tempus*) on the *moenia sacra* cements the link between calendrical time, building structures and texts. In Juno’s eyes, not only can the concrete architectural structures displaying the calendar be viewed and read as textual entities, but time itself also.

Ovid, too, presents calendrical time as something which can be monumentalised, as an architectural marker of time or a text written about the calendar. The author of the *Fasti* presents himself as the *Romani conditor anni* (*Fast.* 6.21) who will use poetry to tell of the founding of Rome and Roman calendrical *aetia*. By setting himself up as a *conditor anni*, ‘the founder’ or ‘the composer’ of the year,[187] much like the Roman leaders and calendrical reformers, the poet aligns the calendrical year and the city with his poetic project.[188] The poet illustrates this link between the poem and the calendrical year in the proem of *Fasti* 6, when the internal narrator Juno describes the poet’s task (*Fast.* 6.22-4):

> ause per exiguos magna referre modos,
> ius tibi fecisti numen caeleste videndi,
> cum placuit numeris condere festa tuis.

> You, who dare to retell great things within scant measures, have made it your prerogative to see a heavenly power when it pleased you to set down festal days in your metre.

When discussing the composition of his subject matter in elegy (6.22 *exiguos modos*), the poet once again uses the polysemous *condere*. In doing so, he suggests that the composition of aetiological poetry, or the ‘construction’ of grand poetic material

[187] OLD s.v. ‘*condere*’: 10a ‘to found, establish (a city)’; 10b ‘to set up, establish (a temple, altar etc.)’; 14 ‘to compose, write’. See Rimell (2015), 40 who discusses the different meanings of the verb *condere*.
[188] Volk (1997) argues for the simultaneity between the calendrical year and Ovid’s poem.

within the confined space of the elegiac couplet, is a monumental task, like the creation of the Roman architecture on which the calendar could be read. It is uncertain whether or not Ovid really was trying to directly rival the calendrical reformers and city builders of his day, including Augustus, as Boyle has argued.[189] Nevertheless, he certainly appears to respond to their work, and even to emulate it.[190]

It is possible to compare Ovid's depiction of the composition of his poetic endeavour to the way that he describes the calendrical reforms made by Roman city builders and figures of power. Just as Ovid is the *Romani conditor anni*, Romulus is described in a similar manner when the poet relates how he divided the year into ten months (*Fast*. 1.27-28):

> tempora digereret cum conditor Urbis, in anno
>     constituit menses quinque bis esse suo.
>
> When the founder of the city was setting time in order, he established that there should be ten months in his year.[191]

Ovid's portrayal of Romulus as city founder and calendar maker establishes a parallel between time and space, and between the establishment of a physical city and the creation of a fixed calendrical framework. Furthermore, one could argue that the parallel between Romulus and Ovid as *conditores* also makes it possible to see Romulus as a poetic figure.[192] As he is described distributing calendrical time into ten

---

[189] Boyle (2003), 47: 'In the *Fasti,* Ovid is setting himself up as a rival *conditor* to Augustus.'
[190] Pasco-Pranger (2006), 79: 'The *Fasti* is to be conceived of as an emulation of the city- and calendar-builders.'
[191] See also *Fast*. 3.24 where Romulus is described as *Romani conditor urbis* which, as Pasco-Pranger (2006), 79 suggests, seems a direct, verbal parallel to the description of Ovid as *Romani conditor anni*.
[192] See Favro (1993), 235 on Roman leaders as 'writers': 'Augustus consciously rewrote Rome's urban text in his own words.'

(or twice five) months (28 *quinque bis*), this phrase is placed appropriately within the second half of the five-foot pentameter line, linking Romulus' calendrical organisation to poetic order. Not only is the calendar connected to the monuments of the city, but also to the metre of Ovid's text.[193]

This can be seen when Ovid describes how Julius Caesar reshaped the calendar and imposed mathematical order on the year (*Fast*. 3.161-5):

> ille moras solis, quibus in sua signa rediret,
> traditur exactis disposuisse notis.
> is decies senos ter centum et quinque diebus
> iunxit et e pleno tempora quinta die.
> hic anni modus est.
>
> He is said to have organised, in a precise table, the intervals in which the sun returned to its constellations. To three hundred and five days he joined sixty and a fifth part from a full day. This is the measure of the year.

As with the Romulean arrangement of time, Ovid's language here suggests a comparison between the Caesarean ordering of the calendar and the ordering of space and monuments,[194] and the metrical order needed for poetic production. The verb *disponere* which is used here to describe the ordering of calendrical time (162 *exactis disposuisse notis*) is often used to describe urban or architectural planning: Vitruvius speaks of *dispositio* (from *disponere*), or the arrangement of architecture (*De Arch.* 1.2.2).[195] This verb can also be used with a poetic sense, as is shown by

[193] As mentioned in Chapter 1, poetic metre is an arrangement of time, and long and short units of sound (OLD s.v. '*tempus*': 13 'a unit of length of sound.').
[194] On the ambiguity as to whether Caesar refers to Julius Caesar, and the calendrical reforms originally made by him, or Augustus, who put these reforms into practice see Pasco-Pranger (2006), 70-1. Either way, this passage shows the control of imperial power over the calendar.
[195] Pasco-Pranger (2006), 69 also comments on how this term is used by Caesar to describe his own martial organisation of troops, showing a Caesarean 'conquest' of calendrical time.

Propertius, who plays on the poetic and architectural meanings as he writes about the founding of Rome (Prop. 4.1a.57):

> moenia namque pio coner **disponere** uersu.
>
> For I shall try to lay out walls in pious verse.

Time is, therefore, subject to structure and order, much as illustrated by the monumental buildings which laid out and celebrated the organisation of time in the late Republic and early Empire. As something which is organised numerically, it is easy to draw parallels with the arrangement of poetic material in metrical feet. As a matter of fact, the Caesarean addition of sixty days and a fifth to the calendar (3.163-4 *is decies senos ter centum et quinque diebus / iunxit et e pleno tempora quinta die*) can be viewed as equivalent to the poet's metrical composition. The placement of the numeral *seni* in the hexameter line and the adjective *quintus* in the pentameter line echoes the number of feet within the contiguous lines of the elegiac couplet. Furthermore, in line 163, the numerical words used align with the metrical feet, as *ter* is placed in the third foot of the hexameter and *quinque* is placed in the fifth. The careful metrical play utilised to describe Caesar's accretion of days makes this temporal organisation comparable to the poet's task of composing the elegiac

*Fasti*.[196] The addition of days can be viewed as an alteration to the year which fits calendrical time within a metrical rhythm, aligning calendrical time and poetry.[197]

Thus, when the poet describes the new length of the year – after calendrical order and modification - as the *modus anni* (*Fast.* 3.165), it is possible to read this as the 'measure of the year', or indeed 'the metre of the year'. The noun *modus*, which Juno uses in *Fasti* 6 to describe the 'paltry' elegiac metre (6.22 *exiguos modos*), further suggests an analogous correlation between the framework of time and the generic constrictions of the poem.

Indeed, concrete evidence of this correlation can be seen in *Fasti* 2, when the poet speaks of the Feralia as the last day for propitiating the dead (2.567-8):

> nec tamen haec ultra, quam tot de mense supersint
> Luciferi, quot habent carmina nostra pedes.
>
> But this goes on only as long as there remains as many days in the month
> as there are feet in my verses.

Here, Ovid uses the number of feet in the elegiac couplet (eleven) as a means of numerically indicating the date of the festival and the remaining days of February which follow it. The poet connects the months with his metre and uses the elegiac couplet as a unit of calendrical measurement. As the year becomes measurable by

[196] Barchiesi (1997a), 74 discusses how the year regulates the narrative rhythm, including that the poet has the same number of books as there are in the year. He discusses examples of connectivity between the year and the books of the poem, such as the fact that the poet speaks of the equinox (3.878) just before the half way point of the poem, making this point of the poem equinoctial and syncing up year and text. Barchiesi argues that time makes extratextual demands on the composition of the poem. The control of figures in power over time can also be read as analogous to the poetic and metric demands placed by the poet upon the calendrical year which makes up the poem and has become a poetic form in itself.

[197] Volk (2002), 232-45 has argued that a similar pattern occurs in Manlius' *Astronomica*. She discusses how shared vocabulary is used to refer to the poem and the astronomical poetic matter. She also discusses how Manlius presents the poem and the universe as sharing the same musical structure.

metrical rhythm, it can subsequently be seen to possess its own kind of metre. The Julian/Augustan calendar, made up of festal days and religious rites, becomes a kind of textual entity which is also subject to the order and poetic constraints laid down by the elegist.

Time, space and poetry are aligned within Ovid's *Fasti.* Much as Roman monuments can be compared to texts, inscribed with the Roman calendar which is organised carefully into its own kind of metre, Ovid's own calendrical poem, which includes a record of the religious calendar in extended elegy, can be seen as an alternative *fasti* monument. Just as Lieberg argues that the poet carries out the same actions as the characters within his poem,[198] when Ovid writes about city builders and calendrical reformers, he, too, becomes involved in constructing a version of the city in his poetry, while creating his own monumental *Fasti.*

**Poetic Simultaneity: Ovid 'writes up' Rome**

The constructed medium of calendars and calendrical time can be seen within Ovid's *Fasti,* as calendrical time, monuments and text come together. Just as the calendar was, itself, presented in monumental form, Ovid's calendar includes a record of Roman buildings associated with the religious calendar. In spite of a lack of multiple, extended, architectural descriptions,[199] the landscape and buildings of the city of Rome are, even if often only briefly, carefully and consistently catalogued within the

[198] Lieberg (1986), 23-32.

[199] This absence has been noted by Green (2004b) who ascribes it to political reasons, to the poet's exilic state, and possible inability to remember buildings in detail when revising the *Fasti.*

text of the *Fasti*,[200] just as the Roman calendrical and consular *fasti* were inscribed upon the monuments of the city.[201] While describing temples and public monuments within his *Fasti*, Ovid signposts the relationship between physical buildings and the monumentality of his extended Roman elegy. In depicting urban space, Ovid's text becomes a kind of virtual cityscape – a means of evoking images of, and locating the reader in, buildings and religious sites in Rome.

As part of her study of poetic simultaneity in the *Fasti*,[202] Volk has analysed the 'scene changes' in the poem, and the way in which the poet locates himself at different points in the city. She argues that the poet's portrayal of his movement through the urban landscape attests to the narrative progression which is contemporaneous with the composition of the poem.[203] Going further, the poet's use of the text in order to place himself, and his readers, within the spatial landscape of the city means that the narrative of the text can be read as its own, equivalent form of urban landscape through which poet and reader may progress, just as the city itself can be viewed as a textual entity to be read and interpreted.

Ovid describes the occurrence of religious festivals and his conversations with informants about these festivals in ways which allow the reader to imagine the poet visiting different sites in Rome in order to source aetiological information. The informants with whom the poet converses, in a manner similar to his aetiological

---

[200] For the entire catalogue of Ovid's references to Roman building structures in the *Fasti*, and Ovid's other works, see Boyle (2003).
[201] See Feeney (2007), 167-189 on the creation and placement of different *fasti* in Rome.
[202] According to Volk (2002), 13, poetic simultaneity is 'the illusion that a poem is really only coming into being as it evolves before the readers' eyes, that the poet/persona is composing it 'as we watch''.
[203] Volk (1997), 293-302.

predecessor Callimachus,[204] often provide details about the settings in which these aetiological dialogues take place. In *Fasti* 5, for example, when the poet asks the Tiber to explain the custom of throwing straw men from the Pons Sublicius, the Tiber himself raises his head from the river to provide an explanation (*Fast.* 5.621-62), allowing the reader to imagine the poet on the bank of the Tiber (5.635), or on the bridge itself, as he learns of the custom.[205]

The foregrounding of Roman space in the text of Ovid's *Fasti* is further illustrated in the language used to depict Roman religious sites and building structures. When discussing the rites of the gods, the poet often utilises verbs such as *aspicere* or *videre* as an instruction to the reader to look at a temple or statue, as if standing in front of it.[206] Deictic markers are also frequently used, often in conjunction with this type of imperative.[207] Such a combination of lexical markers can be seen during the description of the shrine of Minerva Capta, used in order to spatially orientate the reader (*Fast.* 3.835-38):

> Caelius ex alto qua mons descendit in aequum
> **hic, ubi** non plana est, sed prope plana via
> parva **licet videas** Captae delubra Minervae
> quae dea natali coepit habere suo.

[204] See Newlands (1992), 39; Myers (1994), 67-73.

[205] See also *Fast*. 1.63-88 (Ovid watches the procession of the consuls to the Capitoline), 3.698 (Vesta speaks from the hearth), 4.905-42 (the poet speaks with the *flamen* in the Robigalia procession while on the road from Nomentum to Rome), 6.395-416 (the old woman at the forum/site of the Lacus Curtius speaks about Vertumnus).

[206] See, for example, *Fast*. 3.436-40 and Ovid's description of the Temple of Veiovis, where he instructs the reader to look upon the young face of Jupiter (*aspice*) and note his lack of thunderbolts, and *Fast.* 4.187-90, where the poet instructs the Quirites to watch (*spectate*) the procession of the Galli, before he is frightened by the noise of the clashing cymbals and droning flutes.

[207] For uses of deictic markers, specifically the formula *hic, ubi…* see *Fast*. 1.463-4 *tu quoque lux eadem, Turni Soror, aede receipt / hic ubi Virginea Campus obitur aqua*, 2.391 *hic, ubi nunc fora…*, 6.791-2 *Lucifero subeunte Lares delubra tulerunt / hic, ubi fit docta multa corona manu*. See Volk (1997), 299 on this topic.

> Where the Caelian mount descends from its height into the plain, here,
> where the street is not level but nearly level, you may see the small shrine
> of Minerva Capta, which the goddess began to own on her birthday.

With this ekphrastic presentation of space, the poet locates his reader at the shrine of Minerva in order to explain the aetiology of the temple's name. He uses the deictic marker *hic* to help illustrate notable topographical characteristics of the space, indicating the extra-textual context of the narrative. Combined with the poet's use of the second person, jussive form of *videre* (837 *videas*), the text demands that the reader imagine the buildings and topography of Rome, locating us as readers in front of the shrine, as if we were really walking around the city.[208]

In the poet's ekphrastic description of this temple, the topographic and the textual merge. This is further illustrated in the poet's discussion of the sources from which he discovered the origin of Minerva Capta's name. As the poet lists variant etymologies of Minerva Capta's name, he states that one version – that she was brought to Rome as a captive of the Falerii – was provided by an ancient inscription (*Fast*. 3.843-4):

> an quia perdomitis ad nos captiva Faliscis
> venit? et in signo littera prisca docet.

> Or because she came to us as a captive from Falerii? The ancient letters
> on the statue even attest this.[209]

[208] For another occasion which combines a verb of sight with deictic markers, see Ovid's description of the Atria of Vesta (*Fast.* 6.261-4): *quae **nunc** aere **vides**, stipula tum tecta videres, / et paries lento vimine textus erat. / **hic locus** exiguus, qui sustinet Atria Vestae, / tunc erat intonsi regia magna Numae.* While the use of *nunc* is used to highlight the newness of the Atria in contrast with the past, combined with *vides* it also locates the reader at the temple contemporaneously with the poet's narrative description. See also *Fast*. 6.395: *forte revertebar festis Vestalibus illa, / quae Nova Romano nunc Via iuncta foro est. / **huc** pede matronam **vidi** descendere nudo.*

[209] See Heyworth (2019), 257 on the manuscript tradition of these lines.

The poet preserves this aetiology within the *Fasti*, and in doing so, the words of his text take on the didactic function of the inscription, likening the form of his poem to the religious structure on which this aetiology was originally inscribed.[210] Thus, studying the text locates us as readers in Rome, and allows us to survey its temples; by reading these words in the poem, we also find ourselves outside the temple, reading the inscription found there.

As his poem relates the religious aetiologies of Rome, Ovid leads the reader around the religious topography of the city, creating an urban landscape within the text. While critics have argued that the Roman cityscape can be 'read' as an urban text,[211] the text of the *Fasti* evokes and constructs its own cityscape: an Ovidian version of Rome. The reader is prompted to recall images of Roman architecture through references to Ovid's conversations with religious individuals and experience of religious festivals and, subsequently, the text becomes interconnected with the city's topography.

Not only does Ovid's poem locate himself and his reader within the city of Rome, but Ovid's siting of himself within the city also informs the reader about the type of poetry he is now composing. After watching the procession of the consuls on the Capitoline (*Fast.* 1.63-88),[212] Ovid's urban tour and aetiological exploration begins in his own home, where Janus appears to him while busy with his writing tablets (*Fast.*

---

[210] Miller (1992), 25 postulates that the inscription was 'presumably affixed to the cult statue or elsewhere located in the *delubrum Minervae Captae*'.

[211] See Favro (1993).

[212] Volk (1997), 295 suggests that one should locate Ovid on the Capitoline during the procession of the consuls, arguing that the scene then changes to Ovid's home. It is also possible, however, to imagine Ovid watching the procession from his home, which was situated in the close vicinity. On the location of Ovid's home near the Capitol, see *Tr.* 1.3.29-30.

1.93-4). This passage may reveal something about the nature of Ovid's aetiological elegy. Here, at the beginning of the *Fasti*, Ovid is found in a setting in which he was regularly seen in his earlier elegy, including during amatory encounters, such as in *Amores* 1.5. This time, however, the figure who appears in an epiphany is not Corinna, whose appearance in *Amores* 1.5 indicated the poet's status as an elegiac lover, but Janus, as the poet's domestic setting takes on characteristics of Callimachus' encounter with Apollo at the beginning of the *Aetia* (*Aet*. 1.1.21-2).[213] This reuse of Ovid's house, as a backdrop for study and religious discussion rather than amatory encounters may signpost the aetiological nature of his new elegiac work. As the poem continues, Ovid ventures out of the house and appears to locate himself at multiple sites in the city, as discussed above. One could see this movement as a metaphor for the progression made by Ovid in the *Fasti* from traditional elegy and its enclosed amatory locations.

The poet's conversation with the goddess Juno, at the opening of *Fasti* 6, sees another location which can provide information about the poet's text, as it can be considered as both a metaphorical and real Roman space. Here, the poet describes himself in a sacred grove, usually a metaphor for poetic inspiration, in which he discusses the etymological origin of the month of June with the goddess Juno. In this case, however, it is possible to locate the grove within the city of Rome, as the poetic and urban ramifications of this setting can be considered (*Fast.* 6.7-16):

> fas mihi praecipue voltus vidisse deorum,
>   vel quia sum vates, vel quia sacra cano.
> est nemus arboribus densum, secretus ab omni

[213] See Hardie (1991), 58; Volk (1997), 296.

voce locus, si non obstreperetur aquis. 10
hic ego quaerebam coepti quae mensis origo
esset, et in cura nominis huius eram.
ecce deas vidi, non quas praeceptor arandi
viderat, Ascraeas cum sequeretur oves,
nec quas Priamides in aquosae vallibus Idae 15
contulit: ex illis sed tamen una fuit.

> It is permitted for me particularly to see the faces of the gods, either because I am a *vates* or because I sing about sacred things. There is a grove thick with woods, a place cut off from all sound except the roaring of water. I was seeking here what the origin of the new month was, and this name was an object of my care. Behold, I saw the goddesses; not those which the tutor of ploughing saw when he followed the Ascraean sheep. Nor were they those which the son of Priam compared in the vales of watery Ida, but there was one from these goddesses.

The poet speaks of his role as *vates* (*Fast*. 6.8) and gives an ekphrastic description of his visit to the wooded grove (6.9-12). The poetic and programmatic nature of this grove is clear to see.[214] The space can be likened to those groves portrayed in poems such as Propertius 3.3, Vergil's *Georgics* 3.40-1 and *Amores* 3.1.[215] Littlewood has drawn parallels between this passage at the beginning of *Fasti* 6 and the beginning of *Fasti* 5, Ovid's conversation with the Muses in the grove on Helicon,[216] but similarities can also be identified with *Amores* 3.1, the first poem of the final book of the *Amores*, thus linking up with the final book of the *Fasti*. In this elegy, the wooded location provides the setting for the poet's conversation with two divine women (*Am.* 3.1.5-6). The poet seeks instruction (*Am.* 3.1.5-6 *hic…quaerebam*) about what type of poetry to write, advised by Elegy and Tragedy. In the grove described at the beginning of *Fasti* 6, the poet is similarly seeking information (*Fast.* 6.10 *hic quaerebam*); this

[214] See Littlewood (2006), 9-10.
[215] See Hunter (2006), 28-32 on the grove as a metaphor for poetic inspiration.
[216] Littlewood (2006), 7.

time, the reason for the month of June's name, a topic which is debated by three female rivals. Yet, as in *Amores* 3.1, Juno also offers Ovid programmatic instruction about what form his elegiac work should take (*Fast.* 6.22-4).

Although similar to the poetic groves in other literature, Ovid rejects the idea that this is the kind of landscape frequented by the Hesiodic Muses or the goddesses of the Homeric judgement of Paris (6.13-16), indicating that the goddesses who are about to appear are different to those in well-known epic. By rejecting these famous scenes which, in Hesiod's case particularly, were inspiration for other poets, including Callimachus and Ennius, the poet appears also to indicate the real nature of the grove. No *locus amoenus* on Ida or Heliconian grove is this; after Ovid's foregrounding of real-life Roman locations within his text, it is easier to imagine this grove within Rome's boundaries. The opening of the passage (9 *est nemus*) sets up an ekphrastic description of the landscape. Within this ekphrasis, the deictic markers such as *hic* (11) and *ecce* (12), allow one to vividly imagine Ovid leading his readers around the city and pointing out the place where this epiphany apparently occurred, presenting an actual rather than idealised *locus*.[217]

Ovid states that he first recognised Juno in the grove as she resembled the cult statue found in the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (*Fast.* 6.18 *haec erat, agnovi, quae stat in arce Iovis*), linking Juno to her sanctuaries in Rome. The initial appearance of this goddess in the grove, as well as her discussion of her different honorary Roman

[217] Although Volk (1997), 309-10 casts aspersions on the reality of the events described here, that does not mean Ovid's description does not evoke imagery of a real, Roman setting.

titles (33-40),[218] appears to locate the author in the real, sacred grove (or *lucus*) which surrounded the Temple of Juno Lucina on the Esquiline.[219] By comparison, the grove on the Esquiline is directly described at *Fasti* 2.435-6 (*monte sub Esquilio multis incaeduus annis / Iunonis magnae nomine lucus erat*), an occasion when Ovid also discusses the etymology of Juno Lucina's title (449-50), and the link between *lucus* and Lucina. Thus, although the shaded, dense grove of *Fasti* 6 (9 *nemus arboribus densum*) may lead readers to recall symbolic 'uncut forests',[220] such as are seen in *Amores* 3.1, it may equally recall the wooded space on the Esquiline (*Fast.* 2.435 *multis incaeduus annis*).

The poet's placement of his discussion with Juno against the backdrop of a grove which is outside of the realm of Hesiod and Homer, and which may even be a real Roman setting, can be viewed as a comment on the nature of his text. Ovid blurs the lines between real and poetic, as the grove in which he finds inspiration appears to be one located within the city rather than at a site from myth. The topography of Rome now appears to be his text's main inspiration, as the text he is composing can be located within the city of Rome, emphasising the urban nature of this Augustan, aetiological elegy.

As a response to the monumentalisation of Roman time in the Augustan city, Ovid ties together time and space in the text of the *Fasti*. The textual nature of the

---

[218] Cf. *Fast.* 6.39-40: *an facient mensem luces, Lucinaque ab illis / dicar et a nullo nomina mense traham?*

[219] Littlewood (2006), 10: 'Ovid does not identify his grove, but the appearance of Juno might suggest to Roman readers the grove sacred to Juno below the Esquiline.' Two of the three goddesses who appear in the grove had temples on the Esquiline (the temple and grove of Juno Lucina and the Temple of Concordia, erected by Livia (*Fast.* 6.637-38), while Iuventas' temple stood in the Circus Maximus.

[220] See Hinds (1998), 11-14.

calendar, which was inscribed on monuments in the Roman world, is emphasised as calendrical time is presented as a concept which can be ordered and regulated, much as poetry is organised into metrical couplets in Ovid's texts. At the same time, monumental Roman space is revealed as something which can be accessed through a text. Ovid's poem helps the reader to be present in Rome, allowing us to imagine ourselves there even at the very moment when Ovid is composing the *Fasti.* The poem provides an Ovidian version of Rome and its famous building structures and, in doing so, writes itself into the cultural memory of the city.[221] This Roman landscape also sheds light on Ovid's *Fasti*. If we view the Ovidian narrator's trip around Rome as a reflection of, and simultaneous to, the composition of a poem about the city, it is possible to make inferences around the nature of Ovid's text from the depictions of different monuments and urban locations.

## PART 2: THE *AEDES HERCULIS MUSARUM*

Having considered the way in which Ovid approaches time and space in his calendrical poem, the focus of this chapter will now be directed to one specific building described in the poem. The *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, the final monument described in Ovid's *Fasti* (*Fast*. 6.797-812), can be viewed as the ultimate example of a textual structure in the poem. The temple to Hercules and the Muses was founded around or after 179BC by Fulvius Nobilior.[222] It stood in the Campus Martius, close to the Circus

[221] Rather than taking the view, set out by Boyle (2003), 46-9, that the poet sets up his depiction of Rome as a rival to Augustan urban development, I would suggest that the *Fasti* simply highlights the possibility of reading buildings, like texts, in multiple ways.
[222] On the date of the temple, see Skutsch (1944),79; Rüpke (1995), 199; Boyle (2003), 169.

Flaminius and the Portico of Octavia. Within this temple stood cult statues of Hercules Musagetes and the Muses, brought back to Rome by Fulvius after his campaign in Ambracia, along with a bronze shrine to the Camenae, supposedly from the time of Numa, which once stood in the Temple of Honos and Virtus.[223] In bringing the statues of the Muses back to Rome, Fulvius became an equivalent to Hercules, as leader of the Muses.[224] The placement of these statues in the temple, along with the shrine to the Camenae, can be seen as the architectural counterpart of a poetic act ascribed to the epic poet Ennius: the transference of the Muses from Greece to Rome and the translation of Greek poetic traditions to Latin literature.[225] Indeed, Fulvius and Ennius can be clearly linked, as Fulvius was notably accompanied on the campaign to Ambracia by Ennius, in whose epic Fulvius featured, possibly at the end of book 15.[226] The founding of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* by Fulvius was also believed to have been related within Ennius' work.[227]

Within the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, Fulvius Nobilior's *fasti* were also found. This calendar, which included notes on the etymology of the names of months,[228] was painted inside the temple (or possibly kept in book form, as will be later discussed). Critics have argued that the *fasti* in the temple was related to Ennius' *Annals*, a text

---

[223] Serv. *Aen*. 1.8. See Boyle (2003), 269.
[224] On the significance of Hercules, as a poetic figure, in the temple see Littlewood (2006), 230; A. Hardie (2007), 562-64.
[225] A. Hardie (2007), 561 argues that the temple's 'indigenous and imported artistic traditions […] may owe something to Ennius'.
[226] On the possible content of this episode, see Newlands (1994), 135; Gildenhard (2007), 85; A. Hardie (2007), 560-61.
[227] Skutsch (1985), 553; Elliot (2013), 62 on *Ann*. 15.
[228] Feeney (2007), 169-70.

about the founding and rise of Rome.[229] Some have even gone so far as to argue that Ennius could even have 'ghostwritten' these *fasti.*[230] Whatever the case, a synergistic relationship between architecture and poetry, and between Fulvius, the temple founder, and Ennius, the annalistic poet, can be seen within this space.[231]

This temple was later restored and renovated by Lucius Marcius Philippus, around 29BC, and a new Portico was built around the temple.[232] It is this restoration that features in Ovid's description of the temple on the 30th of June, as the final day of his six book *Fasti* (*Fast*. 6.797-812):

> Tempus Iuleis cras est natale Kalendis:
>    Pierides, coeptis addite summa meis.
> dicite, Pierides, quis vos addixerit isti,
>    cui dedit invitas victa noverca manus. 800
> sic ego. sic Clio: 'clari monumenta Philippi
>    aspicis, unde trahit Marcia casta genus,
> Marcia, sacrifico deductum nomen ab Anco,
>    in qua par facies nobilitate sua est.
> par animo quoque forma suo respondet; in illa 805
>    et genus et facies ingeniumque simul.
> nec quod laudamus formam, tu turpe putaris:
>    laudamus magnas hac quoque parte deas.
> nupta fuit quondam matertera Caesaris illi.
>    o decus, o sacra femina digna domo!' 810
> sic cecinit Clio. doctae assensere sorores;
>    adnuit Alcides increpuitque lyram.

> Tomorrow is the birthday of the kalends of July. Muses, add the final touches to the work begun. Tell me, Muses, who joined you to him, to

[229] Hannah (2013), 84 has suggested that, if the *fasti* of Fulvius contained a consular list as well as calendrical days, 'the approach to time that these represent is congruent with Ennius' sequential approach to history'. See also Newlands (1994), 135; Barchiesi (1997a), 270; Gildenhard (2007), 84-6; Heslin (2015), 206 on the connection between Fulvius' *fasti* and Ennius' *Annales.* On the relationship between Fulvius and Ennius see Skutsch (1944), 79; Heslin (2015), 204-7.
[230] See Rüpke (2006), 508-12.
[231] This is identified by Cicero, who connects poetry and monuments in his defence of Archias (*Arch.* 27.4). He speaks of the respective connections between the monuments established and decorated by Decimus Brutus and Fulvius Nobilior and the poetry of Accius and Ennius.
[232] On the possible renovations made, see Heslin (2015), 207-14.

> whom the defeated step-mother was forced to reluctantly surrender. Thus, I spoke. Clio spoke thus: 'You see the monument of brilliant Philippus, from whom chaste Marcia is descended. Marcia, whose name comes from sacrificial Ancus; her form is equal to her nobility. Her beauty goes with her character. She has noble birth, beauty and talent all at once. Don't think it unsightly that we praise her beauty; we praise the great goddesses in this place also. Caesar's aunt was once married to Philippus. Oh grace, oh female worthy of the sacred house!' Thus sang Clio. The learned sisters agreed. Hercules nodded and twanged his lyre.

Critics have argued that Ovid focusses solely on the newly renovated Portico of Philippus in *Fasti* 6. Arguing that no clear reference is made to Fulvius or Ennius, Barchiesi maintains that there is a 'glaring omission' in the temple's description, as Ovid does not specifically mention Fulvius Nobilior's *fasti* and the older history of the temple.[233] Heslin makes a similar case, positing that Ovid's calendrical poem supersedes the *Annals*, just as Philippus remodels and restores the Fulvian temple and adds a new portico.[234] It is also possible, however, to view Ovid's interview with Clio and the description of the temple as a way of recalling and preserving the original structure of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, the temple's original founder, the *fasti* contained with it and the annalistic poetic tradition associated with it. When such a view is taken, the celebration of the temple in its renovated form does not merely replace the original building, just as Ovid's textual *Fasti* does not write other *fasti* out of the calendrical tradition and architectural space. Rather, the renovated temple ultimately acts as a reminder of the original form of the temple, just as Ovid's *Fasti* supplements the material form of the *fasti* found in the temple.

[233] Barchiesi (1997a), 269.
[234] Heslin (2015), 203.

In what follows, the structural layout of *Fasti* 6 will be considered, as reading the book as a whole makes it possible to identify references to Fulvius and Ennius in Ovid's text. The thematic balance of the ring composition found there matches the discussion of disorder and concord in *Fasti* 6, both mapping onto the poem's overall dialogue on the ordering of the cosmos, the calendar and the cityscape, while also reflecting the original context of concord in which the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* was constructed. To further illustrate the Fulvian presence in the *Fasti,* Ovid's presentation of himself at the site of the temple, using poetic simultaneity, will also be considered. The final passage of *Fasti* 6 will be compared to a passage in *Fasti* 1, where Ovid presents himself speaking to the Muse about a *fasti*. Both passages will be read together in order to show how Ovid makes reference to Fulvius' work, as he invites his readers to imagine him composing his text in the temple and reading a form of Fulvius' *fasti*.

In spite of these Fulvian/Ennian connections, Ovid's reasons for speaking about the contemporary, Philippian version of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* at the end of the *Fasti* will also be considered. Ovid's *fasti* and description of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* will be considered as a (possibly exilic) revisionary addendum to both the annalistic tradition and the poet's earlier texts. The way in which Ovid depicts the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, its decoration and its renovation, can shed light on the context of the poem's composition, firmly establishing a connection between Ovid's poetry and the religious and calendrical architecture in Rome.

**Locating Fulvius and Ennius in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* and Ovid's *Fasti***

It might be said that, within Ovid's discussion of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* in *Fasti* 6, Fulvius and his *fasti* are, to use the intertextual term,[235] 'present under erasure' rather than a 'glaring omission'. It is fair to say that the calendrical format and narrative of Ovid's own *Fasti*, which describes this temple, acts as an unavoidable textual reminder of this earlier version by Fulvius. Ovid inscribes the building, on the walls of which the calendar may have once been inscribed, into his own calendrical poem and makes his own text a structure in which physical, inscribed monuments are found.[236]

Fulvius and Ennius are not distinctly mentioned in this final part of the text, but this does not mean that they are not present in the *Fasti.* In the proem of Book 1, the poet discusses his source material for the *Fasti*: he describes how Germanicus will read about rites which have been 'dug up from the *Annals*' (*Fast.* 1.7 *sacra recognosces annalibus eruta priscis*),[237] which could easily be a reference to Ennian hexameter poetry, a source for the poet's work.[238] Ovid also states that Germanicus and Augustus will receive *praemia*, just like those which adorn the 'painted *fasti*' (1.11 *pictos signantia fastos*), highlighting the calendrical tradition which existed

---

[235] See Fowler (1997), 17 on the intertextual theory and erasure.
[236] In terms of similarities between poetic and architectural structures see Wallace-Hadrill (1987), 227, who discusses the similarities between the Praenestine *fasti*, set up in the forum, and the Ovidian *Fasti*, including the textual similarity between poem and inscription, such as the confinement of each month, respectively, to one tablet and to one book of the poem. He argues that 'any contemporary seeing Ovid's new poem would find an image vividly evoked of the sort public monument he would meet in the forum at Praeneste and doubtless in Rome too'.
[237] See also *Fast*. 4.11-12: *tempora cum causis* ***annalibus*** *eruta priscis / lapsaque sub terras ortaque signa cano*. The poet places the *Annals* at the beginning and middle of his text, before providing a temple which is an architectural embodiment of the Ennian appropriation of the Muses at the end. Ennius is present throughout the structure of the *Fasti*.
[238] See Green (2004a), 35 on this passage. See also Prop. 3.1.15 *multi, Roma, tuas laudes annalibus addent,* and Green and Morwood (2011), 101 who argue that this is an Ennian reference.

before him from the outset of the poem. At the opening of his text, as he prepares to sing of temples and days added to the calendar (1.13-14), Ovid thus mentions both *Annals* and *fasti*. At the close of his text, one finds a temple with which the Ennian *Annals* was associated and in which the Fulvian *fasti* was placed. Thus, the *Annals* and the *fasti* are both present in tandem once again. Accordingly, the beginning and ending of the poem correspond and the structural circularity of the text places both temple architect and author in the final passage of the text and within the *Aedes Herculis Musarum.*

There is, furthermore, unspoken reference to the original architect of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* and the *fasti* he created. It is the poet's questions about the combination and alliance of different divinities (*Fast.* 6.799-800), rather than Clio's answer about the temple, which act as a reference to the true author of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* and the *fasti* depicted there. The poet's question comes in two parts: an enquiry as to who conjoined the Muses with Hercules (6.799 *dicite, Pierides, quis vos addixerit isti*), and a reference to the harmony between the once rivalrous Juno and Hercules (800 *cui dedit invitas victa noverca manus*).[239] Both examples of divine unification locate Fulvius Nobilior at the *Aedes Herculis Musarum.*

The real, unspoken answer to Ovid's questions at *Fast*. 6.799-800 is, of course, Fulvius, who brought home the statues of the Muses and placed them together with Hercules in the temple. Yet, Ovid's questions to the Muse of History elicit a response which includes a description of the temple's restoration by Philippus and the beauty

[239] On Juno's link to the Muses, see A. Hardie (2007), 552-560.

and ancestral lineage of his daughter, Marcia. By this point in the text, however, and after multiple aetiologies given for the same religious rites,[240] the reader should know that there is frequently more than one answer to any aetiological question in the *Fasti*. To take Clio's answer to the question at face value, and to believe that Fulvius does not lurk in the background of the poet's dialogue as a possible variant to be narrated, would be a narrower reading than Ovid tends to encourage. The way Ovid's questions are posed allows the reader to insert Fulvius and the history of the temple into the text.

Ovid's mention of the harmony found between Juno and Hercules (*Fast.* 6.800) also provides, by mythological allusion, the context of the original construction of the temple, which was built against a backdrop of discord and harmony between Fulvius Nobilior and Aemilius Lepidus. Once bitter rivals, these two men were publicly reconciled as Censors in 179BC, leading to the construction of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* beside the Temple of Juno Regina, which Lepidus had already begun building near to the Circus Flaminius.[241] Both temples were the product, and an architectural celebration, of the newly established *concordia* between the two enemies.[242] The discord and harmony between Juno and Hercules, charted within the structural framework of *Fasti* 6, maps onto these historical events.[243]

---

[240] On this topic, see Miller (1992); Newlands (2006).
[241] Liv. 40.52. See A. Hardie (2007), 561: 'The timing of Fulvius' embarkation on his Temple of Hercules, in 179, thus looks like the product of their concord.'
[242] See Liv. 40.51-52 on the *concordia* of the two men and the outcome of this concordance, including the construction of the Temple of Juno Regina and the *Aedes Herculis Musarum.*
[243] See A. Hardie (2007), 566-570 on other instances of concord in *Fasti* 6, including the reconciliation of the Muses after discord in *Fasti* 5.

At the beginning of *Fasti* 6, during the debate between Juno, Iuventas and Concordia about the naming of June, there is reference to the discord between Juno and Hercules, through the medium of Hercules' wife. A rival to the queen of the gods herself, Iuventas is also clearly associated with, and acts as a reminder of Juno's hatred for, the hero. She is identified first and foremost as *Herculis uxor* (6.65, 6.78) rather than as Iuventas or the daughter of Juno.[244] Unlike Juno, who believes June is named after herself, Iuventas believes Iunius is derived from *iuvenes* (6.83-9) and argues that she deserves the honour, due to Hercules' role in slaying Cacus and bringing the cows to Rome (6.79-82),[245] once again providing a reminder of Juno's rival. Thus, the charting of the enmity and reconciliation of these two mythological figures links the beginning and ending of Book 6 in a ring composition, creating thematic balance.[246]

Further links between the beginning and ending of *Fasti* 6 can be seen in the different arguments of the goddesses, placing Fulvius firmly in the framework of the

---

[244] The enmity of Juno towards Hercules may also be hinted at due to the fact she lists her famed anger towards different mythological men (6.41-48), among whom he was included, although not mentioned here. She speaks of Dardanus, Paris and Ganymede and Aeneas (she refers to the fact she has placed Latium before Carthage, leading readers to recall the *Aeneid* and her former role as Aeneas' prime antagonist). A reader well versed in mythology would also remember her hatred of Hercules, particularly when his wife speaks immediately after Juno.

[245] This story is told in full at *Fast*. 1.543-586.

[246] The presence of Concordia at the beginning of *Fasti* 6, as the third goddess in this competition, may also establish a link between the beginning and end of the book and foreshadow Ovid's mention of the reconciliation between Juno and Hercules. Some (see Feeney 2006, 485-6; Newlands 1994, 137,140-41) have argued for the case that there is a discordant note to the ending of the *Fasti*, arguing that the twang (*Fast.* 6.812 *increpuit lyram*) of Hercules' lyre is a dissonant final sound (see Barchiesi 1997, 268-69 for a more positive reading). I would argue that these elements of the passage reflect the process towards ultimate concord and harmony rather than a detraction from it. To highlight this, one might compare Juno's unwilling reconciliation with Hercules (6.800) to the softening of Juno's anger and her conciliation towards the Trojans at *Aen*. 12.809, another occasion which displays reluctant reconciliation in order to find harmony for a greater cause. On the reconciliation of Juno as an ongoing process, see Feeney (1984), 179-84.

final book. The goddesses use different source material as they advocate different reasons for the naming of June. Juno's argument refers to multiple *fasti,* including that of Verrius Flaccus (*Fast*. 6.51-64), while reference is made to the *fasti* of Fulvius in the words of Iuventas. The wife of Hercules provides her own explanation for the month of June by relating how Romulus divided the old and young people and named two months after them (*Fast*. 6.83-88), an identical explanation to that related in Fulvius' own calendrical etymologies, as is indicated by Macrobius.[247] Placing the Fulvian aetiology for the month into the mouth of the wife of Hercules, Ovid uses Iuventas' speech as a way of referencing Fulvius and the *fasti* which stood in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, before going on to speak of that very same temple later in Book 6. There may be no direct mention of this *fasti* at the very end of Ovid's poem, but Fulvius' work is certainly present in the *Fasti.* Ovid embeds material from this calendar within the overall structure of Book 6 and its Herculean framework.[248]

Thus, the repeated appearance of Juno and Hercules in book 6, and the mention of their ultimate reconciliation, certainly appears to recall the discord and ultimate concord of Fulvius and Aemilius Lepidus and founding of the respective temples of Juno and Hercules. This *concordia* was also referred to in the work of Ennius. The reconciliation between Fulvius and Aemilius Lepidus, the triumph of

[247] Macr. 1.12.16: *nam Fulvius Nobilior in fastis quos in aede Herculis Musarum posuit Romulum dicit postquam populum in maiores iunioresque divisit, ut altera pars consilio altera armis rem publicam tueretur, in honorem utriusque partis hunc Maium, sequentem Iunium mensem vocasse.* (Text taken from Kaster 2011).

[248] Littlewood (2006), 59-60 shows that there is further evidence of a ring composition in *Fasti* 6. At the beginning of the book, the poet speaks of the Temple of Juno Moneta (6.183-4), which contained the *Libri Lintei*, in which the consular *fasti* were recorded. At the end of *Fasti* 6, the poet speaks of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* which contained the Fulvian *fasti*. *Fasti* 6 is bookended by *fasti.*

Fulvius and the subsequent founding of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* are all topics believed to have been discussed in Book 15 of the *Annals*.[249]

The final passage of Ovid's *Fasti* and discussion of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* recalls themes which were prevalent at the end of Ennius' fifteenth book. Similarly, the permeable and incomplete ending of the *Fasti* could also be compared to *Annals* 15 and the structure of Ennius' text.[250] *Fasti* 6, like *Annals* 15, is both an ending and the preface to a new part of the text. *Fasti* 6 finishes the poem. but is also presented as a supposed introduction to the promised second half of the *annus* and the poet's calendrical work.[251] It can, therefore, be likened to *Annals* 15, the original ending of Ennius' poem, to which three books were added after publication.[252] By placing the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* at the final point of his poem, Ovid maps his text onto the structure of *Annals* and the (false) closure of *Annals* 15, with Ennius' discussion of Fulvius' campaign and the triumphant founding of the temple.[253]

### Poetic Simultaneity (2): Placing Ovid in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*

---

[249] On the closure of the *Annales* with this very same temple, see Skutsch (1944), 80. See also Gildenhard (2007), 81, 85 on the *concordia* of Fulvius and Lepidus at the end of *Annales* 15. While Heslin (2015), 203 argues that Ovid's discussion of the temple at the end of his poem 'effaces' the ending of Ennius' *Annales*, A. Hardie (2007), 565 argues that 'the closure of Ovid's *Fasti* may well recall the culmination of Ennius' fifteen book *Annales*'.

[250] See Feeney (2006), 483n28; Barchiesi (1997a), 270-1.

[251] The opening to the description (6.797-98) of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* both seems to conclude the *Fasti* and to promise its continuation: *tempus Iuleis cras est natale Kalendis: / Pierides, coeptis addite summa meis.*

[252] See Gildenhard (2007), 85. Newlands (1994), 137 hypothesises that, in imitating the ending of *Annales* 15, Ovid might be hinting at a possible resumption of the *Fasti* at a later date.

[253] See Skutsch (1985), 553; Elliot (2013), 62 on *Annales* 15. See Newlands (1995), 217-18 on the correlation between this passage in *Fasti* 6 and *Annales* 15.

*Fasti* 6 reveals the relationship between the text of Ovid's *Fasti* and the *fasti* of Fulvius Nobilior in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, placing the temple in Ovid's own poem and Ovid's own *Fasti* in the temple. This can be seen when we consider the physical location of the aetiological discussion about the temple between the poet and the Muse of history, which takes place at the end of Ovid's text.

As discussed earlier, over the course of the poem Ovid appears to locate himself around the city of Rome, speaking to different divine and religious informants at the site or religious structure with which they are connected. In *Fasti* 6, Ovid's final divine informant is the Muse of History, who speaks to the poet about the restoration of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* (*Fast.* 6.801-10). Clio is the only Muse to speak here, but Ovid states that her sisters agree with her sentiments and Hercules twangs his lyre in accompaniment (6.811). It is possible to visualise Ovid actually standing within the temple, since Clio's use of the verb *aspicere*, in the second person singular, (6.801-2 *clari monumenta Philippi / aspicis*) seems to locate him at the temple, as a viewer of the monument.

The presence of Clio, the other Muses and Hercules all point to Ovid's location within the building about which he is speaking. Hardie has argued that at this point in *Fasti* 6, the Muse who addresses Ovid about the temple is actually a speaking statue – one of the nine Muse statues which were placed in the temple.[254] The speech of Clio, as a statue, in *Fasti* 6 might be compared to the aetiological narrative of the Vertumnus statue in Propertius' fourth book (4.2), as he stands on the Vicus Tuscus

[254] See A. Hardie (2007), 565 on how the goddesses at the beginning of *Fasti* 6 and the Muses at the end are visible to the poet, 'embodied in their temple statues'.

and describes his changing form and the manner of his creation (59-64). In Horace, too, the wooden statue of Priapus speaks from his place in the Gardens of Maecenas on the Esquiline Hill, acknowledging his existence as a carved fig-wood stem (*Serm*. 1.8.1-5). The narratorial voices of the statues address us, as readers, as if we were passing by and locate us within the urban topography of the city, as if walking past the sculptures and structures of Rome. In the *Fasti*, Ovid similarly uses his conversation with Clio to place himself and his readers in a Roman location, the statue-filled Temple of Hercules and the Muses.

Reading this passage with an awareness of Volk's theory that the poet is presented as constantly in the process of poetic research and composition,[255] Ovid's conversation with Clio in *Fasti* 6 evokes an image of the poet composing his own *Fasti*. Here in this temple, which is believed by some to have been a location for poetic composition and performance,[256] the poet's aetiological questions to the Muse conjures up a picture of Ovid sourcing material for his text. These questions locate Ovid in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, along with the poem which he is researching and composing – a *Fasti* which acts as reminder of the original *fasti* which once stood there.

[255] Volk (1997), 290-91. Although Volk does not discuss this section of the poem in her argument, her theory can fruitfully be applied to it.
[256] The *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, like certain other temples in Rome, is believed to have been the setting for some 'form of collective poetic activity' (see Horsfall 1976; Heslin 2015, 231-37). Horace speaks of poetic performance and competitive composition in locations including the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* (*Ep.* 2.2.91-105, *Serm.* 1.10.38). See Hardie (2010), 298-304 on the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* as the performance location for Horace's Roman Odes. Heslin (2015), 199-201 argues, using the Severan building plan, which shows evidence of a corridor between the Portico of Philippus and the Portico of Octavia, that poets could work in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, while using and accessing the library next door.

Ovid's own *Fasti* can be seen as a virtual *monumentum,* reminding the reader of the Fulvian *fasti* which existed within the *Aedes Herculis Musarum.* My reading in this section so far has suggested that the poet can be located, composing his *fasti*, in the Temple of the Hercules and the Muses. Another passage in Book 1 supplements this idea, and can be further interpreted as a reminder of the Fulvian *fasti* in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum.* Book 6 is not the only time when Ovid appeals to the Muses as informants in his poem. The Muses all appear in *Fasti* 5, in May, as they give variant aetiologies for the name of that month (*Fast.* 5.7-110). Although there is no clear suggestion as to where this conversation in Book 5 takes place, another interaction between Ovid and the Muse Clio, in Book 1, might well be located within the *Aedes Herculis Musarum.* This instance, which once again evokes an image of the poet sourcing material for his text, could provide acknowledgement of the existence of a Fulvian *fasti* in the building.

Towards the end of *Fasti* 1,[257] Ovid describes himself reading *fasti* in the presence of a Muse. When the poet is unable to find the festival which he is looking for (the *feriae Sementivae*) in these *fasti* which he has consulted, the Muse rebukes Ovid and asks why he is trying to find a moveable festival in the official *fasti* (*Fast.* 1.657-62):[258]

> ter quater evolvi signantes tempora fastos,
>    nec Sementiva est ulla reperta dies:
> cum mihi (sensit enim) 'lux haec indicitur' inquit
>    Musa, 'quid a fastis non stata sacra petis?          660
> utque dies incerta sacri, sic tempora certa:
>    seminibus iactis est ubi fetus ager.'

[257] *Fast*. 1.11, 1.289, 3.87-96, 6.57-64.
[258] On the different moveable festivals see Green (2004a), 301-5.

> Three or four times, I unrolled the *fasti* designating the times, and the day of Sowing was nowhere to be found. The Muse said to me (as she saw this), 'This day is publicly appointed. Why do you look for festivals which do not stand immovably in the *fasti?* While the day is moveable, the time of year is fixed: after the seed is sown, it is when the field is fertile.'

Ovid describes his consultation of other calendrical *fasti* at various points within his poem. Earlier in *Fasti* 1, he describes himself learning from previous *fasti* and using them as aetiological sources (*Fast.* 1.289-90 *quod tamen ex ipsis licuit mihi discere fastis*). These *fasti* included the text of Fulvius presented within the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, as is indicated by his use of the Fulvian aetiology at *Fasti* 5.55-78 and 6.83-4. Accordingly, the *fasti* which Ovid is reading here, when speaking to the Muse, could reasonably be this particular text.[259] Indeed, the discussion of a *fasti* as a source text, along with his conversation with a Muse who is well versed with the intricacies of the calendrical system, makes it possible to locate the poet in a specific religious space at this point in the text: the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*.[260] In this space, the Muses would most certainly be present, in the form of cult statues, and the *fasti* of Fulvius, which marked out the calendrical days of the year, were displayed for all to see.

---

[259] See *Fast.* 6.83-4 and the discussion above.

[260] The poet does not specify that the Muse he speaks to here is Clio, who is the narrator in *Fasti* 6. Nevertheless, the frequent presence of the same characters in both *Fasti* 1 and 6, as a part of the circularity of the books. In Book 1 and 6, for example, Janus appears (*Fast.* 1.63-289, 6.101-128), as do Hercules and the vanquished Cacus (1.543-586, 6.879-82), and Priapus and the banqueting gods, in the duplicated tale of the lecherous god and Silenus' noisy donkey (1.393-440, 6.319-48). Both books also give explanation for the Romulean distribution and naming of the months, including the attribution of May from *maiores* and June from *iuvenes* (as discussed, a Fulvian explanation) (1.41, 6.88). Thus, one might see a pairing between the Muse and the *fasti* in *Fasti* 1 and the Clio and the *fasti* in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* in *Fasti* 6.

Ovid's unrolling (*Fast.* 1.57 *evolvi*) of the *fasti* appears to indicate the physical nature of the document, as if the poet is reading a book roll or papyrus.[261] Critics generally take the view that Fulvius' *fasti* was a wall painting, but some have raised the possibility of its existence in book form, or, indeed, as both a book and a wall painting.[262] If this was the case, the image of the poet unrolling and reading the *fasti* in the presence of the Muse would allow us to picture the poet in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, unrolling and reading the book form of Fulvius' *fasti* while researching and sourcing material for his own *Fasti*.[263]

If the *fasti* of Fulvius was not in book form, this passage could still feasibly refer to his calendar and the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, due to the presence of both a *fasti* and a Muse who has clear knowledge of the *fasti*. This reading would give us an image of the architectural, painted form of the calendar, and the statues found within the temple, transformed into their textual (in the case of the *Fasti*) and living (in the case of the Muse) equivalents, just as Ovid transforms the Roman calendar from its architectural form, inscribed or painted on structures, into an elegiac poem.

---

[261] Horace uses the same verb (*Serm.* 1.3.112 *tempora si fastosque velis evolvere mundi*). Gowers (2012), 142 argues that *evolvere* is 'used of thorough reading […] esp. in the context of epic or annalistic histories, from the lengthy book rolls that contained them'.

[262] Rüpke (2006), 492-506 points out that the production of marble calendars was seldom seen before the Augustan and Tiberian ages, and questions the possibility of a large inscription featuring within the temple decoration, but concludes that he believes the *fasti* would have been in the form of a wall painting. However, he also considers the possibility that a book was kept in the temple to accompany the large paintings of the calendar. On the idea of the *fasti* in the form of a book and a wall painting see also Michels (1967), 125 n18. Miller (2002a), 172 also suggests that a *fasti* could exist in both book and architectural form when he highlights how the tablets of the *Fasti Praenestini* were completed after Ovid's exile and suggests that there must have been a co-existent, abridged monograph of Verrius Flaccus' calendar to which Ovid could have referred. When explaining the use of *evolvi* at 657, Green (2004a), 304-5 also argues that, although the *fasti* were generally found in inscriptional form, they also existed as manuscripts.

[263] Rüpke (2006), 510 argues that the temple was a place where writers could meet and the *fasti* would have been copied.

At the end of the first book of the *Fasti*, just as at the end of the final book of the *Fasti*, Ovid appears to locate himself in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*,[264] a building structure which displayed the calendrical *fasti* in physical form. In his search for the moveable festivals, Ovid can be imagined as a poet searching for inspiration within a temple which contains a calendar in either textual or architectural form. The poet uses the *fasti* which he consults and the text of his own *Fasti*, which narrates his reading of this calendar, as a means of summoning up images of a physical space. In doing so, the building in which Ovid can be imagined and the calendar it contained are evoked and memorialised within the structure of Ovid's text.

### Revising the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*: Philippus and Ovid

Ovid's choice to conclude the poem with the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* – an architectural embodiment of poetic inspiration, as a temple of the Muses and the home of Fulvius' *fasti* – cements the connection between his poetic text, the calendar and the public monuments of Rome.[265] So far in this discussion of the temple,

[264] In view of this reading of the *Fasti,* it also may be possible to locate other figures from Ovid's poetry in this same temple. In his exilic poetry, Ovid often describes poetic collaboration with friends while in Rome (see, for example, *Pont.* 2.4). It may be possible to imagine such poetic composition and collaboration occurring in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, among other Roman literary spaces. In *Tristia* 3.7, he imagines his addressee Perilla at home with her mother (*Tr.* 3.7.3), or amongst the 'books and the Muses' (3.7.4 *inter libros Pieridasque suas*). This could merely be a reference to Perilla's literary interests, but also allows us to imagine her in Rome at the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, with its Muse statues and surrounding libraries. In his letter to Tuticanus, furthermore, Ovid describes their poetic collaboration, in the presence of the Muses (*Pont.* 4.12.25-8 *saepe ego correxi sub te censore libellos, / saepe tibi admonitu facta litura meo est, / dignam Maeoniis Phaeacida condere chartis / cum te Pieriae perdocuere deae*). As Ovid appears to describe the process of recitation and correction during composition, while the Pierides provide new inspiration, it is possible to imagine this scene of poetic *collegium* and composition occurring in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*

[265] Newlands (1995), 136 believes that the Temple of Hercules and the Muses exhibits the union of artist and state or between 'poet, work and imperial ideology'. In Ovid's description of this building, one can also see the union of poetic text and public monument.

consideration of the Fulvian *fasti* and its relationship with Ovid's poem has highlighted the interplay between texts and monuments. In addition to this, Ovid's discussion of Philippus' renovation of the temple further establishes the link between place and poetry. The *Aedes Herculis Musarum* was renovated, or perhaps even rebuilt,[266] in 29BC by Lucius Marcius Philippus.[267] Among other changes, he added to Fulvius' original temple by constructing a portico around it. Ovid's mention of this temple's renovation ties in with the poem's overall focus on Augustan restoration and rebuilding of Roman monuments,[268] which is summarised in *Fasti* 2, when the poet celebrates Augustus as 'the holy builder and rebuilder of temples' (*Fast*. 2.63 *templorum positor, templorum sancte repostor*).

Ovid's discussion of this renovation of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* has been seen as a reflection of poetic change and adaptation, as he inherits material from other poets such as Ennius. The revisionary process is also reflected by the day on which the temple is memorialised. The discussion of the temple on the last day of June, a day which would not have existed before the Caesarean calendrical reforms,[269] makes Ovid's celebration of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* a new addition to the calendrical tradition which hitherto had no record of this temple's current *dies natalis*. As a result of this theme of revision prevalent at the end of *Fasti* 6, it is argued that, just as the Augustan Portico of Philippus can be seen as an addendum to or

---

[266] See Platner and Ashby s.v. '*Hercules Musarum, Aedes*'. Heslin (2015), 210-13.
[267] See Heslin (2015), 208 on the possibility that the portico commemorated Augustan deeds, including his triple triumph after his return from Alexandria in 29BC.
[268] Newlands (2002), 227: 'The *Fasti* provides its own complex monument to mutability.'
[269] Boyle (2003), 270; Heslin (2015), 203.

replacement for the Republican temple of Fulvius Nobilior, Ovid's elegiac *Fasti* appears to succeed the Ennian *Annals*.[270]

Considering the close connection between the original temple architect and the poet of the *Annals*, Ovid's decision to place Philippus' renovation at the forefront can be seen as a reflection of the *Fasti's* superseding of earlier aetiological texts. It seems to me, however, that the description of this renovation in *Fasti* 6 also reflects the process of adaptation and renovation which occurred within Ovid's own text. To end with a celebration of this temple's restoration and renovation seems highly appropriate if one considers that parts of the *Fasti* itself were revised (or textually 'restored') after the completion of the text, including – if Fantham is correct – this very section of the poem.[271] The restored temple is written into the revised, Julian year at a point in Ovid's text which is itself part of the revisionary process.[272] Monument, time and text can be viewed as similar in their potential to be altered, and Ovid's own revised poem about the calendar is correlated with this calendrical monument, which has undergone similar restoration.

In something of a paradox, the final act of the poet in the *Fasti*, about to cut short his poem, is to add a new dedication for a renovated Augustan temple, on a new date in the Julian calendar, to Rome's annalistic tradition. The poet uses his discussion of the renovated temple on this recently added, final day of June to

---

[270] Heslin (2015), 211: 'Ovid's *Fasti*, which in a sense rivals the *Annales* as the great poem of the Roman calendar, effaces that foundation from the record and climaxes with the foundation of that temple's new Augustan incarnation instead, thus superseding Ennius' poem.'
[271] For her discussion of revisions in the whole text see Fantham (1986), 243-73. She argues [261-2] that this particular section is a later addition to the poem.
[272] See Martelli (2013),104-14 on the revised status of the *Fasti*.

advertise his own calendrical reformation, as he asks the Muses in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* to help him finish his work and cut short the year by six months (*Fast.* 6.798 *coeptis addite summa meis*). This move highlights that, although imperial calendrical and architectural renovation are catalogued in the poem, it is the poet who is the ultimate reformer in the *Fasti*.[273] By discussing this temple, a symbol of the preservation of the old (Fulvius, Ennius) and the creation of the new (Philippus), on this final day of the poem, the poet highlights that the calendrical year and the cityscape associated with it are subject to change and revision by not only imperial figures, but also his own poetry.

Furthermore, the poet seems to suggest here that his own texts are subject to similar change and reformation. Ovid notably glances back to the proem of the *Metamorphoses*, a poem about constant change and transformation, in his invocation to the Muses on the 30th of June. In invoking the Muses to help complete his work (*Fast.* 6.798 *coeptis addite summa meis*), he uses the same phrase for his poetic undertakings in the *Fasti* (*coeptis…meis*) as he does when describing the *Metamorphoses* at the opening of his *carmen perpetuum* (*Met.*1.2-3 *di, coeptis…adspirate meis*).[274] The use of *deductum* too, at *Fast.* 6.803 also makes the reader recall the opening to the *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 1.4).

---

[273] Martelli (2013), 108 argues, considering Ovid's statements about his exilic position in *Fasti* 4 (75-84): 'Each of the first three books of the *Fasti* thus begins by recording in sequence the reformers who have subjected the calendar to a gradual process of structural modification through the addition and reordering of months and extra days. Ovid's decision to flag the revised status of his calendar text through the reference to exile incorporated into the introductory section of *Fasti* 4 should, I suggest, be viewed within this sequence'.

[274] See also *Ars Am.* 1.30: *coeptis, mater Amoris, ades.*

The ending of the *Fasti* revises the length and structure of the *Metamorphoses.* By echoing the language at the commencement of his *carmen perpetuum* to discuss the closure of his elegiac poem, Ovid connects his two oeuvres and appears to suggest that only now is the project he began in the epic truly finished, as he reaches the end of his *tempora*.[275] The word *tempora* opens *Fasti* 1 (1.1. *tempora cum causis Latium digesta per annum*), as a secondary title, but the noun is also seen repeated here, at the end of the poem (6.797 ***tempus*** *Iuleis cras est natale Kalendis*). It seems appropriate that the *Fasti* ends on a new calendrical day in the reformed and altered year, with a building which is the product of architectural change, as Ovid not only revises the end of his poem, but the end of the *Metamorphoses.*

### ***Fasti*** **6 and** ***Metamorphoses*** **15: Ennian endings**

The placement of the Fulvian/Ennian/Philippian *Aedes Herculis Musarum* at the end of Book 6 also makes for an interesting connection between the end of the *Fasti* and the Ennian sphragis at the end of the *Metamorphoses*. The text of the *Metamorphoses* self-reflexively finishes with an anticipation of the final metamorphosis of the text into an incorporeal entity passed on by the mouths of the people (*Met.* 15.871-79).[276] The *Fasti*'s final building, as a temple to the Muses, can be viewed as an architectural embodiment of poetic inspiration. With the established correlation between Ovid's *Fasti* and the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, as a renovated

[275] *Met*. 1.4*: ad mea perpetuum deducite* ***tempora*** *carmen.* On the connections between the end of the *Fasti* and the beginning of the *Metamorphoses*, see Barchiesi (1997b), 181-208.
[276] This will be discussed further in the final Coda.

structure which contains the calendrical *fasti*, the temple could be viewed as an architectural representation of the kind of monument a text such as the *Fasti* can become. Both the ending of the *Metamorphoses* and the end of the *Fasti* enable the reader to reflect upon the lasting or monumental nature of poetry.

In the *Metamorphoses*, the end of the poem and the promise of Ovid's 'afterlife', as well as poetic fame on the lips of men (15.878-79 *ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama, / siquid habent veri vatum praesagia, vivam*), recalls Ennian declarations of poetic fame, as recorded in Cicero,[277] and imitated in Vergil's *Georgics* (*Georg*. 3.8-9):

> temptanda uia est, qua me quoque possim
> tollere humo uictorque uirum uolitare per ora.[278]
>
> A path must be taken, by which I, also, shall be able to raise myself from
> the ground and, as victor, soar on the lips of men.

This proclamation is accompanied by a description of a grand Mantuan temple, a celebration of Caesar, but also an anticipation of Vergil's future poetry. Vergil presents himself as a triumphant figure who has led the Muses back to his homeland (3.10-11).[279] As a result of this Ennian self-presentation,[280] it is also possible to imagine the temple which he then promises as a poetic version of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*.[281] Both the proclamation of Ennian verbal fame and the description of a

---

[277] Cic. *Tusc.* 1.34. *Nemo me lacrumis decoret nec funera fletu / Faxit. Cur? volito vivus per ora virum.* (Text taken from King 1927).
[278] Text taken from Mynors (1969).
[279] A. Hardie (2002), 196: 'Vergil will himself be a new Hercules, leading the Muses as Musagetes (*deducam…Musas*).'
[280] See Hardie (2004), 626.
[281] See Heslin (2015), 257-260; A. Hardie (2007), 564-65 on the temple of the *Georgics* as an evocation of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*. Other critics have argued that Vergil's Mantuan temple causes the

monumental temple, as is found together at the opening of Vergil's *Georgics* 3*,* are seen in Ovid's poetry. Read alongside the Ennian declaration of oral fame in the *Metamorphoses*, the end of the *Fasti*, with its discussion of the Fulvian/Ennian *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, appears to recall the Vergilian promise of a (textual) temple which accompanies his declaration of lasting and incorporeal poetic fame. Indeed, the very temple which Ovid describes may be that on which Vergil's poetic temple is modelled, leading us to question in turn whether we should see Ovid's *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, like Vergil's temple, as a poetic temple, and monumental expression of his text, as well as a real architectural structure.

The similarity between the temple in *Georgics* 3 and the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* in the *Fasti* is made clearer if one is to consider the placement of the temple in these two texts.[282] Ovid's discussion of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* is set not only at the end of the *Fasti*, but also at what was meant to be the medial point of the twelve-month, twelve-book text, further aligning it with the temple at the centre of Vergil's poem, in *Georgics* 3. Like Vergil, who presents himself as a successor to Ennius in constructing a kind of poetic temple of the Muses, Ovid presents himself as a

---

reader to think of the Temple of Palatine Apollo, although not yet built. See Miller (2009), 140-1; Dufallo (2013), 108-26.

[282] The two passages can also be compared, due to the similar referencing of stories related to Hercules which are then not narrated. In the *Fasti*, although the poet asks Clio about the enmity of Juno and Hercules and their eventual reconciliation (6.799-800), the Muse avoids this topic and speaks instead about the new Portico of Philippus. One might see, in the poet's mention of Hercules and Clio's evasive response, a similarity to the programmatic beginning of *Georgics* 3. Here, Vergil proclaims that he will not tell well-known stories, most of which relate to Hercules (the pitilessness of Eurystheus, the altars of Busiris, and the tale of Hylas (3.4-6)). Instead, he unexpectedly speaks about the Mantuan temple. At this point in *Fasti* 6 and *Georgics* 3, both authors interestingly choose to speak of architecture (and perhaps even the same building) rather than including extended narratives about Hercules in their text.

successor – and reformer – of the epic and annalistic poets and, as a consequence, a recipient of poetic fame as his texts are read, memorialised and monumentalised.[283]

**PART 3: MARCIA(N MONUMENTS)**

Ennius' presence within the final monument of the *Fasti* has been firmly established. It is also important to consider the elegiac nature of Ovid's text in his depiction of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, specifically the influence of Roman and Callimachean elegy. At the climax of this aetiological poem about Rome's architectural expansion, it is certainly noteworthy that the narrative of the Muse of history focusses almost entirely on the virtues of a woman, rather than discussing the creation or renovation of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum,* or the calendar it contained. This section of my chapter will consider why, at such a crucial point of the *Fasti* – and during his discussion of a highly poetic building – Ovid chooses to focus on this female figure.

In what follows, I will consider how Marcia is presented in a similar way to other women in Roman elegy and Callimachean poetry in order to show how Ovid's text ties into the tradition of female praise in Roman elegy, while he also associates Marcia with women in the *Aetia*, the Ptolemaic queens, who were associated with the Alexandrian *Museion*, the Hellenistic equivalent to the Temple of Hercules and the Muses in Rome. As Ovid finishes his elegy with praise of a female member of the Roman imperial household, his text stands as a Roman version of the *Aetia*, a poem

[283] Hardie (1991), 47 believes that 'taken together, the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* represent Ovid's typically indirect answer to Vergil's epic'.

which was also concerned with both religious customs, rites and foundation myths of cities.

One of the episodes of female praise in Callimachus to which Ovid's discussion of Marcia will be compared, the *Victoria Berenices*, an epinician for Berenice which may have included a narrative about the founding of a temple, has been shown, by Thomas,[284] to have begun a rich poetic tradition in Roman literature of triumphal poetry, which regularly included mention of a grand temple, a triumph and the presence of the Muses, such as the Mantuan temple in *Georgics* 3. I will argue that this final monument in *Fasti* 6 should, like Vergil's Mantuan temple and other monuments from poems in this tradition, be seen as an Ennian and Callimachean construction, and a combination of Roman annalistic history and Hellenistic elegy.[285]

Ovid's presentation of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum,* as both a real *and* poetic structure, will then be compared to the statements of other elegiac poets about the preservation of their texts and the lasting fame of the women memorialised within them. Ovid's praise of Marcia in *Fasti* 6, in connection to the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, will be compared to Propertius' discussion of real and poetic monuments in elegy 3.2, which adapts Ennian and Callimachean material in order to discuss the lasting nature of the poet's work, in contrast to imperial Roman and 'Marcian' monuments. Reading the end of *Fasti* 6 in comparison with Propertius 3.2 will illustrate how Ovid's

[284] Thomas (1983).
[285] See Miller (1983a), 280; Barchiesi (2011), 515-17 on the likely influence of Callimachus on Ennius' work. Miller argues that [295] 'for Ovid […] Ennius is diametrically opposed to Callimachus'. The *Fasti*, and this passage about the *Aedes Herculis Musarum,* however, combines Ennian and Callimachean traditions while negotiating the annalistic and elegiac genres.

annalistic and elegiac *Fasti* brings together themes of monumentalisation which are prevalent in the respective genres, that is, the praise of imperial Roman monuments and the creation of poetic monuments which praise and memorialise women. Ovid correlates his elegiac text with the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* to provide a new configuration of monumental poetics.

### Considering Marcia's predecessors and the *Fasti*'s generic context

As the poet turns to the *Aedes Herculis Musarum,* his apparent intentions to tell of masculine (architectural) achievements associated with annalistic history (*Fast*. 6.797-800) – the deeds of Fulvius and the literature of Ennius – are frustrated by the words of the female Muse. The renovator of the temple, Lucius Marcius Philippus, is also granted only the briefest of mentions. Clio's praise is reserved for a woman whose only apparent connection to the temple is her filial relationship to Philippus. Marcia is praised as a beautiful female and a figure of Roman importance and nobility (6.802-10).[286]

Although now writing about religious and architectural aetiology, Ovid ends the *Fasti* with female praise. This may be a resetting of the poem's elegiac agenda; the foregrounding of a desirable figure (*Fast.* 6.807 *laudamus formam*) within the *Fasti*

---

[286] This is not the only time in the Ovidian elegy in which the poet commends Marcia, as an imperial relative and woman of virtue, in elegiac metre. In his letter to her husband, Fabius Paullus Maximus, in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1, the poet states that Marcia and his own wife are close friends (*Pont*. 1.2.138-39 *hanc probat et primo dilectam semper ab aeuo / est inter comites Marcia censa suas*). In his letter to his wife in Book 3, furthermore, Ovid includes instructions to honour Marcia (*Pont.* 3.1.77-8 *cuncta licet facias, nisi eris laudabilis uxor, / non poterit credi Marcia culta tibi*). Just as he instructs his wife to do in the later elegies, at the end of the *Fasti*, the poet chooses to honour Marcia. In a part of the text which is believed to have been revised in exile, mention of this woman creates a form of continuation between the *Fasti* and the poet's later elegies.

and in connection to this particular building disrupts the Roman schema of the text and the annalistic catalogue of the *ara Caesaris*.[287] Yet, Marcia, as an imperial Roman matron, cannot be categorised easily as the kind of woman who would traditionally receive elegiac praise. Rather, standing at the end of the *Fasti*, she is better likened to Cornelia, whose narrative ends the fourth book of Propertius' Romanocentric elegies (Prop. 4.11).[288] This similarity is particularly apt as these aetiological poems were a model for the Ovidian *Fasti*. Both conclude with poems about women from the Augustan household. Cornelia was the stepdaughter of Augustus (as daughter of Scribonia); Marcia was linked to the imperial house as the cousin of Augustus by her father's marriage to Atia Minor.

Deceased and separated from her beloved husband, Propertius' Cornelia finds a place in the genre which chronicles the pain of parted lovers, but is ultimately a clear reminder of her noble lineage and imperial connections. Propertius uses her (and her female narratorial voice) as an alternative way of writing about the Roman, epic heroes to whom she is related.[289] Similarly, in the aetiological elegy of the *Fasti*, Marcia is a female reminder of the men in her family – namely Philippus and Augustus, but also the legendary Ancus Marcius (*Fast.* 6.803) – and of their great achievements (in architectural form). Furthermore, both women receive their own share of praise and memorialisation. Cornelia is, in Propertian elegy, memorialised

[287] This of course, is not the first time in which material or themes from erotic elegy are included within the poet's *Fasti*. See Hinds (1992a, 1992b); Merli (2000); Chiu (2016) on erotic elegy within the *Fasti*. This can be also likened to the poet's later reconfiguration of historical texts in the *Tristia* 2. There, for example, the poet states that the reader of the *Annals* will find a female figure (pregnant Ilia) and themes worthy of erotic elegy (*Tr*. 2.259-60).
[288] See Newlands (1994), 135.
[289] See Wyke (1987), 173.

by a monument: this epigrammatic poem speaks of her tombstone (Prop. 4.11.1-2).[290] Marcia is herself affiliated with a monumental and memorialising structure: the Temple of Hercules and the Muses. Both Propertian and Ovidian elegies praise these imperial Roman matrons, speaking of monuments constructed for them (in Cornelia's case) or associating them with Roman architecture (in Marcia's case), as was seen in the physical cityscape of Augustan Rome, with porticoes and building structures used to celebrate female members of the Augustan household.

By praising Marcia on the *dies natalis* of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, Ovid makes the cousin of Augustus the new poster-girl for the Roman temple. Marcia, an imperial woman endowed with beauty and virtue, is a very different type of woman to those who bought wigs in the very same temple in the *Ars Amatoria* (3.165-68). She replaces these women as a new kind of elegiac figure in the (Ovidian) topography of Rome, as Ovid rewrites the monumental structure and revises material from the *Ars Amatoria* and earlier elegy.[291] One can compare the revision of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* and its female connotations to Ovid's treatment of the Porticus Liviae.[292] The narrator of the *Ars Amatoria* once recommended the Portico of Livia as a place to meet girlfriends (*Ars Am.* 1.71-4), thereby using the structure to promote that

---

[290] Hutchinson (2006), 231: '4.11 is an aetiological expansion of an epigram on an object. 4.11 presents itself as an inscribed, unnarrated address.'

[291] One must consider, however, Ovid's ultimate purpose for doing this. As the poet revises the *Fasti* in exile, is Marcia meant to be a replacement for the women in the *Ars*, or is the poet flirting with the subversive and using the chaste and beautiful Marcia and his aetiological, Augustan *Fasti* as a subtle way of recalling the wanton women and the text of his *Ars Amatoria*?

[292] Ovid's inclusion of Marcia in his description of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* aligns the building with Livia's monument. Both buildings have male architects (who renovated and rebuilt Republican buildings) and a female dedicatee. Ovid's *Aedes Herculis Musarum* is actually the monument of Philippus, but is employed by the poet as a memorialisation of Marcia. Meanwhile, Ovid's *Fasti* explains that it was Augustus who was really the architect of the Portico of Livia (*Fast.* 6.645-48), although it is a monument which celebrates the female imperial figure.

text's amatory elegiac agenda.[293] In the *Fasti*, by contrast, Ovid uses the Portico of Livia to praise Rome's first lady for her morality and status as an imperial wife (*Fast*. 6.637-48).[294]

Comparisons can also be made between Marcia and another elegiac female, who appears in the *Fasti* at a point which is structurally equivalent to the passage at the end of *Fasti* 6. Placed at the midpoint of the extant six book text is the poet's programmatic conversation with Venus (*Fast.* 4.1-18), which is followed by a hymn to the goddess of love. Ovid's interaction with Venus acts as a reminder of the poem's elegiac nature, but also indicates the evolution of the genre.[295] His characterisation of the goddess of love in the *Fasti*, and her similarities to Marcia, which will be discussed below, can help the reader to interpret the complex elegiac status of Ovid's final female figure.

These two passages and two female figures in the *Fasti* are connected by Horatian poetry. In *Odes* 4.1, Venus returns to Horace and the poet declares that he is too old for love. A similar stance is seen (albeit somewhat adapted) by the elegiac poet in *Fasti* 4 as the poet resumes his relationship with Venus, but a relationship which departs from his earlier erotic poetry. The two passages are similar in structure and content. Both are found at the beginning of the fourth book of the poet's work. Both feature a conversation with Venus, who is presented as an old companion. Interestingly, this passage of Horace, which Ovid appears to look to when describing

[293] This was discussed earlier in the Introduction.
[294] On the reshaping of the portico from the *Ars* to the *Fasti*, see Newlands (2002), 226-30.
[295] On Ovid's conversation with Venus and the evolution of the elegiac genre, see Hinds (1992a), 85-87.

Venus in *Fasti* 4,[296] also refers to Marcia. Having declared that he is no longer suited to love, Horace instructs Venus to revel in the house of Paullus Fabius Maximus, that is, the husband of Marcia (*Od*. 4.1.9-13). Thus, if one considers that Ovid's description of Venus is similar to that found in Horace, then a Marcian connection to *Fasti* 4 should be sought, too. Indeed, although the wife of Paullus Fabius Maximus is not mentioned at the beginning of *Fasti* 4, she is mentioned at a point linked to it, the alternate middle point of the *Fasti,* if it had been the full twelve-book length.

Standing at the mid-point of the six-book poem and the supposed mid-point of the twelve-book poem, the praise of the two women at the beginning of *Fasti* 4 and the end of *Fasti* 6 is structurally similar. Both include discussion of the poet's work and make the context of composition contemporaneous to the narrative. In the proem of *Fasti* 4, Venus instructs the poet to finish the work he has begun (*Fast.* 4.15-6):

> mota Cytheriaca leviter mea **tempora** myrto
> contigit et '**coeptum** perfice' **dixit '**opus'.
>
> Venus was moved and gently touched my temples with Cytherian myrtle,
> and she said, 'Complete the work you have begun!'.

This instruction is followed by a discussion of the month of April and a hymn praising Venus, the *Aeneadum genetrix* (4.85-132). Newlands believes that Venus' instruction to the poet is left unfulfilled as the 12 book work is left unfinished.[297] One could, however, equally suggest that this instruction finds a kind of fulfilment when this is viewed as the medial point of the poem and a kind of proem in the middle that

[296] See Farrell (2004), 54.
[297] Newlands (1995), 207.

introduces the second half of the work. The poet's invocation to the Muses at the end of the work then answers Venus' instruction and brings the real second half of the poem to a concordant ending. In *Fasti* 6, the poet instructs the Muses to help him complete this work (*Fast.* 6.797-99 ***tempus*** *Iuleis cras est natale Kalendis: / Pierides,* ***coeptis*** *addite summa meis. /* ***dicite****, Pierides*), an invocation which is followed by Clio's encomium of Marcia, the cousin of Augustus.[298]

Further connections can be made between the two passages and these two female members of the *gens Iulia*, in terms of the characterisation of Venus in *Fasti* 4 and Marcia in *Fasti* 6. Venus (as Venus Verticordia) is praised by Ovid in *Fasti* 4 as a bride worthy of devotion, who possesses beauty as well as morals and good reputation (*Fast.* 4.155-56):

> supplicibus verbis illam placate: sub illa
> et forma et mores et bona fama manet.
>
> Placate her with beseeching words. Beauty and morals and good reputation remain in her keeping.

Marcia is honoured and spoken about in connection with the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* due to these qualities. Clio relates that Marcia is a woman with beauty, brains and chastity (*Fast.* 6.805-6 *par animo quoque forma suo respondet; in illa / et genus et facies ingeniumque simul*),[299] leading to a great reputation, which is worthy

[298] Both lines instructing the completion of the work are metrically identical, and *coeptum/is* is placed at the same metrical *sedes* within the line. These are the only times this word is used to describe the poet's undertaking, except for the poet's invocation to Minerva at *Fast*. 6.652.

[299] Newlands has argued that Marcia's laudable *forma* makes her comparable to the three goddesses who were judged by Paris (see Newlands 1994, 138). Earlier in *Fasti* 6, the poet speaks of the Judgment of Paris as he muses on the dangers of judging a debate between goddesses (in this case, Juno, Hebe and Concordia). He describes this judgement as the *iudice formae* (*Fast.* 6.99-100 *perierunt* ***iudice formae*** */ Pergama*). In light of this, the goddesses to whom Clio likens Marcia in her praise of this

of her imperial connections (6.810 *o decus, o sacra femina digna domo*). Like Marcia, who is praised on the *dies natalis* of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, Venus, in the guise of the divine Roman wife, is similarly associated with the founding of a temple. *Fasti* 4 narrates that Venus is granted a temple on the instructions of the Sibyl at Cumae and honoured as Venus Verticordia (*Fast.* 4.159-60).

Like Venus, Marcia is a figure of generic complexity.[300] This woman possesses the characteristics of the beautiful and seductive *puellae* of amatory poetry. As a (supposedly) medial and elegiac figure who is praised for her *forma* by the Muses, she can be equated to the Muse-like embodiment of the erotic genre found at the apparent centre of Ovid's originally five book *Amores,* the *forma decens* of Elegy herself (*Am*. 3.1.9). Yet, Marcia is also, paradoxically, a chaste and well-reputed Roman woman and, subsequently, she more clearly resembles the goddess who stands at the centre of the *Fasti*. Manifesting as both the old companion of the elegist of the *Amores* (*Fast*. 4.2-16) and as the divine, yet matronly recipient of Roman calendrical honours (4.133-64), Venus reflects the poetic programme of the *Fasti*.[301] Like Venus, Marcia can be identified as a symbolic female figure: she is a reminder and reaffirmation of the traditional tenets of the elegiac genre, and a simultaneous reflection of generic evolution in the *Fasti.*[302] Ovid plays with the structure of his

*forma* (6.807-8 *nec quod laudamus formam, tu turpe putaris: / laudamus magnas hac quoque parte deas*) could be these three goddesses, including the goddess of love herself.

[300] One could perhaps even read Marcia, with her 'Martian' name, as Venus' more 'warlike' or epic counterpart, as a figure placed amongst the description of the Fulvian/Ennian *Aedes Herculis Musarum*.

[301] See Fantham (1998), 89-94; Hinds (1992a), 85-7 on the poet's different allusions to his earlier work in his conversation with Venus. See also Chiu (2015), 149-154 on this episode.

[302] Being compared to Venus is not unproblematic, but see *Epistulae ex Ponto*. 3.1. and the poet's praise of Livia (*Pont.* 3.1.117-18 *quae* ***Veneris formam****, mores Iunonis habendo / sola est caelesti digna reperta toro*).

monumental text, cutting short the *Fasti* and leaving readers uncertain as to where the true midpoint and close of the poem are. As he does this, these two women stand as corresponding figures at closely connected points within the text, and the second half of his text is enclosed by female praise.

### Callimachean Structures: Marcia and the *Coma Berenices*

Another possible reason for the inclusion of Marcia at this point in the *Fasti* may be due to the influence of Callimachus. As discussed above, the *Fasti* opens with the Callimachean epiphany of Janus to the poet at his writing tablets (*Fast.* 1.93-102), which recalls the beginning of the *Aetia*. Ovid's choice of finishing the poem with the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* also looks back to the *Aetia.* His conversation with Clio at the end of the *Fasti* recalls *Aetia* 1 and Callimachus' meeting with the Muses on Helicon while in a dream.[303] Harder has noted a lexical similarity between the narrative turn-taking of Ovid and Clio (6.801 *sic ego, sic Clio*) and Callimachus' description of his conversation with the Muse of History in *Aetia* 2 (*Aet*. fr. 43.56 ὣς ἐφάμην· Κλειὼ δὲ).[304] The praise of Marcia, at the conclusion of the poem and within the description of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, also evokes Callimachus' praise of

---

[303] See also the opening of *Fasti* 6 and the poet's conversation with the three goddesses about June, which the poet differentiates from the meeting of Hesiod with the Muses, an event which is referred to in Callimachus' *Aetia*.

[304] Harder (2012), 334. Harder points out the lexical similarities, but one should also note that the subject of both conversations is of a similar, ktistic nature: Ovid and Clio discuss the construction of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum,* while Clio informs Callimachus about the building of cities in Sicily (*Aet.* fr.50.56-7).

female rulers who were firmly associated with architecture of the Hellenistic world, in particular the *Mouseion*, the Alexandrian sanctuary of the Muses.

Hardie has already highlighted similarities between the *Fasti* and the end of the *Aetia*. This is founded on the idea that Marcia, praised by the Muses in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum,* can be likened to one of the women spoken about at the end of Callimachus' work, the Hellenistic queen Arsinoe, who was made a tenth Muse, as an additional statue in the Ptolemaic *Mouseion*. Hardie makes a case for the idea that Marcia's *forma* (*Fast.* 6.803) could refer not only to her beauty but also to a statuary form, and that her *nomen* (6.807) could refer not only to her name but also to an inscription on her statue.[305] Whether or not such a statue actually existed, Ovid places Marcia firmly in the temple and memorialises her in his own monumental *Fasti*, as it stands as a textual equivalent to structures such as the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*.

Taking up Hardie's line of argument, this section will consider how Marcia can be viewed as an Augustan and Ovidian equivalent to the female figures of the Ptolemaic dynasty, as the subject of aetiological praise-poetry, as a relative of an imperial household and as a figure likened to Venus. In doing so, I will map the ending of *Fasti* 6 on to not one but two different sections of the *Aetia* which contain praise of the virtues of dynastic female figures. As a medial point of the hypothetical twelve-book *Fasti* and the culmination of the extant six-book poem, it is possible to structurally equate the praise of Marcia to both the middle *and* end of the *Aetia*: the

[305] Hardie (forthcoming).

*Victoria* and *Coma Berenices*. Linking the centre of the text (the hymn to Venus) and the end of the text (the praise of Marcia), along with the two female figures commended there, makes the structure of the *Fasti* comparable to the *Aetia*. These connections frame the second half of the *Fasti* with female elegiac praise, a structural motif that can be likened to the second half of Callimachus' extended elegy, which is also framed with female praise.

These comparisons, which cast Marcia in the role of the Roman equivalent to these Hellenistic queens, will be used to show how Ovid uses this part of his text, which was revised in exile, as a means of praise and persuasion in relation to a figure who could play an important role in his return to Rome. At the same time, the comparison between the passage describing the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* and the praise of these Ptolemaic women will show how Ovid inserts himself into a poetic tradition influenced by Callimachus' work, which sees Roman poets discuss poetic inspiration and fame through the discussion of monuments which can be likened to the *Mouseion* or *Aedes Herculis Musarum.*

If one views the passage describing the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* and praising Marcia as the final lines of the six book *Fasti*, it is possible to map this passage on to the structure of the *Aetia* and compare it to the ending of Callimachus' aetiological poem. The *Aetia* concluded with the *Coma Berenices* and an Epilogue, both of which included praise of women from the dynastic family of Hellenistic Alexandria: Berenice II, the wife of Ptolemy III Euergetes, and Arsinoe II, the wife of Ptolemy II Philadelphus. The *Coma Berenices* begins with the identification of a new constellation by the astrologer Conon. What then follows is, as a kind of expanded

epigram, an aetiological tale of catasterism narrated by Berenice's lock of hair. Wishing for her husband's safe return from the Third Syrian War, the virtuous, royal wife dedicated this lock as a votive for her husband's safety at the shrine of Arsinoe-Aphrodite. The lock speaks of this action, before lamenting its separation from Berenice's fragrant head.

The *Coma Berenices* was of great importance to the history of Roman elegy, especially given Catullus' translation of it, as an epigrammatic tale of lovers separated by war with a female focus. In Ovidian poetry, *Metamorphoses* 15 had already ended with an apotheosis of Caesar into a star (*Met.* 15.749 *in sidus vertere novum stellamque **coma**ntem*), appearing to allude to the Callimachean *Coma Berenices* and its Catullan translation.[306] Similarly, the ending of the aetiological *Fasti*, with its praise of a female imperial figure, can be correlated with the ending of Callimachus' aetiological poem.[307] Much as reading the end of the *Fasti* together with the end of the *Metamorphoses* highlighted reference to Ennius in both texts, so too can it identify repeated allusion to Callimachean material, with the presence of a catasterism at the end of one text and the praise of an imperial woman at the end of the other.

Studying the *Fasti* in its own right, the final book includes not only its own story of catasterism (that of Aesculapius at *Fast.* 6.755-62), only shortly before the discussion of Marcia and the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, but also its own new

[306] See Knox (1986), 76; Gladhill (2012).
[307] Indeed, Henderson (2007), 260 n27 has viewed Propertius' Cornelia, to whom Marcia stands as an Ovidian equivalent, as a Roman Berenice, a female voice at the end of an aetiological poetry book who is divided from her husband.

calendrical (rather than astrological) aetiology: the *dies natalis templi* on the final day of June.[308] Furthermore, Marcia, the final female figure to feature in *Fasti* 6 can be likened to all three of the female figures at the end of the Callimachean work: Berenice, Arsinoe and Aphrodite.

It is possible that Ovid uses dynastic familial relations as a way of likening his portrayal of Marcia to the Callimachean presentation of Arsinoe and Berenice. Both Hellenistic queens feature in the *Coma Berenices* and a filial connection is established between them,[309] as Arsinoe is presented by Callimachus as Berenice's mother (fr.110 Pf 45 Ἀρσινόης μητρὸς σέο).[310] As in the *Coma Berenices*, the ending of Ovid's aetiological text features two female relatives, one of whom is also presented as a maternal relation of an imperial figure. The poet sets out Marcia's familial position by speaking of her mother, Atia Minor, who was the *matertera* of Caesar (*Fast.* 6.809). Just as the poet of the *Coma Berenices* uses royal women as a means of distinguishing the Ptolemaic dynasty at the end of the text, so in the final lines of *Fasti* 6, the extended imperial family is identified and celebrated by its female members.

Furthermore, the presentation of Marcia as a kind of goddess or Muse also allows comparisons between Callimachean poetry and the *Fasti* to be noted. Clio states that she commends Marcia's *forma* in a similar manner to her praise of goddesses (*Fast.* 6.807-8 *nec quod laudamus formam, tu turpe putaris: / laudamus*

[308] See my earlier discussion of the celebration of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* on the new day of the 30th of June.
[309] In the Epilogue to the *Aetia* (fr. 112.2 Pf), furthermore, there is mention of a queen (Berenice?), her mother (Arsinoe?) the Muses and the Graces.
[310] Berenice's mother was really Apame II. See Prioux (2011), 206 on Callimachus' attempts to link the second and third generations of the Ptolemies.

*magnas hac quoque parte deas*). Hardie argues that *hac…parte* at 6.808 is a deictic marker, referring to the part of the temple in which the Muse statues were placed, meaning that Clio is praising Marcia as she would her sisters.[311] Accordingly, it is possible to compare Clio's praise of Marcia to Callimachus' portrayal of Arsinoe as the tenth Muse.[312]

Reading Marcia as a figure who is similar to Venus in *Fasti* 4, as discussed above, also allows for further comparisons to be made with the imperial queens who feature at the end of Callimachus' text. Ptolemaic queens were frequently associated with Aphrodite. Berenice was linked to the goddess of love at the end of the *Aetia*, as it is Aphrodite who is responsible for the catasterism of the lock (*Aet.* fr. 110. 55-8, 65 Pf). The queen placed this lock in the Temple of Arsinoe-Aphrodite. Arsinoe, too, was linked to Aphrodite both in this shrine conjoining them at Zephyrium and in other literature.[313] Added to this, there is a possibility that, at the end of the *Aetia*, an Epilogue linked the Muses and the queen in her guise as Aphrodite.[314] Thus, due to her comparability with Venus in the *Fasti,* Ovid's Marcia can be linked to all three female figures in the *Coma Berenices* and the end of the *Aetia.*

Although Hardie has identified the comparisons between Marcia and the queens in Callimachus' work, he does not expand upon the reasons why such

[311] Hardie (forthcoming).
[312] Hardie (forthcoming). See also Callimachus' portrayal of Berenice as a fourth among the Graces elsewhere in his poetry (*Epig*. 52, *Epig*. 5 Pf).
[313] See Gutzwiller (1992), 364-7 on Callim. *Epig.* 5 Pf; Posidippus 12-13 GP; Theoc. *Id*. 15.106-11, 18.51-2.
[314] Hardie (forthcoming) discusses the connection of the presentation of Arsinoe as Aphrodite and as a tenth Muse, positing the possibility that the *Aetia* of the Epilogue may have done more to cement this link.

similarities with the *Aetia* are set up at this point in the text. The presence of Marcia in Ovid's later works, as well as the *Fasti*, could help to explain these comparisons. At the end of the *Fasti*, itself a point of possible exilic revision, Marcia is honoured as a figure who can be correlated with the queens at the end of the *Aetia*. Marcia will continue to function in Ovid's exilic work as a kind of Callimachean Arsinoe-Aphrodite figure. In the exilic epistles, she will similarly become a figure who is comparable to the regal figure to whom Berenice appeals for help when divided from her husband Ptolemy III. In the *Epistulae ex Ponto* 3.1, Ovid will instruct his wife to appeal to Marcia for help (*Pont.* 3.1.77-8):

> cuncta licet facias, nisi eris laudabilis uxor,
>     non poterit credi Marcia culta tibi.
>
> You may do all these things, but unless you are a praiseworthy wife, it will not be believed that you have honoured Marcia.

As a member of the Augustan household and a close friend and relative of Ovid's wife by marriage, Marcia is seen as a figure who may be instrumental in restoring Ovid to Rome.[315] The events which occur in Callimachus' *Coma Berenices* will be put into practice in Ovid's exilic poetry: Marcia, amongst other imperial women, will function as a quasi-Arsinoe-Aphrodite figure, to be propitiated and honoured as a means of reuniting a divided husband and wife, one of whom is far away on the edge of the Empire and caught up in the middle of warfare. In this part of the *Fasti* which was believed to have undergone revision in exile, Ovid notably chooses to honour Marcia

[315] See also *Pont.* 1.2.137-8, where the poet uses Marcia's affection for his wife as a means of persuasion (*hanc probat et primo dilectam semper ab aeuo / est inter comites Marcia censa suas*). He cites his wife's connection to not only Marcia but also to her mother, Atia Minor, the aunt of Caesar, who also features at the end of the *Fasti*, whom he once again names as the *matertera Caesaris* (139-40).

himself in the very same way as he will instruct his wife to in his exilic epistles, celebrating her at the climax of his Roman elegy.[316]

Not only does the revision of Ovid's text map on to the revised status of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* itself, but this revision also allows Ovid to end his poem in a literary, yet persuasive manner, aware that Marcia may be a crucial means of returning him to Rome. Indeed, although Ovid firmly locates himself within Rome and inside the Temple of Hercules and the Muses in the text of the *Fasti*, the inclusion of Marcia in this text, as an Arsinoe-Aphrodite figure, also acts as a reminder of Ovid's exilic circumstances, his fragile relationship with Rome and the possibility that this passage was actually composed or, at least, rewritten in an exilic location, rather than in one of Rome's monuments.

**Callimachean Structures (2): Marcia and the *Victoria Berenices***

Ovid presents Marcia and her familial network in a manner similar to the depiction of Hellenistic queens and the Ptolemaic dynasty. The poet's ultimate discussion of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* and the female figure associated with it can be viewed as a reconfiguration of the Callimachean discussion of figures from the Ptolemaic family, who were themselves connected to the Muses and the Alexandrian *Mouseion*.

[316] Martelli (2013), 107: 'Given that this text was only ever circulated after the poet's relegation to Tomis (so the argument goes), and that pre- and post-exilic strata were never read in separate contexts but always within the frame of exile, the text in its entirety is open to appropriation by the exilic discourse operating at some level in the *Fasti.*'

It is possible to find further links between this section of the *Fasti* and Callimachus' own aetiological text. Parallels can be drawn between the ending of the six book *Fasti* and the *Coma Berenices*. At the same time, I would argue that it is equally valid to map the praise of Marcia at the end of *Fasti* 6, as the medial point of an intended twelve-book poem,[317] onto the structural centre of the *Aetia*, the *Victoria Berenices*, a medial moment of epinician praise which inspired a Roman poetic tradition concerned with poetic fame and monumentality.

The *Victoria Berenices* in *Aetia* 3 is an epinician for the victory of Berenice II in the chariot race at Nemea. The episode is believed to have begun with an invocation to Zeus and Nemea and an announcement that news of Berenice's victory had arrived in Alexandria. This was followed by a narrative relating the aetiology of the Nemean Games and the slaying of the Nemean lion by Hercules, including the hero's stay in the humble home of Molorchus. The poem then is believed to have returned to Berenice, with the episode ending with renewed praise for the queen and celebration of her win.[318] Thomas has argued that there is a strong precedent in Latin literature for poets to look back to the *Victoria Berenices* at the central point of their *opus*.[319] Thomas' study focusses on the opening of *Georgics* 3, Propertius 3.1, and Statius' *Silvae* 3.1. Thomas argues that these medial poems in Latin literature can be traced back to the *Victoria Berenices* and its central tale about Hercules and Molorchus.[320]

---

[317] As has already been mentioned, Marcia also appears in exilic poetry. Mention of her is notably found in the medial poem of the *Ex Ponto* (3.1.77-8).

[318] On the content of the episode, see Thomas (1983), 94-5.

[319] See Thomas (1983); Morgan (1999), 28 on Callimachus' *Aetia* and *Georgics* 3. See Newlands (1991), 439-452 on the influence of the *Aetia* and *Georgics* on Statius 3.1, and (2002), 177 on Callimachus, Vergil and Statius.

[320] See Thomas (1983), 94-5.

Although Thomas does not consider the *Fasti* amongst the poems in his analysis, it seems to me that *Fasti* 6, as the medial point of the twelve-book *Fasti,* and its discussion of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* can similarly be considered to have Callimachean influence and to be part of this tradition.

Thomas argues that these Latin medial poems are influenced by epinician and allude to Callimachus, while also referring to Hercules or Molorchus, and to the poet's artistic skills, or to an elaborately constructed temple.[321] It is certainly possible to identify some of the criteria laid down by Thomas in this passage at the end of *Fasti* 6. Similarities can be identified between the epinician of the *Victoria Berenices* and the praise of Marcia by the Muse Clio. This praise of Marcia is inspired by discussion of a temple constructed as the culmination of Fulvius' triumph, in order to honour Hercules.[322] Both texts use the mythological deeds of Hercules as a foil for historic acts. Berenice's victory is likened to the athletic triumphs of Hercules. By comparison, the triumphant deeds of Fulvius and the placement of the statues of the Muses and Hercules in the temple are likened to Juno and Hercules' reconciliation.[323]

I am not the first to make such comparisons between this tradition of poems and the *Fasti*. Newlands briefly connects the *Victoria Berenices*, the *Georgics* and the *Silvae* with the ending of the *Fasti* due to their general use of Hercules as an imperial

[321] Thomas (1983), 105.
[322] Thomas (1983), 97 proposes that Callimachus' *Victoria Berenices* may also have mentioned a temple associated with her triumphant victory. If Callimachus' *Aetia* did not have a temple (Newlands 1991, 442 casts aspersions on this idea), the conclusion of Ovid's *Fasti* still joins the Latin tradition of medial poems which appear to look back towards the *Victoria Berenices* and also speak about a temple, such as the opening to *Georgics* 3.
[323] On Hercules as a foil for the acts of the Ptolemaic dynasty and for Berenice in the *Victoria Berenices*, see Kampakoglou (2013), 113-114.

and victorious figure and the fact that the passages which discuss Hercules also include political references.[324] There are further similarities to be addressed in addition to this. This medial passage has one greater similarity to the *Victoria* than the other poems Thomas analyses. The story of Hercules in the *Victoria Berenices* is ultimately framed by elegiac praise for Berenice II, a member of the Ptolemaic household. The *Fasti*, too, celebrates a female from the imperial Augustan household in the elegiac metre. Ovid's choice to speak of Marcia at this point of the poem, in conjunction with the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, thus makes it possible to align the text with Callimachean poetics.[325]

Furthermore, the location of *Fasti* 6 in a tradition of Callimachean middles can be corroborated by comparing it to a later medial poem which appears to have been influenced by it. Critics have argued that Statius 3.1 clearly alludes to the poetic tradition created by Callimachus, Propertius, and Vergil. His poem includes direct reference to Hercules' host Molorchus (Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.29-31), along with discussion of the construction of a grand temple to Hercules (3.1.49-50).[326] At the same time, Statius also appears to use a number of details from Ovid's discussion with Clio in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*. Apparent Ovidian allusion within this poem by Statius, alongside these elements which suggest that it is part of the poetic tradition

[324] Newlands (2002), 177.
[325] In comparison, see Dufallo (2013), 118-123 on how the temple ekphrasis in *Georgics* 3, including the Mantuan temple and Vergilian triumph, is both influenced by Callimachean material and is also reminiscent of the ending of Ennius' text and the founding of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*.
[326] Thomas (1983), 103-105; Newlands (1991), 439-52.

influenced by the *Victoria Berenices,* allows the reader to consider the possibility that *Fasti* 6 was also part of the tradition which was later inherited by Statius.

Statius' poem includes, after an invocation to Calliope, reminiscences about a visit to Pollius Felix's villa in Surrentum. Out for a picnic, Statius, Pollius Felix, his wife Polla and friends are caught in a rainstorm and forced to shelter in the humble and rustic hut which is the temple of Hercules. The demi-god appears in an epiphany and requests a new temple to be built. Statius then describes the construction of this temple, before finishing by relating Hercules' gratitude and the demi-god's promise of longevity for Pollius Felix's household and the lasting preservation of his new temple.

Primarily, Statius' poem speaks not only of a grand temple but of architectural rebuilding, expressing an interest in religious aetiology similar to that shown in Ovid's *Fasti.* Statius' conversation with the Muse Calliope about the founding of the temple of Hercules, constructed by Publius Pollius Felix, is much like Ovid's aetiological conversations with divinities, including the Muse Clio in *Fasti* 6. Statius begins the narrative about the founding of the temple in a very *Fasti*-like manner. He denotes the time when this event occurred (*Silv.* 3.1.52 *tempus erat*…).[327] He uses astrological terminology, describes the typical customs of a festal day from the Roman calendar (3.1.52-60) and even matches up the inception of the temple with a day associated with Hercules Invictus, although not directly stated in the poem. Statius mentions

[327] Though *tempus erat* is too commonly used a phrase to link it to one specific place in literature, it is interesting that, along with the presence of a Muse who provides information about the aetiology of a temple of Hercules, this opening line of the origin tale is similar to the opening line of Ovid's discussion of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* with Clio (*Fast.* 6.790 *tempus Iuleis cras est Kalendis*).

that on the day on which the new temple of Hercules was first begun, with the epiphany of the god at the picnic, all of Italy were celebrating the Ides of Hecate (3.1.60). He also refers to the festal day of Aventine Diana on 13 August (3.1.55-60), which fell on the same day as the anniversary of the Temple of Hercules Invictus.[328] Statius connects the construction of Pollius Felix's Herculean temple to days in the Roman calendar associated with the founding of temples in Rome, just as Ovid celebrates the addition of festal days in the calendar in the *Fasti.*

Similarities to the end of *Fasti* 6 in particular can be noted in *Silvae* 3.1. In this medial poem, Statius asks Calliope to speak of the construction of a temple to Hercules, who once lived in a lowly hut,[329] in a move which appears to recall *Fasti* 6, where Ovid converses with a Muse about a temple of Hercules which had itself recently been renovated. In *Silvae* 3.1, Statius appeals to Calliope to speak of the construction of the temple (*Silv.* 3.1.46-51):

> hic templis inscriptus auo gaudente sacerdos
> paruus adhuc similisque tui cum prima nouercae
> monstra manu premeres atque exanimata doleres.
> sed quaenam subiti, ueneranda, exordia templi
> dic age, Calliope; socius tibi grande sonabit
> Alcides tensoque modos imitabitur arcu.[330]
>
> Here in this temple, while his grandfather rejoices, the priest is inscribed. He is still young, as you were when you first strangled the snakes of your stepmother with your hand and grieved at their lifeless forms. But come, Calliope, tell me how this unexpected temple came about. Alcides will make music loudly as your accompaniment, imitating your metre with a tight bowstring.

[328] See Newlands (1991), 443 on the festal day.
[329] Not only is Hercules present in this poem, but the Muses too are mentioned, as Statius celebrates the poetic skill of Pollius Felix (*Silv.* 3.1.66-7 *nouosque / Pieridum flores intactaque carmina discens*).
[330] Text taken from Courtney (1990).

This passage has a number of features which appear to recall the ending to Ovid's *Fasti*. Statius speaks of Hercules' *nouerca* Juno and the rivalry between them immediately before he asks Calliope about the temple's aetiology (*Silv.* 3.1.46-7), just as Ovid mentions the finally resolved enmity between Hercules and Juno as he questions Clio about the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* (*Fast.* 6.800 *cui dedit invitas victa noverca manus*). Added to this, Statius' promise to Calliope that Hercules will accompany her (*Silv.* 3.1.49-51) appears similar to the final twang of Hercules' lyre which, in the *Fasti*, accompanies Clio's response and praise of Marcia (*Fast.* 6.811).[331]

The renovation of Hercules' temple in Statius recalls the transformation of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* by Philippus. In addition to this, the reasons given in *Silvae* 3.1 for Hercules' need for a new temple also recall the original circumstances in which the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* was constructed by Fulvius. As already mentioned, Statius' poem raises the age-old enmity between Hercules and his stepmother, but it also speaks of their current uneasy relationship. Hercules admits that he feels pride in his humble shrine, but is derided by Juno (*Silv.* 3.1.104-6):

> sed proxima sedem
> despicit et tacite ridet mea limina Iuno.
> da templum dignasque tuis conatibus aras.
>
> But nearby Juno disparages my seat and silently laughs at my threshold.
> Grant me a temple worthy of your endeavours.

[331] The musical imitation of Statius' Hercules (51 *imitabitur*) could perhaps be a textual comment on the imitative nature of this poem which reshapes material from a number of different texts, including Ovid's *Fasti*. Newlands (1991), 447 suggests that Hercules' accompaniment and imitation of Calliope's grand style hints at Statius' imitation of grand style and epic themes within this poem. Ovid's poem, too, could be considered as one of the texts to which Statius alludes.

Juno's slights are cited as the reason for Hercules' need for a new shrine, particularly due to her presence in a nearby temple (137 *iunctae tecta nouercae*).[332] Notwithstanding its later construction date and shoreline location, the reason for Hercules' temple renovation recalls the construction of Fulvius' temple in Rome.[333] As discussed earlier, after the resolution of discord between himself and Aemilius Lepidus, Fulvius' temple was constructed close to the pre-existing Temple of Juno Regina, as a worthy counterpart of his former rival's architectural monument. Thus, Statius' explanation for the reasoning behind the construction of a new temple of Hercules, and its topographic surroundings, even though outside of the city, appears to be similar to the events behind Ovid's own aetiological depiction of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* in Rome.

Finally, in Statius' discussion of the construction of a temple for Hercules, a Roman matron is praised. The wife of the architect of this building, Polla, receives a mention as the poet recalls her grace (*decus*) and her desirability as a younger woman, suggesting she would have been desired by the hero (*Silv.* 3.1.161-62):

> quodsi dulce decus uiridesque resumeret annos
> (da ueniam, Alcide) fors hic et pensa tulisses.
>
> But, if her sweet grace in her youthful years were to resume, (I beg your pardon, Hercules) you would have carried her weaving.

[332] This line (*iunctae…nouercae*) could also allude to *Fasti* 6 if one reads line 799 with *adiunxerit*, the reading of MS M, instead of *addixerit* (799-800 *quis vos ad**iunxerit** isti / cui dedit invitas victa **noverca** manus?*) (See A. Hardie 2007, 565n76 on the manuscript tradition).
[333] A. Hardie (2007), 567n85 on *Silv*. 3.1.50-51: 'The proximity of a temple of Juno […] might well point to some analogous treatment of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* and the Temple of Juno Regina.'

This praise of Polla, as the wife of the temple's architect, is much like that given to Marcia in the *Fasti.* Indeed, the daughter of Philippus, the renovator of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, is praised for her desirability and grace (*Fast.* 6.810 *decus*) by the Muses and Hercules. Furthermore, Statius appears to refer to material found in the wider narrative of the *Fasti*, as he speculates how, if Polla were younger, Hercules would have been her slave and carried her weaving. Here, Polla is characterised as a second Omphale, who is spoken of in the *Fasti* as the mistress of Hercules (*Fast.* 2.305), when Ovid recounts the tale of Faunus, Omphale and Hercules (2.303-356).

It seems likely, then, that Statius is borrowing details specifically from the *Fasti* or, at any rate, that both poets are making use of *topoi* from the same tradition. The presence of Marcia and a Herculean monument at this pseudo-medial point in the *Fasti* allows comparisons to be made with the other female figures and triumphant, monumental temples found at central moments in poetry, inserting the *Fasti* into a tradition that looks back to Callimachus' *Aetia.* Marcia herself stands as a kind of successor to the queens celebrated in the *Aetia*. She is a figure worthy of poetic epinician and memorialisation via the aetiological discussion of a lasting architectural and poetic monument.

**Anything your building can do, my elegies can do better: A Marcian monument in Propertian elegy**

Having highlighted the ways in which the ending of the *Fasti* and the poet's choice to focus on Marcia can be compared to Callimachus' *Victoria Berenices* in the *Aetia* and

medial poems in the Augustan literary corpus, this section will consider the ending of the *Fasti* in specific comparison to another pseudo-medial, programmatic poem. This chapter has so far considered the placement of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* (and Marcia) at the central point of Ovid's supposed twelve-book *Fasti* in the context of other medial points in poetry, including the *Georgics* 3, the *Aetia*, and the medial point of the *Fasti* itself, the proem to Venus. Propertius 3.2, as part of a triptych of poems at the beginning of Propertius' third book, is connected to the poetic tradition inspired by the *Victoria Berenices*. Much like the end of *Fasti* 6, which focusses on female praise and monumental buildings, Propertius' elegy 3.2 also considers the monumental and textual preservation of female beauty.[334]

Propertius 3.1, the most medial point of the Propertian corpus as it now stands, corresponds with other central, programmatic moments in poetry, such as the opening of Vergil's *Georgics* 3 and the *Aetia* midpoint. It invokes Callimachus (3.1.1), features a triumphal motif (9-10, 19-20), a chariot-race (11-14), the Muses (10, 14), and makes a declaration of the poet's lasting fame (35-8).[335] It seems, however, as many have argued, that 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 are all linked programmatically and should, in fact, be read as a medial triptych.[336] The first three poems which begin Propertius'

---

[334] The idea of a female being worthy of a monument is expressed elsewhere in elegy, particularly in Propertius. See Propertius 4.7.83-6: *hic carmen media dignum me scribe columna, / sed breue, quod currens uector ab urbe legat: / HIC SITA TIBVRNA IACET AVREA CYNTHIA TERRA: / ACCESSIT RIPAE LAVS, ANIENE, TVAE.* See also Propertius 2.11 for the fate of the elegiac female who lacks any kind of memorial or monument (2.11.5-6). On other figures deemed worthy monuments in elegy see also: Prop. 2.38.17-58; *Am*. 2.6.59-62.

[335] See Thomas (1983), 101-103; Miller (1983b), 290; Nelis (2005), 239-40 on the similarities between Propertius 3.1 and *Georgics* 3.

[336] See Miller (1983b), 292n16; Heyworth (2007b), 286 on the possibility that 3.2.1-2 should be read as part of 3.1. See Heyworth (2007b), 285-7 on the connectedness of 3.1 and 3.2, and the possibility of reading them as one poem. On the possibility that Propertius 3.1 and 3.2 are imitations of

third book are all preoccupied with Ennius, the Muses and monumental structures. Both 3.1 and 3.3 are *recusationes* from epic and annalistic poetry, affirming Propertius' Callimachean programme.[337] In 3.1, Propertius appears to recall Ennian poetry as he recuses himself from epic and differentiates himself from the many others who wish to add to the *Annals* of Rome (3.1.15-16):

> multi, Roma, tuas laudes annalibus addent,
> qui finem imperii Bactra futura canent.
>
> Many will add praises to the Annals, Rome, who will sing of Bactra as the future limit of the Empire.[338]

The idea of writing Ennian poetry is also rejected in 3.3, as Apollo turns the poet away from drinking at the fount of inspiration from which Ennius drank, in favour of writing elegy (3.3.5-20). The poet recuses himself from telling of events from Rome's history, listing a muddled and perhaps ironic catalogue of events which appear to be from Ennius' *Annals* (3.3.7-12) including some of those which are also reproduced in the *Fasti*.[339]

Many have argued that the *Fasti* is influenced by Propertius' aetiological fourth book.[340] Yet the poems which open the third book of Propertian elegy can also be viewed as anticipation of and invitation for works such as Ovid's aetiological text.

---

Callimachus' *In Telchinas* and 3.3 of *Somnium,* see Hutchinson (1988), 287. Mader (1993), 321 goes further, arguing that the first five poems of Propertius 3 are a 'coherent cycle with programmatic intent'. See also Sharrock (2013), 159-61.

[337] See Sharrock (2013), 159-61 on the opening five poems as an exploration of Propertius' Hellenistic poetic aesthetics and negotiation of Roman socio-political ideology.

[338] Miller (1983a), 283: 'the 'many' here are, of course, writers of encomiastic historical epic who follow in the footsteps of Ennius. In the present programmatic context, the word *annalibus* would most certainly call Ennius' own epic to the Augustan reader's mind.'

[339] See Miller (1983a), 279-85.

[340] See Miller (1978); McKeown (1984), 179-84; Herbert-Brown (1994), 9-14; Barchiesi (1997a), 102, 186-9, 267.

Propertius claims that he has nothing to add to the annals of Rome (3.1.15-16) (a statement which is, of course, not entirely true when we consider his fourth book). Almost as if directly responding to Propertius, Ovid's *Fasti* does exactly that. The poet adds to the annals (and Ennian *Annals*), rewriting the Roman calendar, adding days from the Julian calendar, and writing about Roman monuments in new ways.

Propertius 3.2, which discusses the monumentality of buildings, stands at the centre of this triptych of poems which are *recusationes* from grand, Ennian epic. This poem can also be counted as part of the poet's reflections upon elegy, the *Annals* and Roman imperial literature. Like the poems which surround it, it contains discussion of poetic inspiration, poetic genre and the Muses. Allusion to Ennius can also be found in the ending remarks of the poem; Propertius' discussion of his poetic afterlife (3.2.25-26) recalls Ennian proclamations that incorporeal poetic fame is a means of life after death. In this poem, Propertius states that he has no need for an extravagant house with fertile gardens, because the Muses are his companions and his elegiac poetry will last longer than any physical monument.

The grand house which Propertius rejects in favour of his elegies can also be interpreted, it will be shown, as a monument with Ennian associations: a Propertian depiction of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* in its guise as a Philippian or, indeed, *Marcian* monument. The presentation of this architectural structure, as Propertius reflects on the nature of his own poetry as a lasting monument, will allow comparisons to be made with Ovid's *Fasti*, where he presents real, Roman monuments such as the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* as complementary to his monumental text.

In Propertius 3.2, the poet considers his own fame and the lasting renown of his subject matter, the *puella*. The poet does so by describing the inability of monumental structures to avoid rack and ruin, while his own elegiac poetry has the capability of becoming a different kind of lasting memorial (Prop. 3.2.11-26):

> quod non Taenariis domus est mihi fulta columnis,
>    nec camera auratas inter eburna trabes,
> nec mea Phaeacas aequant pomaria siluas,
>    non operosa rigat Marcius antra liquor;
> at Musae comites, et carmina cara legenti, 15
>    et defessa choris Calliopea meis.
> fortunata, meo si qua es celebrata libello!
>    carmina erunt formae tot monumenta tuae.
> nam neque pyramidum sumptus ad sidera ducti,
>    nec Iouis Elei caelum imitata domus, 20
> nec Mausolei diues fortuna sepulcri
>    mortis ab extrema condicione uacant.
> aut illis flamma aut imber subducet honores,
>    annorum aut tacito pondere uicta ruent.
> at non ingenio quaesitum nomen ab aeuo 25
>    excidet: ingenio stat sine morte decus.

> My house is not held up by columns of Taenarian marble. Nor are there arched ivory roofs between gold beams. The fruit-gardens are no equal to Alcinous' orchards. No Marcian spring waters an elaborate grotto. Yet the Muses are my companions, and my verses are dear to their reader, and Calliope has grown weary because of my dances. Fortunate one, if any woman is celebrated in my little poetry book, you are. So many poems are monuments to your beauty. For neither the pyramids' lavish extravagance, raised to the stars, nor the heaven-imitating house of Olympian Jupiter, nor the rich fortune of the tomb of Mausolus is free from the final condition of death. Either flame or rain will take away their fame, or they will tumble to ruin, overcome by the silent weight of years. But never in all eternity, will the fame obtained by poetic talent perish. Beauty will exist, without end, because of this.

Propertius 3.2, like 3.1, discusses elegiac poetry as a means of fame and preservation. However, there are subtle differences in the way in which the two poems address the topic of poetic immortality and the lasting nature of Propertian elegy. In elegy 3.1,

Propertius recalls *Georgics* 3 and Vergil's description of his poetic triumph and monument in the form of the Mantuan temple. In elegy 3.2, Propertius rejects grand architecture and artificially created nature in favour of the Muses, much as is seen in *Georgics* 2, where the poet celebrates the simple farmer's life in the countryside and the pursuit of the Muses, as opposed to ornate and extravagant homes (*Georg.* 2.458-89). Propertius' elegy also recalls Horatian lyric, including the poet's discussion of his simple Sabine farm (*Od.* 2.18), his refusal to exchange his Sabine home for a lofty atrium (3.1.41-48),[341] and his ultimate description of poetry as a monument which will outlast the famous and excessive building structures of the world (3.30).[342]

Propertius states that he has no need of a columned dwelling place, set within a manicured landscape, as the Muses are his companions. The lasting structures which will prevent oblivion after death are not grand and luxurious buildings but his love poems: these are presented as monuments which memorialise his beloved's beauty (18 *forma*). The poet reshapes the Horatian tension between grand, man-made monuments and lasting poetry in a way which suits an eroto-elegiac context.[343]

After describing a columned house, which recalls those discussed and rejected by Horace and Vergil, the elegist turns to the exterior of the metaphorical building, and dismisses an orchard full of fruit and a well-watered grotto. In line 13 (*nec mea Phaeacas aequant pomaria siluas*), Propertius depicts a landscape with Homeric

---

[341] On Hor. *Od.* 3.1 as another addition to medial, Callimachean poems such as *Georgics* 3, Propertius 3.1 and Statius 3.1, see Faber (2005), 101n21.
[342] On the Horatian influence on Propertius 3.2, see Miller (1983b); Mader (1993).
[343] Mader (1993), 328: 'Horace uses the opposition extravagance-modesty to make a moral point, while the formally comparable patterning in 3.2 has nothing to do with moral castigation, but everything to do with elegiac poetics.'

connotations, the Phaeacian grounds and orchards which were described surrounding the halls of Alcinous (*Od.* 7.112-31),[344] before dismissing this grand, epic space. Picking up on the recusatio from epic seen in Propertius 3.1, the elegist expresses that neither epic poetry nor grand monuments and wealth will be sought as a means of memorial.

The last architectural description in Propertius' priamel, the cave irrigated by Marcian water (Prop. 3.2.14), appears to refer to a grotto or nymphaeum which is irrigated by the Aqua Marcia from the aqueduct created by Quintus Marcius Rex.[345] This mention of Marcian water could be seen as a reference to Augustan architecture, as Augustus included Rome's water-courses in his imperial building project. In 33BC Agrippa repaired the aqua Marcia while improving the city's drainage system.[346] Thus, within this priamel, Propertius appears to use grand Augustan building structures (or, at least, architecture enabled by these structures) as an alternative to his own elegiac achievements and creates a tension between his poetry and monumental architecture.

After the Vergilian/Horatian pillared house and the Homeric orchards, it seems likely that this third element in the priamel, the grotto which is watered by a Marcian

---

[344] See Mader (1993), 329.
[345] Heyworth & Morwood (2011), 16 liken the *operosa antra* to artificial grottoes in Rome including the 'Auditorium' of Maecenas on the Esquiline.
[346] See Favro (1993), 237; Heyworth and Morwood (2011), 15, 16, 321. The emperor also stated in his *Res Gestae* that he increased the capacity of the aqua Marcia by adding a new spring to it (1.10.20). However, these further aqueduct renovations noted in the *Res Gestae* are believed to have taken place after Propertius' death (c.11-4BC). The Marcian aqueduct is praised elsewhere in Propertius 3, as he describes it as *aeternum Marcius umor opus* (Prop. 3.22.24).

spring, could also have poetic connotations.[347] Mader reads the lines about the Phaeacian orchards and Marcian grotto together, arguing that the mention of the aqua Marcia is simply Propertius' way of placing the Homeric reference in a contemporary Roman context.[348] One could argue, however, that the mention of the Marcian water here can be read as a reference to Roman poetry, especially when Propertius' other description of the Marcian aqueduct as an *aeternum opus* (3.22.24) seems highly poetic.[349]

The well-watered grotto in 3.2 may recall a sacred grove of the Muses, or the type of *locus amoenus* traditionally conducive to poetic inspiration. The Marcian water, famed for its clarity and freshness in comparison to other Roman water sources,[350] appears Callimachean in nature,[351] recalling the opening of Propertius 3.1, where the poet described himself as priest of the Muses in the grove of Callimachus and Philitas (Prop. 3.1.1-6). This grove, Hunter argues, evokes the cult of the Muses and the Alexandrian *Mouseion*,[352] a building which found its Roman equivalent in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*. One might also compare the Marcian water to the Heliconian spring, a metaphor for poetic inspiration, at which Ennius drank (3.3.1-14) in a wooded grotto (3.3.14 *antra*), in the final poem of the triptych. Indeed, the Aqua Marcia was pronounced by Vitruvius to be comparable only to the fountain of the

---

[347] On the aqua Marcia and the innovation of the Roman water-course system as a metaphor for poetry and poetic inspiration, in the context of Statian poetry, see Martelli (2009), 153-156.
[348] Mader (1993), 329.
[349] *opus* like *monumentum* can have an architectural and textual definition (OLD s.v. '*opus*': 10 'a building, structure', 9c '(applied to a literary production)'.
[350] See Pliny *NH*. 31.
[351] Martelli (2009), 155 on the aqua Marcia in Statius: 'a man-made feature of the Roman landscape realises in its actual material qualities the properties of the Callimachean metaphor.'
[352] Hunter (2006), 7-12.

Camenae (the source of the Latin Muses and Roman equivalent to Helicon) as the best drinking water (*De Arch*. 8.3.1).

Sitting between a Callimachean grove and an Ennian spring in the preceding and succeeding poems, it is possible to contextualise the grotto with its Marcian spring as a monument which, like the temple in *Georgics* 3, embodies both poetic traditions. As a poem which includes Ennian allusion (in the discussion of the poetic afterlife at 3.2.25-6), and mention of the Muses (15-16), Propertius 3.2 appears to recall a specific poetic space: the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* and the Portico of Philippus, which was created by a member of the *gens Marcia*.[353] Its architect Lucius Marcius Philippus, the father of Ovid's Marcia, was himself a descendant of Quintus Marcius Rex, architect of the aqua Marcia.[354]

In the same way that the grove in 3.1 and Helicon in 3.3 can be viewed as symbolic spaces associated with Greek poetic inspiration, architecturally embodied by the Alexandrian *Mouseion*, the Marcian grotto in 3.2 can be seen as a

[353] See Heslin (2015), 304-6, who raises the possibility of Propertius 3.2 referring to the Portico of Philippus. It may be possible to further connect the Aqua Marcia and the *Aedes Herculis Musarum.* Livy (40.51) states that the aqueduct was originally meant to be constructed by M. Fulvius Nobilior (architect of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*) and M. Aemilius Lepidus, but they were prevented by M. Licinius Crassus. The aqueduct was, therefore, only later built by Q. Marcius Rex. Thus, in the aqua Marcia, we see another Roman monument, like the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, which has both Fulvian and Marcian connections. While the aqua Marcia did not flow past the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, the temple was itself placed in a Martian landscape, as it was located in the Campus Martius, in the Circus Flaminius.

[354] See Frontin. *Aq.* 1.7 on the creation of the Marcian aqueduct by Q. Marcius Rex and Plin. *NH.* 31.24 who states that Ancus Martius first began attempts to bring the water to Rome, a task which was later completed by Q. Marcius Rex. Numismatic evidence seems to suggest that younger members of this family may have been keen to associate themselves with this monument and their Marcian ancestors. A silver denarius from 56 BC (RRC 425/1) features Ancus Marcius (from whom Ovid says Marcia is descended: 6.803). The coin shows him wearing a diadem and bears his name. On the other side is depicted a horseman crossing the aqueduct. Above this, L. Marcius Philippus' name (i.e. the grandfather of Marcia and the father of the L. Marcius Philippus of *Aedes Herculis Musarum* fame) can be read as the moneyer. Below the image, *AQUAMAR* (Aqua Marcia) is written within the arches of the aqueduct.

contemporary Roman representation of poetic inspiration, architecturally embodied by the recently renovated *Aedes Herculis Musarum*.[355] The cold, clear water of the aqua Marcia in Propertius' landscape description brings together Callimachean and Ennian poetry, much as Ovid will do at the end of his *Fasti* in the description of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, making it possible to look back to Propertius 3.2 when reading *Fasti* 6.

Nonetheless, Propertius distances himself from the grand architectural structures of Augustan Rome (and the Roman poetry associated with them), as he chooses to write elegiac poetry. He presents himself as a kind of Musagetes (Prop. 3.2.15 *at Musae comites*), a self-characterisation which was also seen in 3.1, where Propertius stated that he had brought the Italian mysteries to Greek dances (3.1.3-4). This act of transferring one culture to another is comparable to the Ennian practice of bringing the Greek Muses to Italy and the Fulvian transference of the statues of the Muses from Ambracia to Rome and the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*. In elegy 3.2, however, Propertius' self-styling as a Musagetes comes with a declaration that he has no need of a physical space or monument like the Augustan/Philippian monument which was inhabited by Hercules Musagetes in Rome.[356] The elegist clearly seeks to distance himself from Roman epic and annalistic poetry and the monuments with which this type of poetry was associated.

---

[355] Propertius' third book can be dated in the second half of the 20s BC, meaning that Philippus' renovation of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, around 29BC, would have only taken place a few years before.

[356] Heslin (2015), 300 'The un-Roman elegies of Propertius situate the Muses in a place that is the antithesis of the place where Horace and Virgil and Augustus and Ennius and Fulvius have put them.'

**Comparing Propertian and Ovidian *monumenta***

The previous section has highlighted that Propertius 3.2, like *Fasti* 6, refers to Marcian monuments in Rome, as well as including allusions to Ennian poetry. This poem at the centre of Propertius' medial triptych, which upholds the Callimachean principles laid down in the previous poem and provides an alternative to Ennian poetics, creates a tension between Roman monuments and elegiac poetry. In 3.2, Propertius separates poetic fame from monumental poetry and grand building structures – including those associated with poetry. He views elegy as a lasting and enduring form of fame, which will allow the beauty of the *puella* to endure permanently (Prop. 3.2.26 *ingenio stat sine morte decus*), in contrast to the architectural monuments which are at risk of rack and ruin (3.2.19-24). Accordingly, the Propertian elegiac text becomes a counter-cultural structure which promotes and memorialises the poet's beloved. It stands as an alternative to the building structures which were established and founded in Rome and linked to imperial power.

The poetic programme set out in Propertius 3.2 invites comparison with Ovid's discussion of monuments at the end of the *Fasti*.[357] Propertius rejects both fictional and historical structures such as the Portico of Philippus - and the grand poetry associated with it - as unnecessary and fruitless memorials. As an alternative, he describes his own elegies as everlasting monuments to female beauty (Prop. 3.2.18

[357] Propertius 3.2 and this part of Ovid's *Fasti* share similar language: *Marci-us/a; domus, ingenium, decus, forma, monumenta, nomen.* Even if Ovid's mention of Marcia is not a specific reference to this Propertian elegy, the connection between the two texts is still there; they both clearly address similar themes and discuss monumental structures connected to the Muses and poetic inspiration.

*carmina erunt **formae** tot **monumenta** tuae*; 26 ***ingenio** stat sine morte **decus***).[358] Ovid's later text, however, uses this very building (*Fast.* 6.801 *clari **monumenta** Philippi*) as a way of memorialising female beauty and nobility in the form of Marcia, a Roman woman and elegiac matron (6.805-6 *par animo quoque **forma** suo respondet; in illa / et genus et facies **ingenium**que simul*; 810 *o **decus**, o sacra femina*). As an elegiac poet, Ovid consciously associates himself with the kind of buildings which Propertius rejects.[359] In Propertian elegy, as in Horatian lyric,[360] time is seen as a destructive force from which only famous poetry can escape (Prop. 3.2.24 *annorum aut tacito pondere uicta ruent*). By contrast, in the aetiological elegy of the *Fasti*, the passing of time is used by Ovid, in his calendrical text, as a means of memorialising and preserving the buildings of Rome and the men and women associated with them in written form.[361]

Propertius views grand houses, such as the columned *domus* with its cave watered by the Marcian spring, as unnecessary edifices, in contrast to the household unit that he and his mistress make up. This ties in with Propertius' attempts to distance himself from traditional familial values and social structures in his early

---

[358] Sharrock (2013), 159-60 has questioned whether Propertius' changing focus from Cynthia to Callimachean aesthetics, expressed in the first poems of his third book, may suggest an increasing respectability, as the Callimachean tradition serves as 'a new way of being a man and a Roman'. She illustrates, however, that 3.2 sees a return to core Propertian erotic and elegiac values.

[359] In *Georgics* 2, one of the texts on which Propertius 3.2 draws, Vergil rejects the extravagant houses and buildings. He chooses, instead, the Muses and a knowledge of the ways of the world and nature, including the movement of the stars and the solar and lunar eclipses (*Georg*. 2.477-78). In the *Fasti*, the poet combines the two ideas, celebrating the buildings and structures of Rome in tandem with his cosmological and astrological knowledge.

[360] See also Hor. *Od*. 3.30.4-5; Catull. 68.151-2 for examples of time and the passing days as a means of destruction.

[361] In his exilic poetry, however, Ovid will follow Propertius in expressing a contrast between architecture and poetry as a memorial. As expressed in Prop. 3.2, it will be Ovid's books which provide memorial for his wife's virtue (*Tr.* 5.14.1-2 *quanta tibi dederim nostris monumenta libellis, / o mihi me coniunx carior, ipsa uides*).

elegies,[362] as he even goes as far as to describe Cynthia as his 'only house' (Prop. 1.11.23 *sola domus*). At the end of the *Fasti*, Marcia is associated and memorialised by means of Roman urban constructs, the type of which Propertius rejects as lasting monuments. She is also linked to the type of social structure from which Propertius and his lover distance themselves.[363] The *domus* with which Marcia is linked is the famous imperial house; a house which itself transcends materiality and a house which Ovid suggests can last forever (*Fast.* 1.721-22 *domus…cum pace perennet*).[364] Thus, in the *Fasti,* Ovid evolves the traditions of elegy, as the female object of his praise has clear connections not only to the familial structure of a Roman household but to *the* household of the imperial family.

Propertius uses his text to show elegiac poetry as a lasting and counter-cultural alternative to Roman and Augustan structures, which he believes will eventually decay. By contrast, in the *Fasti*, Ovid ties his elegy firmly to building structures. In doing so, the poet merges ideas from erotic elegy and annalistic Roman poetry, as he speaks of the glorious history of Roman temples and the women associated with them. Rather than overtly suggesting that poetry will outlast the urban cityscape,

---

[362] See Propertius 2.7. A further contrast between Marcia and the traditional elegiac woman can, therefore, be identified, as the elegiac woman is often the cause of the *amator*'s abandonment of the household and familial structures promoted by Augustan family values. See Gardner (2010), 454-58.

[363] Cornelia is an exception to this Propertian tradition in 4.11, she like Marcia is part of a secure social structure: the imperial household (Prop. 4.11.44 *quin et erat magnae pars imitanda domus*). However, the poet may separate himself from support of the Augustan household in his description of Cornelia: he describes how the house is supported by grand titles (4.11.32 *et* ***domus est*** *titulis utraque* ***fulta*** *suis*), using the very same expression (*domus est fulta*), only used in these two cases, as he does to describe the house he rejects (3.2.11 *non Taenariis* ***domus est*** *mihi* ***fulta*** *columnis*). Thus, while Marcia is praised for her association with the imperial house, there may be a certain insincerity to the Propertian representation of Cornelia's domestic situation, harking back to traditional elegiac ideals.

[364] Ovid uses the verb (*perennet*) which is etymologically linked to the adjective with which Horace describes his lasting poetic monument (Hor. *Od*. 3.30.1 *monumentum aere per****ennius***), which itself puns on the name Ennius (see Martelli 2013, 163).

Ovid uses the text of the *Fasti* as a container for and a means of preserving the buildings – and social structures – which make up Augustan Rome. One could even suggest that Ovid's textualisation of these monuments underwrites and ensures their immortality, as texts and architectural monuments come together in his *Fasti.* In turn, these Roman buildings lead the Roman viewer to recall the *Fasti* and, thus, also memorialise the poet's work*.* The *Aedes Herculis Musarum* is used as a memorial to elegy and female beauty in the *Fasti* in conjunction with his praise of Marcia. Thanks to the *Fasti*, it becomes an Ovidian, elegiac monument, as well as a grand Fulvian (and Ennian) and Philippian (and Augustan) structure.

**Conclusion**

The *Fasti* firmly locates its poet in Rome. This elegiac text, which contemplates the ordering of time and space and the construction of urban monuments, allows the poet to become part of the Augustan building project and the monumentalisation of the calendar. Ovid 'writes up' the city within this text, informing the reader about the topography of the city, and creating a version of the city within which he locates himself and his readers.

Ovid's text becomes an alternative version to the *fasti* within the city, taking on similar monumental qualities to these calendars which were inscribed on the city's architecture. Indeed, the *Fasti* becomes similar to one particular monument, the *Aedes Herculis Musarum,* which itself also contained a *fasti.* As the poet appears to place himself within this temple, conversing with one of the Muses, his discussion

acts as a reminder of the architect who built it, the context under which it was constructed and the annalistic poetry in which it was first celebrated. Moreover, both text and temple are connected as Ovid shows that both architecture and poetry can be subject to renovation and rewriting by different architects/authors as time passes.

As the poet speaks of this temple at the climactic point of the *Fasti*, breaking off half-way through the expected length of the poem, this real, Roman temple is portrayed in a way which recalls Ennian and Callimachean poetry. Just as the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* stands as the Latin equivalent of the *Mouseion*, Ovid's aetiological text owes much to Callimachus *Aetia* and can be seen as a Roman version. Ovid speaks of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* and an imperial woman associated with the temple, who can be viewed as a Roman equivalent to the women praised at the end of the Greek *Aetia.*

As Marcia is praised in conjunction with the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, Ovid also appears to tie his poetry to those other Latin poems which allude to and recreate a version of Callimachus' *Victoria Berenices*, such as *Georgics* 3, a poem which also inherited material from Ennian and Callimachean literature and constructed a literary temple within its text. Just as there are those who argue that the poetic temple within *Georgics* 3 can be seen as a version of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* and an expression of the poet's work, Ovid's temple of the Muses in *Fasti* 6 can similarly be seen as a poetic monument, a lasting container of the calendar, in spite of changes and alterations.

Other elegiac poems express a clear dichotomy between architectural constructions and lasting poetry, with Propertius 3.2 even seeming to disparage this particular architectural structure in Rome. In the *Fasti*, however, the poet indicates a different dynamic between literature and architecture, and an interdependent relationship between both. Architectural monuments become 'inscribed' with memories of texts and texts celebrate and preserve architecture.

As the end of the poem looks ahead to exile, and the reader considers the possibility that the end of the *Fasti* may have been revised in Tomis, it seems appropriate that Ovid uses building structures as a means of praising members of the imperial household. While resetting the poem's elegiac agenda and alluding to works which end with female praise, such as Propertius 4.11 and Callimachus' *Aetia*, the *Fasti*, read from exile, becomes a means of persuasion. *Fasti* 6 may be an attempt to seek Ovid's return to the city, in the heart of which this poem showed him to be firmly located.

# CHAPTER 3

## The *Tristia*

## There's no place like Rome: Finding a reader in the city (*Tristia* 3.1)

### Introduction: Rome and Exile

Up to now, this thesis has shown how Rome is a central focus of Ovid's work, from the *Amores* to the *Fasti,* as the poet locates himself in Rome within his texts, constructing versions of the city in his poetry and navigating it as a historical, political and poetic landscape. However, one key change means that the poet's relationship with Rome dramatically alters when writing his two final poetic collections: his exile from the city.[365] In the exilic epistles, the reader finds the poet situated in a cold, barren landscape on the edge of the Black Sea, separated from the city and the monuments which were a seminal part of his earlier poetry.[366] Yet, as Ovid ventures into exile, and the genre of exilic elegy, space is still a key consideration, and a means of orientating himself and his poetic work. The poet's earliest letters back to Rome in the *Tristia* can be used as a means of considering how his relationship with the city and his readers there is affected by his altered situation.

[365] It is impossible to tell how much of the exile Ovid describes is truth and how much is fiction, metaphor or symbolism; so I do not intend to spend time considering this. It seems entirely possible that Ovid did leave Rome for Tomis. That being said, the thesis of Claassen on the 'myth of exile' - that true events of Ovid's life and fictional material used for poetic effect are fused and indistinguishable - should certainly be acknowledged. (See Claassen (2008), 8-10; Claassen (2013), 45; P. Hardie (2002), 284-5).

[366] Of course, one cannot fully separate the poet's relationship with Rome in texts before and after exile, per se, as was highlighted in the previous chapter, due to the revision of the *Fasti* in exile.

Although Ovid has physically departed from the city, Rome is present throughout the exilic corpus. The poet makes repeated reference to the urban topography, the weather, the people who live there and the events which occur. The Roman landscape is evoked as a means of discussing the poet's exiled status: as he laments the friends he can no longer meet, the triumphs and events he cannot watch (*Tr*. 4.2, *Pont*. 2.1, 3.4), and the buildings and green spaces he can no longer visit (*Tr*. 3.1, 3.12 *Pont.* 1.8). Meanwhile, the spaces of his past life in Rome and the Italian landscape are contrasted with the barren and architecturally lacking Tomis as a commentary on the poetic inspiration available to the poet before and after exile. To quote Boyle, 'the poet defines himself by his relationship to the inaccessible monuments of Rome.'[367]

As the urban structures of Rome become further away and less tangible, the poet becomes more concerned with the monumentality of his poetry. The word *monumentum* is used throughout the Ovidian corpus, but it is only in the poet's exilic letters that the word is used overtly to refer to poetic endeavours.[368] His letters stand as memorials to his poetic fame now that he has 'died' in exile (*Tr*. 3.3.77-8, *Pont*. 4.14.25) and as markers of his wife's renown (*Tr.* 5.14.1-2). The works of others are also praised by the poet in this same fashion (*Pont.* 3.5.35-6). Alongside these literary

[367] Boyle (2003), 18.

[368] The term is used only once respectively in the *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria* (*Am*. 1.7.31, *Ars Am.* 3.391). It is used five times in the *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 1.159, 4.161, 4.550, 10.725, 13.524), seven in the *Fasti* (*Fast.* 2.265, 2.301, 3.513, 4.709, 6.195, 6.611, 6.801) and six in the exilic epistles (four of which times refer to poetic monuments) (*Tr*. 2.1.419, 5.14.1, 3.3.78, *Pont*. 1.1.5, 3.535, 4.14.25). While it is understandable that the poet uses it most in his poem about Rome's religious architecture, this trend suggests that, as the poet's career goes on and moves towards exile (the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* both being believed to have been revised in Tomis), there is a greater awareness of monumentality as a means of ensuring the preservation of the memory of the poet and his texts.

monuments, there are contrasting images of architectural ruin: for example, the crumbling house as a metaphor for the poet's esteem in Rome (*Tr.* 2.83-8 *Pont.* 1.9.13-14), and the images of decaying materials as an analogy for his grief (*Pont.* 1.167-74). The contrast between ephemeral architectural structures and lasting poetic monuments is set up in the exilic poems in a way which has not been so clearly visible in Ovid's earlier poetic works. In contrast to the *Fasti*, where the monuments of Augustan Rome were celebrated as lasting memorials, in his exilic epistles the poet even goes as far as to state outright that he favours poetry over architectural monuments (*Pont*. 4.8.31-4). He declares that building materials are impermanent and ephemeral (49-52) compared to poetic *monumenta*.

As the structures and buildings of Rome become physically inaccessible, and an incorporeal figment of his imagination,[369] the poet more regularly returns to the city within his poetry and more clearly presents his poetic compositions as alternatives to architectural constructions. Poetry becomes monumental in that it becomes a means of recreating and summoning up the structures which could be easily reached before. In the *Fasti*, as discussed in the previous chapter, Ovid's poetry allowed his reader to clearly imagine and 'access' Rome. Now, it is poetry that allows the poet *himself* to visualise the city. In a world which now lacks structure and stability, poetry becomes Ovid's main means of an existence in Rome, a way of reconstructing and accessing the city. The poet who can no longer approach the city in reality (*Tr.* 1.8.38 *urbe meo quae iam* ***non adeunda pede*** *est*) returns to it in metre. As he instructs his poetry

[369] See P. Hardie (2002), 300-325.

book to return to Rome on his behalf, he plays on the meaning of 'foot', to highlight that his only access to Rome is now through his poetry (*Tr.* 1.1.15-16):

> uade, liber, uerbisque meis loca grata saluta:
> contingam certe quo licet illa pede.
>
> Go, little book, and greet the beloved places with my words: I shall reach them at least with whatever foot I can.

As others have suggested, the poetry book sent back to Rome is a surrogate for the poet himself, as his work reminds his readers of the author and maintains Ovid's 'presence' in Rome.[370] At the same time, his previous works allow him to summon up and recall the city as he writes about it in his new works, using 'textual memory'.[371] The poet becomes divided from the city which he physically constructed in his earlier corpus. Yet, as the act of writing about the city allows Ovid to access it by means of memory and recollection of his earlier texts, questions are raised as to who has control over how the city is evoked, accessed and read.

### ***Tristia* 3.1**

*Tristia* 3.1 sees an extended depiction of the new, Ovid-less Rome. *Tristia* 3 marks the mid-point in a five-book collection of exilic elegies. 3.1 acts as a preface to poems in which Ovid describes for the first time his existence on the Black Sea and the drudgery and hardship of life after leaving Rome. The poem is narrated by Ovid's personified poetry book which, arriving in the city, goes looking for a home on the Palatine – and

[370] Hinds (1985), 26; P. Hardie (2002), 297.

[371] P. Hardie (2002), 287 highlights, for example how Ovid's 'textual memory' is employed when writing about his last night in Rome, as he uses the text of the *Metamorphoses*, along with *Aeneid* 2, to portray his departure from the city.

for clemency from Augustus.[372] The Ovidian *liber*'s journey is a quest for reception from Roman institutions (the *domus Augusta* and the temples and libraries on the Palatine) as the book attempts to restore its author to Rome and Ovid's work to wider circulation. Like many other medial texts in poetic collections,[373] *Tristia* 3.1 can be read as a programmatic text. It considers the nature of the poet's new elegiac work now that he is removed from Rome. It also raises the topic of how this exilic elegy will be received within the city of Rome and whence an audience might still be sought.

Generically, the poem bears many of the features of the *epibaterion* (the speech of the arriving traveller).[374] The *epibaterion* includes *topoi* such as description of a city's physical features and urban development, mention of the inhabitants' character, and praise for the city's founder. The speech of the arriving traveller is often seen in ancient drama, such as Dionysus' prologue about Thebes in the *Bacchae* (1-63), and Agamemnon's address to Argos in the *Agamemnon* (*Ag*. 810-54). In the same way, *Tristia* 3.1 can be viewed as a dramatic enactment of the reception of Ovid's poetry in Rome, featuring description of the city's monuments and praise for (and appeals to) the *princeps*.

---

[372] It is uncertain whether or not this is the same book as that which appeared in *Tr.* 1.1. In that poem, the poet charged his poetry book with returning to Rome and seeking a pardon on his behalf. Nagle (1980), 85, Newlands (1997), 57 and P. Hardie (2002), 299 argue that *Tr*. 3.1 is a 'sequel' to *Tr.* 1.1. Whether the speaking book is the same book as that instructed by Ovid in the previous poem cannot be confirmed with certainty, but seems likely. What differs between the poems is the fact that the former takes place in Tomis, and is narrated through the voice of the poet, while the latter takes place in Rome, and is narrated by the poet's *liber.*

[373] Cf. Chapter 2 and my discussion of the end of *Fasti* 6 as a programmatic, medial point, along with the programmatic medial poems of Callimachus' *Aetia*, Vergil's *Georgics* 3, Horace 3.1, Propertius 3.1-3 and Ovid *Amores* 3.1.

[374] See Cairns (1971), 212-13 on the *epibaterion*.

The arrival of an *exiled* traveller is also a previously used motif which is adapted by Ovid.[375] This *topos* is found, for example, within Cicero's letters. In his epistle to Atticus (4.1.5), the orator describes how, returning from exile in Dyrrachium via Brundisium, he enters the gates of Rome and tours the temples, forums and Capitol. Cicero describes the warm welcome he received from crowds in the forum and on the steps of the temples, a welcome for which he gave a speech of thanks in the senate house (*Att.* 4.1.5). Ovid might be seen as a kind of failed Cicero, however. While Cicero describes his tour of Rome upon his return from exile, no homecoming is permitted for the exiled Ovid: his book's return is described instead, and it tours the city as a stranger.

In *Tristia* 3.1, it is Ovid's *liber,* as protagonist and narrator of the poem, who returns to Rome. While its author remains in exile and unable to approach the city, the little book arrives in Rome on behalf of Ovid. Apologising for its barbarian appearance and trying to hide its elegiac characteristics, it seeks a friendly guide to show it the sights. Book and guide progress past the *fora* of Caesar (the book is ambiguous about which Caesar) and the temples of Vesta and Jupiter Stator. They proceed to the Palatine, where the book pleads for mercy on the doorstep of the *domus Augusta*, but in vain. Rejected from the house and the adjacent Temple of Palatine Apollo, the libraries in the Portico of Octavia and the Atrium of Libertas, the book receives no warm welcome in the public locations of Rome and declares its own

[375] On exile itself as a literary experience which was described and developed by many writers in antiquity see Nagle (1980), 33-5; Gaertner (2007); Fantham (2007), 191; Innocenti Pierini (1980). On the Ciceronian tone and nature of Ovid's exile poetry in general, see Nagle (1980), 33-5 and Gaertner (2007), 159-60, 170.

exilic status. It appeals once more to Augustus for help, before seeking a place to hide in a private location and appealing to the general public to hold it in their hands and read it. Much as Cicero's welcome is from the general public (Cic. *Att.* 4.1.5.5 *gradus templorum ab infima plebe completi erant*),[376] Ovid's book ultimately seeks a different welcome to that offered by imperial institutions: a mass readership (3.1.82 *sumite, plebeiae, carmina nostra, manus*).

It is uncertain from whom Ovid is primarily seeking help and reception in this elegy, as the *Tristia* has no named addressees. Chronologically, *Tristia* 3.1 follows immediately after the poet's extended appeal to Augustus in *Tristia* 2. Furthermore, the poem includes invocations to Caesar (*Tr.* 3.1.49-52, 75-8), as the personified book seeks a reception from the imperial monuments of the Palatine. The book's final prayer in *Tristia* 3.1 (3.1.77 *di, precor…*) begins with the same invocatory language used at *Metamorphoses* 15.861-70,[377] where Ovid prays for the delayed apotheosis of the emperor, so that Augustus will not become an *absens deus*. Such an invocation may suggest that 3.1 is a flattering and persuasive appeal to the emperor, whom the book even addresses as a god (3.1.78 *Caesar…maxime dive*).[378] Yet, at the same time, the poem ends with an appeal to a mass readership, after the *liber* is unable to find

[376] Text taken from Shackleton Bailey (1999).

[377] *Met.* 15.861-70 begins ***di, precor**, Aeneae comites, quibus ensis et ignis / cesserunt, dique Indigetes genitorque Quirine…,* as it alludes to Verg. *Georg*. 1.498-515, which begins *di patrii, Indigetes, et Romule Vestaque mater.*

[378] See also *Tr.* 5.2, a poem which also appears to allude to *Metamorphoses* 15. It includes a wish that the emperor's time on earth will be drawn out before his ascension to heaven (*Tr.* 5.2.51-2) as the poet begs for a mitigation of his exile. (See P. Hardie (2002), 301-2, (2015), 617 on *Met.* 15 and *Tr.* 5.2.45-6).

a home within a public institution.[379] Claassen and Dupont have suggested that Ovid appears to appeal to the reader as a last resort, or 'afterthought', at the end of the poem.[380] Yet, one should note that, from the very beginning of the poem, the book has hinted that it is the reader to whom it really appeals, and it will be this reader who provides it with a reception. In a ring-composition structure, the book begins by asking the reader to stretch forth their hands (*Tr.* 3.1.2 *da placidam fesso, lector amice, manum*), and ends with its plea to the public to receive the book in their hands (3.1.81-2).

This chapter will investigate what kind of reader the exiled poet is really seeking for his work. To do this, the book's description of public and private places in Rome will be used as a means of exploring how Ovid highlights the different readers who might receive the type of elegy he is writing in exile. Other critics have read the personified book's ultimate rejection from the imperial buildings as a metaphor for the loss of readership. Newlands, for example, argues that *Tristia* 3.1, 'expresses the poet's deep alienation from the city whose monuments and institutions had nourished his poetic gifts'.[381] Dupont even intimates that the poetry book's failure to be placed in the library of Apollo on the Palatine means that Ovid is no longer recognised in Rome as a poet.[382] While the poet is indeed rejected from Roman public

[379] The fact that the book finishes with this appeal to the public as an alternative to Caesar's help might lead one to question whether Augustus is now the *absens deus* which Ovid sought to prevent in *Metamorphoses* 15, meaning that the book must seek help from elsewhere.
[380] Claassen (2008), 16; Dupont (2009), 158.
[381] Newlands (1997), 53. See also Walker (1997), 200; Miller (2002b), 138; Dupont (2009), 157-158; Rimell (2015), 278.
[382] Dupont (2009), 157 on Ovid's *liber*: 'Ultimately, the destiny that Augustus allots to it will ensure (or not) the safety of its master, depending on whether he is recognised as a poet (or not) and placed in the library of Apollo.' She sees the book's rejection as a metaphor for a very grim fate awaiting Ovid

monuments, this chapter will show how the poem highlights alternative means of reception, as Ovid's relationship with the city is redefined, ensuring the survival and preservation of his work.

### The book's search for a reader

The personified figure of the poetry book, sent to Rome on behalf of the poet and in search of a reception, has poetic precedents within earlier poetry. The experience of the little poetry book can be compared to that of Theocritus' Charites in *Idyll* 16, a poem which also uses personified poetic figures as a means of discussing the reception of poetry.[383] Many people have compared Ovid's personified book to other Latin equivalents,[384] but there also seems to be a likeness between the *liber* and these Greek poetic figures. Hardie has suggested that there may be etymological links between the two poems,[385] raising the possibility that the *liber*, a collection of

---

[158]: 'The condemnation of Ovid means at the same time the public disappearance of his books; he disappears as a canonical author. He no longer forms a part of the *litterae Latinae*.'

[383] The narrative of Ovid's poetry book can also be compared to the Hellenistic epigram as the *liber* is an inscribed personification which bridges the gap between object and poetry. Tueller (2008), 16 argues that, in the epigram, 'the inscribed object is assumed to be the speaker.'

[384] Newlands (1997), 59, P. Hardie (2002), 297-8 and Dupont (2009), 157 compare the book in *Tr.* 1.1 and 3.1 to Horace's personified book/slave boy (*Epist.* 1.20). Mordine (2010), 527 sees similarities between the personified book in *Tr.* 1.1 and Catullus 1. Geyssen (1999) compares Ovid's poetry book to Martial's book of epigrams which are sent to Proculus, while Graverini (2004) compares the situation of the book in *Tr.* 3.1. to Apuleian literature.

[385] A. Hardie (*per litteras*) has suggested that comparisons can be drawn between the two poems as both feature two figures of power, one of whom is referred to but not named. In *Tristia* 3.1, the book appears to refer to two Caesars: Augustus, to whom the *liber* directly appeals (3.1.75-8), and Julius Caesar, to whom the book may refer as it visits the *fora Caesaris* (27). The ambiguity of this description means that it could just as easily refer to the *Forum Iulium* as to the *Forum Augustum*. In *Id.* 16, similarly, there are two Hierons: the tyrant of Syracuse praised by Simonides around 470 in *epinikia* for chariot victories in the sacred games; and Hieron I, king from roughly 270 (who claimed descent from the former Hieron). The latter is, of course, the principal focus of encomiastic interest. Theocritus does not name the earlier Hieron directly, but alludes to him through etymology at line 47 (the crown-bearing horses returning) ἐξ **ἱερῶν** ... ἦλθον ἀγώνων. This name-reference is flagged up by

speaking pages (*Tr.* 3.1.4 ***char**ta*) which distances itself from its own poet (5-6), may be reminiscent of Theocritus' travelling **Χάρ**ιτες, doubling as speaking parchment who are critical of their author (*Id.* 16.9).[386] The Charites, who are used to represent Theocritus' poetry, have a function and fate similar to that of Ovid's exilic poetry book: they are sent out alone, in advance of the poet, to find a receptive audience (16.5-13, 106-9), just as the *liber* is sent to Rome alone in the place of Ovid as a means of trying to find a sympathetic reception for the poet.

The Charites seek a house in which they will be received in order to perform their poetry and grant *kleos* to their subject (*Id.* 16.5-7):

> Τίς γὰρ τῶν ὁπόσοι γλαυκὰν ναίουσιν ὑπ' ἠῶ
> ἡμετέρας Χάριτας πετάσας ὑποδέξεται οἴκῳ
> ἀσπασίως, οὐδ' αὖθις ἀδωρήτους ἀποπέμψει;
>
> Now who of all those living under the gleaming dawn will, opening his doors, gladly welcome my Graces in his home, and not send them away again, unrewarded?[387]

The *liber*, similarly, seeks Roman buildings in which its poetry will be received and a city to which its author will be welcomed back. Theocritus hints that it will be Hieron who will restore his Graces to glory, by giving him an opportunity to write praise poetry (*Id.* 16.68-75, 98-100), as he seeks a man who will receive him. The book vainly hopes that Augustus can be responsible for the reception and readership of Ovid's poetry and restoration of its author to Rome (*Tr.* 3.1.49-52).[388] Yet, the Charites find

---

ὀνομαστούς (45). The term ἀγώνων (ἱερῶν ... ἀγώνων) is not equivalent to *fora* (*fora Caesaris*), but loosely comparable as (places of) public gatherings. Ovid refers to the *via Sacra* by an elaborate etymology (cf. *Am.* 1.8.100 for the straight name) which also appears similar to *Id.* 16: *haec est a sacris* (cf. ἐξ ἱερῶν) *quae via nomen* (cf. ὀνομαστούς) *habet.*

[386] A. Hardie, *per litteras*.

[387] Texts from Theocritus taken from Gow (1952).

[388] See also *Tr.* 1.1.69-70.

no welcome.[389] Instead, they return home to the chest from which they originally were taken (*Id.* 16.8-12).[390] Theocritus states that he too will remain at home with his poetry unless he is expressly summoned (16.106-7). In a similar outcome, the Ovidian book is rebuffed from the imperial institutions and literary monuments from which it hopes for a welcome. As a result, it seeks a hiding place within a Roman household, while its author remains on the edge of the Black Sea, desperately awaiting a pardoning summons from Augustus in Rome or a mitigation of the harsh location of his exile.

Further comparisons can be drawn between the two poems. In *Idyll* 16 the Charites, who are often seen as graceful beauties who make poetry pleasing (Pind. *Ol*. 1.30, 14.5-6; Callim. *Aet*. fr. 7.11-12), come home bedraggled and barefoot. They have been rejected, or so Theocritus claims, because of a general lack of interest in the type of poetry with which they are associated (*Id.* 16.14-15). In *Tristia* 3.1, the book embarrassedly describes its physical attributes, including a limp caused by the long journey from Tomis to Rome, creating a real-life cause for a common elegiac convention (*Tr.* 3.1.11-2):

> clauda quod alterno subsidunt carmina uersu,
> uel pedis hoc ratio, uel uia longa facit
> quod neque sum cedro flauus nec pumice leuis,

[389] Gow (1952), 150 opines that the poem would have had no success in gaining a response or a reward from Hieron. He points out that Hieron's only recorded literary benefaction was bestowed in reward for an epigram by Archimelus. Yet, the fact that Theocritus writes about Hieron in such encomiastic terms might indicate that Hieron himself had commissioned this poem. Whatever the case, however, the Charites are presented as rejected from all those to which they appeal.

[390] One could compare the chest in Theocritus' room to the bookshelf in Ovid's study in Rome, where his pre-exilic corpus lies hidden (*Tr*. 1.1.105-8). The poet instructs his poetry book to return to this space in *Tr.* 1.1, a poem which can be seen as a precursor to *Tr.* 3.1. The cowering and rejected Charites seem somewhat similar to the shamed scrolls of the *Ars Amatoria* which hide from sight in a corner of the poet's study (*Tr.* 1.1.111).

erubui domino cultior esse meo.
littera suffusas quod habet maculosa lituras,
laesit opus lacrimis ipse poeta suum.

> Either the measure of my foot, or the long journey, means that the limping couplets halt in alternate verse. If I am not blonde with cedar oil or smoothed by the pumice stone, it's because I blush to be more elegant than my master. If the letters are blotted and stained with smears, the poet has wounded his work with his tears.[391]

Just as Theocritus' Charites have transformed from beautiful Graces to glum and battered figures, one can see a transformation of the elegiac personification in Ovid's poetry. Once upon a time, the limping figure of Elegy was a polished and elegant figure, with this defect seen as attractive quality (*Am.* 3.1.10 *et pedibus uitium causa decoris erat*). Now, the figure of the elegiac poetry book unhappily bears this corporeal blemish as an unattractive reminder of its eroto-didactic relative, the *Ars Amatoria*, despite its pleas that it has none of the faults of this earlier work (*Tr*. 3.1.3-10). As a result, it is banished from the bustling libraries and literary spaces in the city and deprived of a benign reception from the public monuments. Despite visiting a selection of well-known architectural structures, including the *domus Augusta* and the Atrium of Libertas, the book is shut out of Rome. Yet, while there is a general air of defeat in the return of the Theocritean Charites to the poet's house and the chest, it seems to me that, in *Tristia* 3.1, the book's search for a private household and a plebeian readership may actually suggest an alternative reception for the poet's exilic elegies rather than standing as an indication of failure.

---

[391] Indeed, one might see a greater similarity between Ovid's rumpled, stained and limping book and Theocritus' bedraggled poems than between it and those elegant and polished personifications in Catullus 1 (1-2 *cvi dono lepidum nouum libellum / arido modo pumice expolitum?*) (text from Mynors 1958) and Horace *Epist.* 1.20 (2 *pumice mundus*). (See P. Hardie 2002, 298 on the book as 'the very opposite of Horace's 'slave-boy''.)

**Visiting the Palatine: The book's literary tour of Rome**

The book's arrival in Rome and tour of the Roman Palatine not only highlights its search for a reception, but in doing so, Ovid's exilic *liber* highlights the reception of previously published literature. Its tour of Rome alludes to earlier texts and reminds readers of the literary culture surrounding and inspired by the Augustan urban monuments. Yet the book's rejection by these very monuments may indicate that, unlike the texts to which the book alludes on its tour of Rome, the exilic elegies which the *liber* embodies are not suited for public consumption or reception in such places.

Like the rejection of the Theocritean Charites, on account of the type of poetry which they represent, one can read the book's rejection from public literary monuments, and its attempts to seek a private house instead, as a reflection of the nature of Ovid's exilic work. This section shall consider the book's ascent to and rejection from the Palatine as an indication of the book's lack of generic elevation compared to earlier texts which interact with the same Augustan public spaces.

As in other cases of *epibaterion*, *Tristia* 3.1 (and the book's arrival in the city) provides an opportunity for spatial description, as the Republican and Augustan monuments of the city are depicted. The book visits monuments including the temples of Jupiter Stator and Vesta, the *domus Augusta,* the Temple of Palatine Apollo and the Atrium of Libertas. It has been pointed out that the route which is taken by the exilic book and its tour guide, beginning in the Argiletum, progressing through the porta Mugonia and continuing upwards towards the Palatine and the *domus Augusta*, is the route which Aeneas takes with Evander as he climbs the

Palatine and is welcomed into the house of Evander in *Aeneid* 8.[392] The book's description of the forbidding doors of the House of Augustus, a building 'worthy of a god' (*Tr.* 3.1.33-4 *uideo fulgentibus armis / conspicuos postes tectaque* ***digna deo***) has been identified as an intertextual reference to the tour of Aeneas, when Evander offers Aeneas a simple dwelling for the night (*Aen*. 8.364-65 *aude, hospes, contemnere opes et te quoque* ***dignum*** */ finge* ***deo***).[393]

The awe which Ovid's book, as a *hospes in urbe* (*Tr.* 3.1.20), experiences when he sees the monuments in the city (3.1.33 *singula dum miror*), furthermore, is comparable to the wonder of Rome's most famous *hospes* (*Aen*. 8.364) as Aeneas looks upon what, for Vergil's reader, is the future site of Rome (*Aen.* 8.310-12):

> **miratur** facilisque oculos fert omnia circum
> Aeneas, capiturque locis et **singula** laetus
> exquiritque auditque uirum monimenta priorum.
>
> Aeneas marvels and stares readily around at everything. He is caught up with the place and joyfully scrutinises each thing and hears about the monuments of the men of old.

While Aeneas looks upon the humble, mythological dwellings of the Saturnian age and what will one day be the city of Rome, Ovid's book now looks upon the imperial building project of Augustus, as these constructions have also become a seminal part of Rome's history and literature. Rome's architecture stands as a reminder of Rome's famous literary texts.

[392] Newlands (1997), 67 argues that the book and Aeneas are different, despite this: 'both are strangers in Italy, seeking a home. Yet the book is vouch-safed no vision of a glorious future.' See also Pandey (2018), 119-20.
[393] Edwards (1996), 120; Newlands (1997), 66-7; Huskey (2006a), 27; Miller (2009), 213; O'Sullivan (2015), 119-20; Pandey (2018), 125.

These imperial monuments which make up the book's guided tour are also described within the pages of Ovid's own corpus, particularly in the *Fasti*.[394] Critics have argued that the way in which the book describes the temples and the *domus Augusta* intertextually refers to this earlier text.[395] This can be seen particularly within the book's description of the House of Augustus, where it throws itself upon the mercy of the occupant. The book's questions about the inhabitant of the dwelling intertextually refer to the earlier explanation of the aetiology of Augustus' name in the *Fasti*. In the *Tristia*, the little book sees the house as a place of awe and some confusion and describes the exterior of the house through a number of aetiological questions (*Tr.* 3.1.33-46):

> singula dum miror, uideo fulgentibus armis
> conspicuos postes tectaque digna deo,
> 'an **Iouis** haec' dixi 'domus est?' quod ut esse putarem, 35
> **augurium** menti **querna corona** dabat.
> cuius ut accepi dominum, 'non fallimur,' inquam,
> 'et magni uerum est hanc **Iouis** esse domum.
> cur tamen opposita uelatur ianua lauro,
> cingit et **augustas** arbor opaca fores? 40
> num quia perpetuos meruit domus ista triumphos,
> an quia Leucadio semper amata deo est?
> ipsane quod festa est, an quod facit omnia festa?
> quam tribuit terris, pacis an ista nota est?
> utque uiret semper laurus nec fronde caduca 45
> carpitur, aeternum sic habet illa decus?'

> While I was marvelling at every single thing, I saw doorposts, distinguished with gleaming weapons, and a house worthy of a god. 'Is this Jupiter's house' said I; the oaken crown gave me a sign to think that this was so. Even as I heard its master, I said, 'I'm not deceived; this *is*

[394] Temple of Jupiter Stator: *Tr.* 3.31-2; *Fast.* 6.793-4, Temple of Vesta: *Tr.* 3.1.29-30; *Fast.* 6.265-6, *domus Augusta*: *Tr.* 3.1.33-50; *Fast.* 1.607-14, Temple of Libertas: *Tr*. 3.1.71-2; *Fast*. 4.623-4.
[395] See Miller (2009), 216-20 on the verbal and syntactic echoes of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* and *Ars Amatoria* which can be recognised within the *liber*'s description of the *domus Augusta* and Danaid Portico. See also Newlands (1997), 67-72 on the descriptions of the *domus Augusta* and Atrium of Libertas in the *Fasti* and *Tristia*.

> truly the house of great Jove.’ Why is the door covered with laurel in front of it? Why does that shady tree wreathe the august doors? Is it because that house has earned a never-ending triumph? Or because it has always been beloved of the Leucadian god? Is it because the house is filled with joy? Or because the house makes everything joyful? Is it a sign of the peace which it has granted to the lands? Just as the laurel always blooms and is not weakened by the falling leaf, so does this house have eternal glory?

The house is described in detail, as it was in the earlier text of the *Fasti*,[396] which discussed the etymology of the emperor’s name and the oaken crown on the door (*Fast.* 1.607-14):

> sed tamen humanis celebrantur honoribus omnes
> hic socium summo cum **Iove** nomen habet.
> sancta vocant **augusta** patres, **augusta** vocantur
> templa sacerdotum rite dicata manu; 610
> huius et **augurium** dependet origine verbi,
> et quodcumque sua **Iuppiter auget** ope.
> **augeat** imperium nostri ducis, **augeat** annos,
> protegat et vestras **querna corona fores**.

> But all are celebrated by mortal honours, this man alone has a title associated with loftiest Jove. Our ancestors called sacred things ‘august’. Temples, solemnly consecrated by priestly hands, are called ‘august’. Augury is derived in origin from this word, and whatever Jupiter augments by his power. May he augment the power of our leader, augment his life’s years, and may the oaken crown protect your doors.

Critics have drawn a comparison between the book, which enquires about Rome, its famous monuments and their aetiologies, and the narrator of *Fasti* who appeals to multiple informants to provide him with the history of Roman festivals and institutions.[397] Both passages in the *Fasti* and *Tristia* use vocabulary which is

---

[396] See also Miller (2009), 216-17 and Pandey (2018), 124, who discuss how this passage may also allude to the description of the same house in *Metamorphoses* 1 and the tale of Daphne and Apollo.
[397] Newlands (1997), 63 argues that ‘the interaction between the book and the guide who leads it […] also recalls many of the aitiological quests of the *Fasti,* as the guide points out and explains the major sights which they pass’.

etymologically linked to the emperor's name - the adjective *augustus* and noun *augurium* (*Fast.* 1.609, 11, *Tr.* 3.1.36, 40). Both use the same words to describe the oak which is placed on his doors (*Fast*. 1.614, *Tr*. 3.1.36, 40 *querna corona* and *fores*). The book also connects Jupiter to the *domus Augusta*, echoing the honorific comparisons drawn between *princeps* and god in the *Fasti*, as both mention the god twice (*Fast.* 1.608, 612, *Tr*. 3.1.35, 38). Despite the exiled book's claims of being barbarian by nature,[398] its descriptions of the space exhibits shared lexis with, and intratextual references to, the aetiological explanations in the *Fasti*. One could question, however, whether the barbarian book really is knowledgeable of its literary predecessors, or whether Ovidian poetry is now such an inherent part of the Roman landscape that the book cannot help quoting it as it surveys the Palatine. The monuments of Rome appear to project a version of themselves which is imprinted with the works which no longer find a home there.

This is also seen when the book visits the Temple of Palatine Apollo and the Portico of the Danaids. The little book narrates its approach to the lofty temple and describes the portico, a description which is almost identical to that describing the same portico in the *Ars Amatoria* (*Tr*. 3.1.61-2):

> signa peregrinis ubi sunt alterna columnis,
> **Belides et stricto** barbarus **ense pater.**
>
> Where statues stand, alternating with foreign columns: the granddaughters of Belus and their barbarous father with sword drawn.

[398] *Tr.* 3.1.17-8: *siqua uidebuntur casu non dicta Latine, / in qua scribebar, barbara terra fuit*. Williams (1994), 50 speaks of the 'linguistic isolation' which is a by-product of Ovid's exile in Tomis, but this does not seem to be the case in terms of his book's vocabulary.

The Temple of Palatine Apollo is discussed frequently in Latin literature. Its decoration is described in detail in Propertius 2.31 as the author explains that the opening of the portico was the reason why he was late to meet Cynthia. In *Amores* 2.2, the Danaid Portico attached to the temple is a location where Ovid catches sight of the closely-watched Corinna, his desire for whom is in vain, however, thanks to her guard. Reference to the Danaids and to the artwork portraying them can be found within Horace's *Odes* 3.11,[399] and in *Aeneid* 10 with the ekphrasis describing Pallas' baldric.[400] The book, therefore, views the monuments of Rome against the backdrop of a literary landscape, yet the work which most clearly informs the book's description of the temple is the *Ars Amatoria.*

Lexical similarities between the two Ovidian elegiac texts highlight that the *liber* is specifically recalling the *Ars Amatoria* and the poet's description of the portico amongst a list of imperial buildings on the Palatine (*Ars Am*. 1.73-4 *quaque parare necem miseris patruelibus ausae /* ***Belides et stricto*** *stat ferus* ***ense pater***). Both lines share the same five words, all placed at the same consecutive points of the pentameter line of the elegiac couplet.[401] Once again, one can see how the monuments of Rome are inscribed with reminders of the Ovidian corpus, as the

[399] Nisbett and Rudd (2004), 148-9 'the monument is likely to have influenced Horace's *Ode*'. See also Leach (2008) on the poem and the monument.
[400] Putnam (1994), 180: 'It is the only one of the six Virgilian ekphraseis that reflects an actual work of art, in this case one of the major monuments of the Augustan era.'
[401] Geysson (1999), 733 argues that Ovid in the *Tristia* speaks of the decoration on the Temple of Palatine Apollo 'in order both to further the possibility of reintegration into Roman social and poetic circles and to remove himself from his characterisation of these buildings as spots to find dates in the *Ars Amatoria*'. One could argue instead that the exiled *liber*'s use of identical language to the *Ars Amatoria* promotes the earlier works of the poet. The uncensored inclusion of the *Ars Amatoria* in the Ovidian *liber* is plain to see, as the text is still firmly connected to the monuments of Rome.

language used by the book to describe the sights it sees is a recycled version of the poet's earlier work.

The little book qualifies the monument in more exilic terms, however, as Danaus is characterised as *barbarus* rather than *ferus*, using the very term with which the little book qualifies the land in which it was written (*Tr.* 3.1.18 *in qua scribebar,* ***barbara*** *terra fuit*).[402] The columns of this portico were described elsewhere as 'Punic' or 'African' (Prop. 2.31.3 *poenis digesta columnis*), in reference to Numidian building material from which they were constructed. In Ovid's text they are now merely 'foreign' (*Tr.* 3.1.61 *peregrinis…columnis*). The adjective *peregrinus* is notably used by the poet in *Tristia* 1.1 to describe his exilic poetry book (1.1.59 *uenias magnam* ***peregrinus*** *in urbem*), meaning that a connection can be made between the *liber* and the Roman monument. The present passage indicates that, much as the book is the product of exile, Augustan Rome itself is constructed from foreign materials from far-flung regions.[403] An exilic reading of the building is thus produced. It is Rome itself which is now presented as foreign, relative to Ovid's position in Tomis, and in the eyes of the visiting book.

Viewed by Ovid from the outside, from the perspective of an exile, Rome is both familiar and foreign, readable in an exilic light. The *liber*'s description brings to light a new way of interpreting the temple's architecture, while also recalling previous

---

[402] Critics have discussed how the myth of Danaus and his children can be made applicable to Ovid's exilic circumstances, and to his relationship with his bookish 'children', or to the dynamic between Augustus, the *pater patriae*, and the poet. See Newlands (1997), 68-70; O'Gorman (1997), 117-19; Miller (2009), 220; Pandey (2018), 130.

[403] The adjective *peregrinus* used to describe these columns is also a substantive used to describe the opposite of a Roman citizen, an alien resident as it were (OLD s.v. '*peregrinus*[2]': 2). A Roman citizen is exiled from his own city, but foreign columns, without citizenship, are present.

depictions of this monument in his other work. Accordingly, the identity of Rome and its monuments is informed by Ovidian literature, even though it is not outwardly accepted by the literary structures there.

The Rome which the exilic *liber* visits is a city inscribed with the earlier texts of epic and elegy which catalogue the construction of, and political events associated with, the urban environment. The book's narrative suggests that even texts like the *Ars Amatoria* now help to make up the topographical 'text' that is Rome's landscape. Yet, the book finds no place within or welcome from these public spaces. It is forced to seek a private house instead (*Tr.* 3.1.65-82):

> quaerebam fratres, exceptis scilicet illis,
> quos suus optaret non genuisse pater.
> quaerentem frustra custos me sedibus illis
> praepositus sancto iussit abire loco.
> altera templa peto, uicino, iuncta theatro:
> haec quoque erant pedibus non adeunda meis. 70
> nec me, quae doctis patuerunt prima libellis,
> atria Libertas tangere passa sua est.
> in genus auctoris miseri fortuna redundat,
> et ferimus nati, quam tulit ipse, fugam.
> forsitan et nobis olim minus asper et illi, 75
> euictus longo tempore, Caesar erit.
> di, precor, atque adeo—neque enim mihi turba roganda est—
> Caesar, ades uoto, maxime diue, meo!
> interea, quoniam statio mihi publica clausa est,
> priuato liceat delituisse loco. 80
> uos quoque, si fas est, confusa pudore repulsae
> sumite, plebeiae, carmina nostra, manus.

> I was seeking my brothers, except those of course which my father would wish had never been born. But the search was in vain; the librarian who presides over that sacred space ordered me to go. I sought another temple, next to the theatre: my feet were not permitted to approach this one either. Nor did Liberty allow me to reach her atria, which first lay open to learned books. The fortune of our miserable author overflows onto his children, and at birth we endure the exile which he has suffered. Perhaps at some point Caesar, overcome by the long years, will be less

> harsh to us and to him. Gods, I pray, and especially – for it is not for me to pray to the crowd – Caesar, greatest deity, hear my prayer! Meanwhile, since a public residence is closed to me, may it be permitted for me to lie hidden in some private place. You also, hands of the people, if it is permitted, take up our songs which are confounded by the shame of rejection.

Other critics see the book's inability to approach these monuments as an indication that the *liber* will not find a reader within these public monuments,[404] but one could also argue that this is a programmatic statement that the public, urban constructions and achievements of Augustan Rome are *not* the main subject of his text. As the little, limping book in *Tristia* 3.1 states that it is not able to approach on foot the Roman monuments which featured within poetry such as the *Fasti* and *Aeneid* (*Tr*. 3.1.70 *haec quoque erant pedibus non adeunda meis*), one could read this as a poetic statement about the poet's work, playing on the noun *pes* as both body part and metrical component.[405] This is literary territory which the little book is prohibited from occupying. Accordingly, it is possible to interpret the book's tour as a spatial reflection of Ovid's departure from more public and imperial poetry, such as the *Fasti*, and a return to the more traditional, elegiac realm in his poetry of exilic lamentation.[406] Indeed, the poetry book to which this poem is a preface and which the personified *liber* transports to Rome is highly personal, describing life in Tomis

---

[404] Walker (1997), 200; Miller (2002b), 138; Dupont (2009), 157-158; Rimell (2015), 278.

[405] The book plays on this pun as it describes the reasons for its 'limping' foot (*Tr.* 3.1.11-12).

[406] One might compare the book's experiences as a *hospes* (*Tr.* 3.1.20) to Aeneas in *Aeneid* 8, but also to the *hospes* in Propertius 4.1 (see O'Sullivan 2015, 119). In Propertius 4, the poet turns away from the earlier elegy of the previous books and engages in a textual tour of Rome, as an indication of his ascent to a more aetiological and public elegy. Yet Horos attempts to prevent this act by proclaiming Propertius' status as an elegiac poet (4.1b.71-4). In the same way, one might see the book's tour of Rome and the public settings there, followed by its rejection from them, as a programmatic statement about the generic nature of Ovid's exilic work. While Propertius goes on to speak of Roman public themes in encomiastic terms in his book of poetry, the same cannot be said for *Tristia* 3.

and the experience of exile. Rome is only briefly mentioned as a fleeting space in the poet's memory, an inaccessible cause of his grief.[407]

As the book says that it must find a private space in which to dwell (*Tr.* 3.1.79-80 *interea, quoniam statio mihi* ***publica*** *clausa est, /* ***priuato*** *liceat delituisse loco*), rather than finding a public home, this could be taken as a programmatic statement about the literature with which the book is filled. By comparison, in *Tristia* 4.2, a poem about an imagined triumph, Ovid considers the type of poetry that he will write in future, using the concepts of 'public' and 'private'. He states that one day, due to the glorious deeds of Germanicus, he might be induced to write poetry about 'public' themes and put aside his 'private' and mournful elegy (*Tr.* 4.2.73-4 *illa dies ueniet, mea qua lugubria ponam, / causaque* ***priuata publica*** *maior erit*).[408] In this poem, Ovid imagines the kind of triumph about which he might one day write panegyric. He imagines the Palatine en fête (4.2.1-6), the sacrifices in the temples of the 'friendly' gods (4.2.7 *donaque amicorum templis promissa deorum*) and the glory of *domus Augusta* (8-10).[409] This celebratory image of Rome is a stark contrast to the unfriendly welcome on the Palatine and the images of the lonely book stranded outside the closed doors of the temples. For the moment, the Palatine remains a mournful and forbidding place to Ovid and his poetic offspring. So too, it seems, does Ovid's elegiac

[407] Rome is spoken of in grand terms in *Tristia* 3.7, but as a means of expressing Ovid's lasting fame, rather than in order to engage with public themes.
[408] At *Tr*. 3.1.9-10, the book declares its mournful status, *nihil hic nisi triste uidebis, / carmine temporibus conueniente suis* in a way which recalls the programmatic opening of *Am.* 1.1 (1.1.2 *materia conueniente modis*) and highlights the elegiac status of the book as a lamenting and mournful being.
[409] See also *Tr.* 4.2.55 *inde petes arcem et delubra fauentia uotis* and the description of the shrines on the Palatine, that welcome prayers – a statement not entirely true in the case of the little book's earlier experience.

work remain unoccupied with such Roman themes as he once engaged with, and may one day write about again.[410]

### *Exclusus liber*: Reading elegy in Rome

Shut out from the public locations of Rome, the book's elegiac status is emphasised. The book's plight enacts the paraclausithyron scenario of earlier Ovidian poetry. Critics have argued, when discussing how Ovid's exilic elegies reformulate the amatory genre, that Rome is presented as the inaccessible object of the exiled poet's desire; instead of the *puella*, the poet now seeks to reach the city itself.[411] In the very same way, the book's attempts to reach the temples of Rome in 3.1 are identified as a modification of the paraclausithyron motif.[412] Subsequently, many have read this rejection from Roman monuments, and subsequent plea for a plebeian readership, as a failure in the book's search for a Roman reception or readership, much like the elegist's failure to access the *puella* in amatory poetry.[413]

[410] In the *Ex Ponto*, one can find poems that engage much more publicly with the urban Rome, including detailing the triumphs of Germanicus (2.1, 3.4), and the consulship of Pompeius (4.4, 4.5). There are also those, such as Labate (1987), 103-12, who speculated the possibility that Ovid, if recalled from exile, would have written imperial panegyric. See also Myers (2014), 16 on Ovid's promise to write 'poems full of joy' (*Tr*. 5.1.42), a promise which is dependent on his recall.
[411] See Nagle (1980), 43; O'Gorman (1997), 116; Boyle (2003), 17-18; Spentzou (2005), 319. Similarly, Miller (2004), 211-12 sees Ovid, in the general context of the exilic corpus, as an *exclusus amator* separated from his desire, which is now not the *puella* but the city of Rome and Augustus: 'The exilic poetry does not abandon the position of amatory elegy but recasts it.' Hardie (2002), 286 suggests that the place of the *puella* is taken by the emperor, the city or the poet's wife.
[412] Leach (2012), 150 argues that 'the cartography of *Tristia* 3.1 does replay the paraclausithyron as a trek from door to door.' Newlands (1997), 63 believes that the book 'ironically plays the *exclusus amator'*. See also Miller (2002b), 139.
[413] Newlands (1997), 57 posits that *Tr.* 3.1, in particular, 'directly expresses the poet's anxiety about the reception and preservation of his poetry in a city which has failed to understand him'. Walker (1997), 200, Miller (2002b), 138, Dupont (2009), 157-158 and Rimell (2015), 278 all believe that the rejection of the book from the library reveals that the poet has suffered a loss of fame and recognition.

The negotiation of elegiac space in *Tristia* 3.1, as the concepts of architectural exclusion and domestic interiority are explored, raises questions about the poet's relationship with the city from which he is exiled, and the type of readers he is now seeking there. It certainly seems right to view the little book as an *exclusus amator* who is shut out from the public spaces. I would suggest, however, that the book's search for a private and secluded household also presents another spatial concept of elegy: the secluded, interior space of the private household, which the more successful lover has the liberty to enjoy. By considering the presentation of the enclosed interior spaces in amatory elegy as places out of the public eye where illicit amatory events can occur and elegiac messages can be read by the lover, one can view the book's attempts to find a private household as the promotion of an alternative, private readership for Ovid's elegies to that found in the public literary institutions. The book may not find a place within imperial monuments, but that does not mean it fails to find a reader.

Despite the book's argument that it does not resemble its more elegiac relations (3-4), the plight of the shabby little book, begging for mercy outside the House of Augustus and shut out from the libraries by the librarian (3.1.65-82), can be compared to *topoi* frequently found in elegiac poetry. If this poem is read with an awareness of the paraclausithyron *topos*, it is certainly possible to view the *liber* as an evolved version of the *exclusus amator*. The poetry book is shut out from the literary institutions by the librarian (67-8 *custos me [..] iussit abire loco*), much as the

lover is rejected from the house of the *puella* by a watchman or guard (*custos*).[414] I would like to suggest, however, that this rejection and the seeking of a place within a private household (79-80 *quoniam statio mihi publica clausa est, / priuato liceat delituisse loco*) actually promotes a less public readership, as the book finds a home within more elegiac, confined settings.

This seeking of a private place to hide is repeated in *Ex Ponto* 1.1 when the poet describes his book's avoidance of Roman monuments in preference for the private house (*Pont.* 1.1.10 *latere sub Lare priuato tutius esse putant*). These images recall the *Ars Amatoria* and the poet's description of the shamed and guilty book, exiled from the shelves of his bookcase and skulking in a corner of Ovid's study (*Tr*. 1.1.111 *tres procul obscura latitantes parte uidebis*). At the same time, one could argue that it also recalls the environment of illicit love affairs in earlier poetry.[415] In the *Ars Amatoria* itself, for example, Ovid advises that sexual activity should take place behind closed doors, in a darkened and concealed interior (*Ars Am*. 3.807-8 *nec lucem in thalamos totis admitte fenestris; / aptius in uestro corpore multa latent*). It is the

[414] For the amatory *custos*, see *Am*. 2.2, 3.8.63; *Ars Am*. 2.635-36. Luck (1977) suggests that the *custos* in *Tr*. 3.1 could be the librarian, Hyginus, a friend of the poet and the recipient of *Tr*. 3.14. This might make some question whether the characterisation of the librarian is really as a forbidding figure, like the traditional *custos* of elegy. Yet I believe there is some truth in the argument of Miller (2002b), 138 who advocates that 'Ovid's book suffers the maltreatment of another elegiac relative, the *exclusus amator* routinely turned away by the girlfriend's *custos*'. One might compare the librarian, as surrogate elegiac *custos,* to the priestess of the Bona Dea shrine who acts as a *custos,* shutting out Hercules the *exclusus amator,* in Propertius 4.9 (see Debrohun 2003, 121-25). Both poems see the paraclausithyron adapted to feature a public Roman space and an unlikely cast of characters, but both still bear elegiac qualities.

[415] Cf. *Am.* 1.5.8-9 *illa uerecundis lux est praebenda puellis, / qua timidus latebras speret habere pudor.* See also Prop 1.3 and 2.15, 2.29b; *Am*. 1.14.19-22, 2.7 and the intimate scenes which take place within the privacy of the bedroom.

enclosed, hidden and secluded settings of elegy which allow such erotic events to occur.

Harrison has discussed how the interior, domestic spaces which are the backdrop to Latin love elegy emphasise the rejection of 'the conventional world of public achievement.'[416] This also appears to be the case in Ovid's exilic poetry, as the little book seeks private homes as an alternative place of reception to the grand and public Roman literary monuments. Like the intimate and complicit relationships which are able to occur in the elegiac household, out of the public eye, the book's entrance into the private spaces of Rome could indicate the existence of a covert readership which is defiant of public approval.

Harrison points out that interior settings, such as the bedroom, are a suitable environment for love elegy to be read, quoting Propertius 3.3, where the *puella* is seen reading on a stool (Prop. 3.3.19-20 *ut tuus in scamno iactetur saepe libellus / quem legat exspectans sola puella uirum*).[417] The image of elegy being read in a covert, erotic setting is also found in *Amores* 3.1, another medial poem like *Tristia* 3.1. Elegy describes the way in which she gained a readership from the *puella*, undiscovered by forbidding eyes. She, in the form of a book or a message to the *puella*, lay hidden in the bosom of a slave girl until a cruel guard had departed (*Am.* 3.1.55-6 *quin ego me memini, dum custos saeuus abiret, / ancillae miseram* ***delituisse***

[416] Harrison (2013), 144.
[417] Harrison (2013), 144.

*sinu*).[418] This illicit image of the slave girl holding the book also imitates the position of the beloved in the arms of the successful lover, after sneaking into the house.[419]

Elegy uses the same word to describe her covert actions (*Am.* 3.1.56 *delituisse*) as the *liber*, turned away from Roman monuments (*Tr.* 3.1.67-8),[420] uses to describe its hidden position in the private houses of readers. This description suggests that the book, like the successful lover, is able to enter the more illicit, private settings of Rome. Indeed, one might argue that the personified pages (*Tr.* 3.1.4 *charta*) of the almost human poetry book, taking the words of the poet into the private houses of Rome, are similar to the confidant whose own body is used as *charta* to sneak the messages of the poet into the house of a lover (*Ars Am.* 3.625-6 *cauerit haec custos, pro charta conscia tergum / praebeat inque suo corpore uerba ferat*).[421] Defiant of and hidden from the eye of those who seek to exclude or criticise, it finds an alternative readership and reception in Rome to the exclusive public monuments.[422] Other Roman buildings, instead, offer a place for the book.

There could be some suggestion that, even before the *liber* reaches the Palatine, Ovid has already found an alternative readership to the public institutions

---

[418] This description shows the possibility of Elegy to exist as both personified and book form, much as the exilic *liber* stands as both.

[419] Cf. *Am.* 2.12.2-4 *in nostro est, ecce, Corinna sinu* / *quam uir, quam custos, quam ianua firma, tot hostes, / seruabant*.

[420] The situations are also similar, as Elegy in *Amores* 3.1 is forced to lie hidden until the guard departs (***custos abiret***), and the elegiac *liber* in *Tristia* 3.1 is forced to hide after the guard ordered it to depart (***custos*** *me* […] *iussit* ***abire***).

[421] The two figures bear similarities in that the book becomes anthropomorphised and gains bodily features: the book describes its pages going pale and trembling as if it actually possessed limbs and human faculties (*Tr.* 3.1.55-6 *aspicis exangui chartam pallere colore? / aspicis alternos intremuisse pedes*?). At the same time, in the *Ars Amatoria* the confidant becomes a bookish body, as her skin becomes a text, a means of transporting an elegiac message to the *puella*.

[422] Pandey (2018), 132 suggests that the book's appeal for private readership 'reminds readers present and future that even Augustus could not control the private sphere'.

of Rome. Pandey has suggested that, as the book's tour begins when he meets a reader in the Argiletum (an area well known for its booksellers), the *liber* could already be part of Rome's public book trade.[423] This urban area is spoken about in another poem which is compared to 3.1 due to the poet's personification of his poetic work.[424] In Horace *Epistles* 1.20, Horace's own personified poetry book hankers to go to the Argiletum and booksellers' quarter (*Epist.* 1.20.1-2), desiring to be sold. To Horace, the public circulation which his book desires is a vulgar and unworthy fate (1.20.3-9) when his work could easily find a place in the libraries of Augustus (*Epist*. 2.1.214-28). To Ovid, however, the dissemination of his work via popular readership is seen as a substitute reception to that denied him by the public urban monuments.[425]

Interestingly, both authors portray reading as an amatory experience. Horace sees the private sale of his book as a negative outcome and a kind of prostitution (*Epist.* 1.20.2 *prostes*), as the book seeks a reader or 'lover' who, Horace believes, will soon grow tired of him (1.20.8 *scis / in breve te cogi, cum plenus languet amator*). While it is true, as Newlands points out, that the Ovidian book is not as 'sexualised' as the Horatian book, one can certainly identify its elegiac and amatory

---

[423] Pandey (2018), 132-3: 'The book had already been privately welcomed and circulated even before it sought admission to the Palatine library.'

[424] As Newlands (1997), 58 points out, there are similarities between poems as both poets are concerned with the fate and reception of their literary productions.

[425] Newlands (1997), 59 believes that *Tristia* 3.1 evokes Horace *Epistle* 1.20 as a reminder of the uncontrollable nature of a public reception. While the uncertainties of reception is a topic which certainly is addressed in the *Tristia*, I would argue that the poet in *Tristia* 3.1 is still seeking a public reception as an alternative to the earlier rejection from literary monuments, and thus stands in contrast to the Horatian text which favours these institutions.

characteristics.[426] For Ovid's little book, amatory resonances are employed as the book plays the evolved role of *exclusus amator* who is rejected from the public institutions which should provide it with a reception. At the same time, the elegiac resonances and intertextual references to the earlier amatory poems which are deployed within the book's description of the private houses of the public suggest that, for Ovidian exilic elegy, the reception of the general public will provide an alternate, if clandestine, means of readership.

**Public and Private Readership: Reading *Tristia* 3.1 with Callimachus and Horace**

The book's final plea for a reception from the general public comes after its rejection from the imperial monuments, which are characterised here as exclusive and the preserve of the few. It may be possible that the contrast created between the exclusive literary monuments and the homes of 'plebeian' readers in Rome (3.1.79-82) plays on the Callimachean-derived tension between refined, specialised poetry and poetry for public consumption. Reading the book's final remarks on the reception of the poet's work, one can identify sentiments which stand in contrast to the poetics promoted by those such as Callimachus and Horace, who use religious space and images of ritual initiation as a means of highlighting the exclusive and learned nature of their poetics. At the same time, the book's negotiation of a public readership also

[426] Newlands (1997), 59. She is keen to distance the book from its amatory associations, arguing that, although the book plays a role similar to the *exclusus amator*, [70]: 'the book is reformed; it talks of the library not the boudoir.' When Ovid spends Book 2 of the *Tristia* arguing that amatory themes can be found in all poetry, it seems very strange that he would then spend the next book of the *Tristia* 'uneroticising' *topoi* from his earlier amatory poetry as Claassen (2008, 112) believes he does.

plays on the paradoxical combination of Callimachean poetics and a mass readership, a paradox which is also explored in the *Metamorphoses,* as the poet discusses the preservation and longevity of his work.

The tension between refined, exclusive poetics and work created for a more general readership can first be identified within poetry such as Callimachus' *Epigram* 28 and the prologue to *Aetia*, as the poet expresses his dislike of poetry which is meant for wider public consumption. This is often expressed through a number of metaphors, such as the fountain from which all can drink and the well-driven chariot track.[427] Such poetic statements can also be identified within Latin poetry, such as Horace *Odes* 3.1. In this medial poem Horace presents himself as a priest of the Muses who hates the mob and cultivates his poetry for the exclusive and initiated reader. The language used can lead readers to picture the performance of these poems in a religious setting, much like those from which Ovid's book is rejected. In this ode, Horace lays out the principles of his poetics in an introduction to a series of Roman odes (*Od.* 3.1.1-4):

> Odi profanum vulgus et arceo;
> favete linguis: carmina non prius
> audita Musarum sacerdos
> virginibus puerisque canto.
>
> I abhor the uninitiated crowd and keep them at a distance. Hold your tongues! As priest of the Muses, I sing songs not heard before to the boys and girls.

Miller compares the experience of the Ovidian book at the Temple of Apollo to Horace's description of the empty shelves of the library of Palatine Apollo in *Ep.*

[427] Callim. *Epigr*. 28.1-3; *Aet.* 1.1.25-8.

1.3.17,[428] but it may also be possible to view the situation in *Tristia* 3.1 as comparable to the circumstances surrounding this programmatic medial ode.

Horace's *Odes* 3.1-3.6 are written in praise of Rome. They are addressed to a ritually pure and initiated elite audience in a Roman temple, probably in the presence of Augustus.[429] In the first of these poems, Horace upholds the ideals of exclusive, elite poetics first promoted by Callimachus, and uses images of religious ritual to illustrate this. Horace rejects the impure and uninitiated (1 *profanum vulgus*) and demands silence (2 *favete linguis*), much as a priest would do in a temple before an epiphany.[430] Indeed, Cairns points out the etymology of *vulgus profanus* (3.1.1) allowing readers to imagine Horace standing on the steps of the temple, dismissing the uninitiated *vulgus* gathered in front of the temple (*pro-fanum*).[431] One can imagine Horace, as priest of the Muses, frequenting the kind of religious temples and literary spaces within which the book is unable to find a home. Hardie, among other critics, has raised the possibility that the shrine at which Horace is situated is not just an imaginary space. He argues that the setting for the ode may have been a Roman temple such as the *Aedes Herculis Musarum,* where the odes were performed in the presence of the *princeps*.[432]

---

[428] Miller 2002b, 138.
[429] See Hardie (2010), 304-8 on the circumstances of performance of the Roman Odes.
[430] See also Callim. *Hymn* 2.1-11, a scene which Dickie (2002), 113 imagines takes place in the *temenos* outside the doors of the Temple of Apollo, as those who have done wrong and whose presence would displease the god, are instructed to depart.
[431] Cairns (2012), 296.
[432] Hardie (2010), 300 raises the possibility of locating Horace in a specific Roman space: 'The question that follows from this reading is whether the shrine, like the priesthood of the Muses assumed by Horace, is imaginary, or whether it evokes a real temple.' He then states that [307] 'it would be difficult, moreover, to think of a more appropriate institutional location for presentation of the Roman odes than the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*'. See also Birt (1926), 48, 50 on the performance space as the

For Ovid's book of exilic poems, unlike the Roman Odes of Horace, there is no acceptance into a temple and no *princeps* to receive the work.[433] The little exiled book of Ovid, punished for his father's wrongdoings (73-4), is rejected from temples (3.1.59-68), much like the profane who are rejected by Horace the *sacerdos*.[434] As Miller argues, the rejection of the book from Roman libraries is 'cast in terms of possible religious violation'.[435] It should be recalled that the rejection of the *liber* from the temples is on account of his father's exile and the apparently parricidal deeds of his brothers (i.e. the *Ars Amatoria*) (*Tr*. 1.1.114 *Oedipodas facito Telegonosque uoces*).[436] Such familial discord is seen elsewhere as a reason for exclusion from temples. As Dickie has highlighted, Ovid includes disunited families amongst those wrongdoers who should be excluded from temples, in his description of the *Caristia* in the *Fasti* (*Fasti* 2.623-30).[437] In the role of a *vates* himself, Ovid orders discordant relatives and those who have committed offences such as parricide to depart from

---

*Aedes Herculis Musarum*. Cairns (1995), 94-6, meanwhile, argues for the case that the Alexandrian *Museion* is to be imagined.

[433] The little book receives no reply when he goes to the House of Augustus. The *princeps* is nowhere to be found and no mercy is granted (*Tr.* 3.1.33-58).

[434] Ovid's description of the book's attempts to approach the *candida templa* of Palatine Apollo (60) is reminiscent of a scene of initiation in the *Fasti* which itself appears to allude to Hor. *Od.* 3.1 (*Fast.* 1.70-1 *et resera nutu* ***candida templa*** *tuo. / prospera lux oritur: linguis animisque favet*). Green (2004a), 60 suggests that *candida* is a 'standard adjective' to describe marble of temples, but I would point out that the phrase *candida templa* is used only on these two occasions in Ovid and at the same point in the pentameter line. The book's approach to the temple, and the way it is described, appears reminiscent of the spaces and rituals of religious epiphany and initiation in Ovid's earlier work, yet the book is now one of those who is unable to enter.

[435] Miller (2009), 220n.74.

[436] This familial discord is reflected in the artwork of the temples from which Ovid's book is nevertheless rejected, in the Danaid portico (3.1.61-2). See also *Tr.* 3.1.73-4. Similarly, in a letter to Hyginus, the poet describes how the books of the *Ars Amatoria* were infected by him (*Tr.* 3.14.17 *tres mihi sunt nati contagia nostra secuti*), while he pleads the librarian to find a place for his other, unpolluted literary offspring in the city.

[437] Dickie (2002), 119.

the ritual.[438] Now Ovid and his literary offspring are caught up in a similar kind of familial disharmony and are cast out of the religious spaces of Rome.

The book is left on the thresholds of Rome's religious sanctuaries and literary monuments, dismissed by those who stand guard in front of Rome's sacred spaces (68 *praepositus sancto…loco*). No acceptance into the temples of Rome awaits the little book. No reading of the exilic work in the libraries and literary spaces is to occur. One could subsequently argue that the little book appears to be like the *profanum vulgus* which is rejected from poetic initiation and the elite, exclusive poetics favoured by Horatian and Callimachean poetry. The *liber*'s rejection from the religious and imperial monuments of Rome, along with its subsequent search for the 'plebeian' readership, appears to portray a reversal of the earlier poets' promotion of pure and selective poetics.

The poet's search for a readership from the many is also related in the language of a ritualistic context, just as Horace's poetics are discussed in religious terms. The book asks its plebeian readers to stretch out their hands and receive its books (*Tr*. 3.1.81-2 *uos quoque, **si fas est,** confusa pudore repulsae / sumite, plebeiae, carmina nostra, manus*). As Newlands has already pointed out, *fas* can have religious connotations, as it refers to what is permissible by divine law.[439] The term is used to express the idea of permissibility when meeting or seeing a divinity in a religious

[438] Robinson (2011) 390 observes that the *Caristia* in *Fasti* 2 is made into a religious ceremony, which focusses on familial disharmony rather than the traditional idea of familial celebration, perhaps an early indication of the 'familial' discord to come for the exiled poet.
[439] OLD s.v. '*fas*': 2 'That which is ordained by divine law, the will of heaven'. Newlands (1997), 74.

context.[440] In the *Fasti*, Ovid discusses his privilege to see the gods, because of his status as a *vates* and the 'sacred' subject matter of his work (*Fast.* 6.7-8 ***fas*** *mihi praecipue voltus vidisse deorum, / vel quia sum vates, vel quia sacra cano*).[441] One might interpret a similarly ritualistic tone in the *Tristia*.[442] For the little book, who is prohibited from seeing the gods and appealing to Caesar within the urban monuments, an alternative to the established centres of literary and religious initiation is found: acceptance and readership by the general public.[443]

The book also appears to further play on the tensions found within Callimachean poetics when it seeks a reception from the hands of the readers. While this appears to promote a readership from those who are excluded from Callimachean poetics (*Epigr*. 28.1-4), I would like to suggest that the plea of the poetry book to the private reader (*manus […] sumite*), appears to anticipate a lasting reception. It echoes Callimachus' appeal for his own work in the *Aetia* (Callim. *Aet.* fr. 7.13-14):

> ἔλλατε νῦν, ἐλέγοισι δ᾽ ἐνιψήσασθε λιπώσας
> χεῖρας ἐμοῖς, ἵνα μοι πουλὺ μένωσιν ἔτος.[444]
>
> Come now and wipe your anointed hands on my elegies so that they may last for many years.

---

[440] In *Georgics* 4, the mother of Aristaeus prays for an epiphany, stating that it is permitted that Aristaeus might enter the temples of the gods (*Georg.* 4.358-9 '*duc, age, duc ad nos; fas illi limina diuum / tangere*').

[441] This statement in itself has Callimachean overtones of religious and poetic initiation, as what follows this statement is Ovid's conversation with the goddesses in the grove, a scene which appears reminiscent of the dialogue with the Muses in Callimachus' *Aetia* (see Chapter 2).

[442] Furthermore, as Newlands (1997), 74 points out, the language used in *Tr*. 3.14, in a letter which is frequently thought to be addressed to Hyginus the librarian, emphasises the priestly role of the librarian (3.14.1 *cultor et antistes doctorum sancte uirorum*, 3.14.7 *uatum studiose nouorum*).

[443] Newlands (1997), 74: 'The sacred function of preserving literature is transferred to the realm of private friendship.'

[444] On Ovid's reception of Callimachus in exile see Williams (1991) and Helzle (1988), but a parallel between the end of this poem and Callimachus' request in the *Aetia* has not yet been made.

In the *Aetia*, Callimachus prays that his work will be divinely anointed, as he asks the Graces to wipe their hands on his elegies, in order that his work might achieve longevity. By entrusting itself to the hands of the plebs, Ovid's book appears to anticipate a similar kind of longevity, while at the same time going against the Callimachean ideals of exclusive reading. A dichotomy can thus be identified, between the allusion to Callimachean poetics and the rejection of the ideals promoted by Callimachus. The exiled poet and his book seek support from a wider, 'plebeian' readership, as the public take on the role of providing poetic longevity which was once the preserve of religious and poetic figures.

A similar dichotomy can be found at the end of the *Metamorphoses*, as the poet suggests that his work will live on due to the approval of the many rather than the few.[445] In the *Metamorphoses*, the poet attributes the guarantee of future fame and preservation of the epic text to the lips of men (*Met.* 15.878-9). In the *Tristia*, the book's hopes of survival and reception depend on their hands. In both texts the poet puts forward the idea that it will be a wider readership which will cause fame and poetic preservation, rather than imperial approval and canonisation.[446] Thus, the readers to whom Ovid appeals as an apparent 'last resort' in the *Tristia* may actually

---

[445] Hardie (2012), 167: 'This is the last of the paradoxes of Ovid's paradoxical poem, at once an exercise in Callimachean cultural elitism and a poem aiming at the widest popularity.'

[446] Critics who consider the exilic elegies' similarities with the *Metamorphoses* generally focus - understandably - on *Tristia* 1.7, a poem which openly discusses the fate of the *Metamorphoses.* See Hinds (1985); Tissol (2005); Kyriakides (2013). At the same time, I would argue that the ending of *Tristia* 3.1, with its paradoxical allusion to Callimachean conventions of poetic preservation, appears to also recall the ending of the *Metamorphoses.*

be those to whom his earlier works were addressed.[447] The poet appears to suggest, through the voice of his exilic *liber*, that the city offers poets different kinds of readership: that found in imperial institutions of Rome, and the more 'public', alternative readership offered by the private houses of the Roman people.

**Conclusion**

Although he is separated from the famed monuments in the city of Rome, and deprived of a homely and safe physical space, Ovid clearly recalls the city and considers the continued reception of his poetry in Rome. This narrative, placed at the programmatic centre of the *Tristia*, raises questions as to the nature of Ovid's new exilic elegy, sent back to the city where his earlier works were composed and where the most suitable reception for it may be found.

By revisiting the urban monuments through the eyes of the *liber*, the poet reconsiders Rome in an exilic context, and shows it to be a polyvalent cityscape steeped in literary culture. The Rome presented in the text of 3.1 promotes the earlier texts of the poet and traditional themes from Roman public poetry. Yet, the book's inability to access the monuments which were a seminal part of earlier poetic traditions highlights the poetic departure from the type of poetry which featured public and imperial themes associated with these constructions, as the book's private, elegiac status is emphasised.

[447] Hardie (2002), 309 aligns the readers of Ovid's *publica carmina* (*Tr.* 5.1.23) with those for whom he had written the *Metamorphoses* (15.878 *ore legar populi*) and the *Ars Amatoria* (1.1-2 *si quis in hoc artem populi non nouit amandi / hoc legat*).

Much like the poetry with which the book is filled, the book takes on a lamentable, elegiac pose as it turns away from these public structures and seeks a private household. Yet, rather than indicating the book's failure to achieve reception in Rome, the poet uses traditional motifs of elegy to suggest that his work is not simply rejected by readers. Instead, a private readership is favoured over public promotion and prestige, as the book finds a place within the kind of intimate settings found in traditional amatory elegy, rather than in imperial Augustan buildings.

In its discussion of the public and private settings within Rome, Ovid's personified *liber* acts as a medium through which the poet can not only return to Rome, but also consider the alternate types of readership found there. While the poet outwardly suggests that his work receives the same fate of public exile as its author, the book finds a substitute reception in Rome. By reading this poem alongside earlier texts, it is clear that the poet merely reformulates the ideas of poetic reception, actually confirming that his readership will continue, in spite of exile.

*Tristia* 3.1 confirms Ovid's later statements in *Tristia* 3.7 that, as long as Rome is in existence, the poet's work will be read (3.7.51-2 *dumque suis uictrix septem de montibus orbem / prospiciet domitum Martia Roma, legar*).[448] The exilic poems, including *Tristia* 3.1, also seem to suggest that as long as Ovid's poetry is read, Rome will be in existence. Ovid's exilic texts are used by the poet to conjure up the city, in spite of his exile, often by means of intertextual reference to his earlier works. Rome is a pervasive presence in the exilic corpus. It is mapped out by and accessed through

[448] I diverge from Hall's reading of *uictrix omnem* at *Tr.* 3.7.51 in favour of *uictrix septem*, as printed by Owen.

the poet’s earlier texts, suggesting that Rome is still to be viewed and read as an Ovidian construction, even if the poet himself is not present in the city.

# CHAPTER 4

## The *Epistulae ex Ponto*

### A tale of two cities: Ovid and Severus in Rome (*Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8)

#### Introduction

This chapter will explore the connection between Ovidian poetry and place in the context of Ovid's later poems about Tomis. In spite of his exilic position, Rome still pervades the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, as it did in the *Tristia.* At the same time, these letters explore the effect of the new Rome-less landscape of Tomis on Ovid's poetry and raise questions as to the necessity of Rome and Roman landscapes for the composition of Ovidian poetry. This chapter will also consider how Roman and Tomitan landscapes are used as a means of persuasion, as the poet suggests that a move from his current situation is necessary if he is to continue writing poetry.

Within the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, Ovid continues to 'revisit' Rome, by means of memory and imagination. He lingers over the delights of life in Rome, its monuments (1.8), its triumphs (2.1, 3.4), and its political celebrations (4.4, 4.9).[449] Yet, one can identify a number of differences in the poet's depiction of Rome in the *Epistulae ex Ponto* when compared to the earlier texts. Before, the poet's own interactions with the city were very regularly at the forefront of his elegies, with his amatory

[449] The poet's mental freedom and 'absent presence' in Rome is explored in the exilic epistles (see Hardie 2012, 285-325, Pandey 2018, 215-239). See P. Hardie (2002), 307-15 on Ovid's illusory presence in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*: '*Enthousiasmos* and *enargeia* characterise poetic makings that strive to be exact evocations of sights and sounds of imperial Rome, eliminating as far as possible the spatial and temporal distance between the poet and the city.'

encounters in the *Amores*, his conversations with divine informants in the *Fasti,* and even his painful memories of his departure from his home in the *Tristia*. Now, the poet writes to, locates and imagines specific readers in Rome, appealing for help and sympathy from named addressees in poems which are now much more epistolary in genre.[450] Ovid explores the consequences of the fact that these named addressees (a number of whom are poets) are able to remain within the city from which he himself is rejected. He imagines others in Rome without him, complaining that they profit from being present in the city while his own inspiration suffers (*Pont.* 3.4.51-58, 4.2.15-28).[451] In doing this, the exiled poet increases his attempts to persuade those still in the city to rescind or to soften his exile.

At the same time, the poet describes his life in Tomis in detail. Daily existence in this 'barbarian' landscape is set in stark contrast to the lifestyle enjoyed by those who have the freedom to remain in the city of Rome. In a kind of evolution of the town and country synkrisis, Ovid longs for the city he has left and condemns the space which he is forced to inhabit. Tomis is presented as the very antithesis of the Roman and Italian landscapes. The harsh situation of this locale is used as explanation for the poet's extreme homesickness and, subsequently, as a means of celebrating Rome. Perpetually frigid and unyielding to any human cultivation, the land lacks agricultural

[450] Tissol (2014), 19: 'Dropping the cautious discretion of the *Tristia*, Ovid now makes public demands on his addressees by name, implicating them willy nilly in his effort to procure recall or mitigation of his sentence.' On the topic of names in the exilic corpus, and the reasons for names being used in the *Epistulae ex Ponto,* see also Nagle (1980), 77-81; Williams (1994), 103-6; Oliensis (1997a); Tissol (2014), 18-23.

[451] Yet we have to question these statements with the poetry in hand, as Nagle (1980), 109-167 and Williams (1994), 50-99 have done.

and architectural development.[452] Much of the Tomitan landscape resembles Vergil's descriptions of the Scythian landscape at *Georgics* 3.349-83, a parallel which is commented upon by exilic scholars,[453] and other ethnographic descriptions in earlier poetry. What is unusual, however, is the fact that Ovid is situated in the landscape about which he writes, while at a distance from Rome.[454]

This is not the first time in Ovid's poetry where he locates himself in a place of exile, far from Rome. In his early elegy, Ovid presented himself as dislocated from the Italian landscape, but this dislocation was merely in his imagination. In *Amores* 2.16, the love-struck poet complained that he experienced a kind of exile due to the absence of Corinna. He stated that while he was located in his hometown of Sulmo, he was actually in Scythia or one of the lands at the far ends of empire (*Am.* 2.16.37-40):

> non ego Paelignos uideor celebrare salubres,
> non ego natalem, rura paterna, locum,
> sed Scythiam Cilicasque feros uiridesque Britannos,
> quaeque Prometheo saxa cruore rubent.
>
> I seem not to inhabit the beneficial Paelignian lands, nor my birthplace and father's fields, but Scythia and among the fierce Cilicians and the woad-painted Britons, and the rocks red with Promethean gore.

The very landscape in which Corinna's absence caused him to imagine living is now Ovid's enforced reality, as he refers to Pontus as a kind of Scythia (*Pont.* 1.3.37 *quid melius Roma? Scythico quid frigore peius?*). Equally, in a reversal of *Amores* 2.16, it is

[452] *Tr.* 3.10, 3.12.13-16, 5.10.23-6; *Pont*. 1.2.23-4, 1.3.49-56, 2.7.69-74, 3.1.11-28
[453] Williams (1994), 8-25; Evans (1975).
[454] See Williams (1994), 8-12 on Ovid's view of Rome from the periphery of the world compared to that of Vergil who was situated at its centre.

now Rome and the Italian landscape which are the imagined and illusory locations.[455] The poet is now on the outside looking in and his ethnographic descriptions are given a highly personal and egocentric focus. It is the elegiac poet himself who, shut out from Rome, must experience and suffer the hardships associated with this landscape, as the themes and tropes of love elegy continue to play out in exilic elegy.

For many Roman poets, it is poetry which allows them to explore place: through the medium of poetry and poetic imagination, the extremes of empire can be imagined or 'visited'. For Ovid, place also allows him to explore poetic considerations. The way in which the poet describes Rome and the surrounding countryside, in contrast to his present situation in the Tomitan landscape, raises questions as to how his new exilic position affects his poetic inspiration and composition compared to those who are able to remain within Italy.[456]

*Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 is one of the many poems which see the poet 'return' to Rome (albeit merely in his imagination), while also describing a number of other landscapes in Ovid's new exilic world. The elegy's addressee, Severus, is most likely the epic poet Cornelius Severus, known for his epic poem the *Bellum Siculum* and his *Carmen Regale/Res Romanae* on the ancient kings of Rome.[457] Ovid's epistle to this

---

[455] See Hardie (2002), 283-325 on the poet's absent presence in exile.

[456] Nagle (1980), 109: 'Ovid often alleges in the exilic elegies that his environment and situation have affected his ability to write poetry.'

[457] The other possible Severus was the consul A. Caecina Severus. Yet, as this man was on campaign at the time, it seems most unlikely that Ovid would write to him to discuss his leisurely life in Rome. See Gaertner (2005), 428-9 for a detailed discussion of Severus' identity, which concludes in advocating for Cornelius Severus as the recipient of *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8. Some may have reservations in believing that this is the case due to the fact that, in 4.2 (a poem which much more overtly discusses Severus' literary career) Ovid states that he had not written to Severus before (4.2.3). However, Tissol (2014), 148 argues that this may not be true in chronological terms, as *Pont*. 4 was a collection of letters put together posthumously, and not all together in sequence.

poet, as a whole, foregrounds place and orients itself through a series of topography inflected considerations.

Ovid begins his letter to the epic poet with an apology for the quality of his poetry, explaining that it was written in the midst of warfare (*Pont.* 1.8.3-10). This is followed by an epic ekphrasis which describes the sacking and retaking of the city of Aegisos (1.8.11-24). Ovid then goes on to describe his wish to return to Rome and see his family, imagining himself visiting the places of his past, including his home, the fora and theatres, and the leisure complex of the Campus Martius (1.8.29-38). The poet's gardens outside Rome are described (1.8.39-48), but Ovid declares that he would not miss these if only he could create a rustic habitat in exile. He then engages in an idyllic dream of a happy, pastoral lifestyle (1.8.49-62), much like those found in Tibullan elegy or the Vergilian pastoral, but this dream is rendered impossible because of the military action in which Tomis is embroiled. Finally, Ovid states that Severus, by contrast, is able to enjoy all the pleasures of Rome, the buildings which he himself imagined visiting, and the surrounding countryside (1.8.63-8). He then concludes with a hope that he will either be welcomed on Severus' country estate, if Caesar were to permit it, or moved to a less hostile landscape (1.8.69-74).

This chapter will go on to analyse Ovid's portrayal of Roman landscapes in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, in conjunction with the description of Tomis in the same epistle, in order to illustrate some of the ways in which Ovid establishes a connection between space and poetic inspiration, as a means of persuading his addressee that a move to a *terra proprior* would be beneficial for his own poetry.

**Ovid and Severus: Poetic *amicitia* and Rome**

Critics have analysed and discussed the persuasive attempts in the poem, as the poet seeks a *terra proprior*,[458] but there is more to say about the relationship between the poet and Severus, and how Ovid specifically tailors this epistle towards his addressee. The topography of the architecturally developed city and the fertile countryside which surrounds it, along with the contrasting barren landscape of Tomis, are all used in this epistle as a means of persuading Severus specifically.

The *Epistulae ex Ponto* sees the use of named addressees for the first time in Ovid's exilic corpus, which the poet himself points out as he compares these letters to the *Tristia* (*Pont*. 1.1.17-18):

> rebus idem, titulo differt, et epistula cui sit
> non occultato nomine missa docet.

> They have the same themes, but the title differs: and each letter reveals
> to whom it is sent, as the name is clear to see.

In these letters, Ovid often refers to the works of his addressees, many of whom are also poets. As Gaertner notes, for example, the medical imagery in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.3 is tailored to the addressee Rufinus, who is believed to have authored scientific works.[459] In his letter to Albinovanus Pedo, who wrote a *Theseis* (4.10.71-6), Ovid exhorts his addressee to imitate the very same hero in terms of his fidelity to Ovid in exile (77-84). In his epistle to Carus, who wrote a poem on Hercules (4.16.7), he suggests that any poetry by Carus will be easily recognised, as its author has all the

[458] Williams (1994), 24-34; Edwards (1996), 122-23.
[459] Gaertner (2005), 222-3.

vigour of the epic hero (4.13.9-12). Ovid refers to his addressees' works as a means of persuasion and flattery.

The poet also appeals to his addressees by discussing the places which they visited together. This can be seen in Ovid's epistle to his friend Atticus. He describes the atmosphere of poetic criticism and composition (2.4.9-18) which was concurrent with their joint existence in Rome (*Pont.* 2.4.11-20):

> saepe citae longis uisae sermonibus horae,
> saepe fuit breuior quam mea uerba dies.
> [...]
> utque meus lima rasus liber esset amici,
> non semel admonitu facta litura tuo est.
> nos fora uiderunt pariter, nos porticus omnis,
> nos uia, nos iunctis curua theatra locis.

> Hours often seemed too short for long conversations, often the day was too short for my words. More than once I have made erasures at your suggestion so that my book might be touched by a friend's file. The fora saw us both together, every portico, every street watched us, and the curved theatre found us in the seats next to each other.

The locations mentioned here were, in Ovid's earlier work, presented as possible sites of seduction. The *curua theatra* (20) is a particularly Ovidian phrase, as the poet is the first to use the adjective *curuus* in conjunction with the noun *theatrum.* It is used once in the *Amores* (2.2.26) and twice in the *Ars Amatoria* (1.89, 2.497) as a place to meet a girl. Here, this landscape is presented as a more literary environment, a backdrop to friendship and literary criticism, yet it recalls Ovid's earlier elegies, as if the poet is referencing his earlier works for a reader who knew them well. Ovid's use of these particular Roman locations to express the depth of their friendship could

cast their relationship in an eroticised light,[460] once again bringing out the amatory potential of these monuments. Equally, this might be an attempt in exile to overwrite his earlier eroticisation in Rome with something more traditional. The harmonious literary pursuits of the two friends are placed in correlation with their mutual existence in Rome and their ability to visit its monuments.[461] While friendship is certainly important for Ovid's skilled poetic production, the poet emphasises that so too is Rome itself.

Another poetic relationship about which Ovid writes, which is particularly commented on, is the friendship between himself and the poet Macer (*Pont.* 2.10).[462] As other critics have argued, the depiction of the two poets' travels through the Sicilian and Asian landscapes can be viewed as a means of describing their mutual poetic endeavours.[463] As Ovid describes their different journeys (2.10.17-18 *diuersum…iter*) through the same landscapes (21-9), he indicates the literary production of two different poets who write in different genres, yet are aided by friendship and poetic cooperation.[464] Indeed, Williams has shown that the particular landscapes which the poets visit refer specifically to different episodes within their

---

[460] The eroticisation of poet-friends is relatively common in Latin poetry, especially in Catullus (particularly his relationship with Licinius in Catull. 50). See Williams (2012), 181-5 on the erotic associations in Catullus 50 and other poems to his friends. The patron-client relationship is often figured in similar language to the beloved-lover relationship of elegy. See Oliensis (1997b).

[461] Ovid does not reference Atticus' own poetic composition here, but this addressee certainly appears to be in Ovid's literary circle due to the fact he clearly gives Ovid notes on his poetry (17-18). Atticus is also seemingly addressed in *Amores* 1.9 (2 *Attice, crede mihi, militat omnis amans*). Even if Atticus was not a poet himself, then, as Williams (1991), 170 states, a 'shared commitment to literary pursuits' can still be identified.

[462] See Helzle (2003), 391-2 on the relationship between Ovid and Macer.

[463] Williams (1994), 42-9; Hardie (2002), 318, 323-4.

[464] As Williams (1991), 174 argues, this imagery 'denotes more than the different courses which the lives of Macer and Ovid have taken, with the latter's downfall and long journey into exile. The phrase also embraces the contrasting paths which Ovid and Macer follow as practitioners of different genres, while still sharing common literary interests'.

respective poetry. The path they take through Asia Minor and Sicily follows the journey of Aeneas, a reference to Macer's Trojan epic, while also recalling the locations found in Ovid's Persephone narratives in *Metamorphoses* 5 and *Fasti* 4.[465]

This poem highlights that it is possible to enjoy leaving Rome and traversing the Empire, if with a companion.[466] Exile and solitary isolation are an entirely different matter. Ovid's poems to Atticus and Macer highlight the advantages of poetic *communia*, but Ovid's epistle to Severus considers the ramifications of poetic separation, as one poet remains in Rome and the other is caught up in exile. Severus and Ovid both explore the same landscape, but one in imagination, the other in reality. As the poet places himself and Severus in similar landscapes which act as reminders of their poetry, much like the landscapes which Ovid and Macer experience, it is possible to consider their poetic relationship and their different poetic production.

Material from Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto* and the fragments of Severan poetry appears to suggest that some level of allusion to each other's work existed in their poetry. Ovid himself mentions Severus' *Carmen Regale* in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, as he describes Severus as the 'greatest poet of great kings' and specifically names his work (*Ex Pont*. 4.2.1 *o uates magnorum maxime regum*, 4.16.9 *quique dedit Latio carmen regale Seuerus*). In turn, Severus also appears to refer to Ovid's work, albeit by allusion rather than direct naming. Within the fragmentary remains of Severus'

[465] Williams (1994), 45-7.
[466] See also Catull. 11.1-16.

work, critics have identified allusion to *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.2 in Severus' description of the death of Cicero.[467]

In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, Ovid appears to make further reference to Severus' work, as an indirect means of impressing and persuading his addressee. His discussion of cities allows him to do this: Ovid describes Aegisos and Rome in ways which allude to the poetic genre and content of Severus' work. Even in the medium of elegy, Ovid uses his discussion of the harsh and war-torn environment he must now inhabit as a means of including ktistic epic themes within his epistle to a poet who was himself writing Roman epic.[468]

Epic allusion can be identified in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, right from the very beginning of his letter to Severus, as Ovid speaks about being caught up in warfare, and writes about Aegisos.[469] As Gaertner points out, the opening to his description of the sack and recovery of Aegisos (*Pont.* 1.8.11-12 ***stat uetus urbs**, ripae uicina binominis Histri, / moenibus et positu uix adeunda loci*) is reminiscent of the ekphrastic descriptions found in epics such as the *Iliad* (*Il.* 6.152) and in Vergil's

---

[467] Courtney (1993), 326, Hollis (2007), 362-3 both suggest that Severus' poetry (fr. 219.10 ***abstulit una dies** aevi decus)* alludes to Ovid's description of the Fabii (*Pont.* 1.2.4. *non omnes Fabios* ***abstulit una dies***) while the description of Cicero's eloquence (fr. 219.11. *conticuit* ***Latiae*** *tristis* ***facundia linguae***) may allude to Ovid's praise of Cotta Maximus' father (*Pont.* 2.3.75 *tuus ille pater,* ***Latiae facundia linguae***).

[468] In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.2, Ovid's other letter to Severus, Ovid considers how Homer would have borne the fate of exile. He states that Homer, too, would write scanty and poor poetry if relegated to Tomis (*Pont.* 4.2.21-2), aligning the epic poet in his situation.

[469] As Ingleheart (2010b), 171 points out, the employment of the *militia amoris topos* in elegy makes Ovid and his predecessors 'soldier-poets in love's lists who succeeded one another in (erotic) tours of duty'. This *topos*, however, is adapted in exilic elegy as Ovid becomes an elegist who is involved in real warfare.

description of Carthage in the *Aeneid* (*Aen.* 1.12. *urbs antiqua fuit*).[470] Gaertner makes comparisons between *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 and *Aeneid* 1 due to the ekphrastic language, but one can also see a further similarity as Aegisos is a fallen city (1.8.15-16) and Carthage will be a fallen city, due to events begun in the *Aeneid*. As he describes the fall and recapture of the city, one can see that Ovid's poem doubles as a foundation myth for the city on the Black Sea, in the same way that the ktistic epics, such as the *Aeneid*, tell of the rise and fall of cities.[471] Even outside Rome, and writing about other landscapes, Ovid is able to refer to and imitate its most famous poetry as his elegiac epistle takes on qualities of Roman epic.[472]

Furthermore, within this episode, Ovid's epic description of the recapturing of Aegisos by the local ruler Cotys and praise of his kingship (1.8.15-24) may also be alluding directly to Severus' own ktistic epic work on ancient kings, or even creating his own exilic homage to the *Carmen Regale* as a means of impressing his addressee. Although Cotys was a local king, he was a ruler with clear Roman connections, as a client king of Thrace after the country was divided in two by Augustus. He is presented by Ovid as a westernised ruler, a lover of cultural and poetic pursuits (*Pont.* 2.10). Ovid's praise of Cotys' humanity in peacetime and his ferocity in war (2.10.45-6) and description of his defeat of those who attacked Aegisos, beating down the

[470] Gaertner (2005), 435. Helzle (2003), 208 introduces the possibility that Ovid's opening to his miniature epic narrative (1.8.9 *stat uetus urbs*) may have been directly taken from the opening of an ekphrasis in Severus' own work.
[471] Horsfall (1989), 8 points out that the *Aeneid* is not simply about the rise of Rome, but an epic about a number of cities which are founded; it is a poem about 'urban settlement and colonisation'.
[472] On other similarities to the *Aeneid* in the poem, see Gaertner (2005), 445-6; Tissol (2014), 155. Both argue that Ovid casts himself as a Virbius figure in this elegy, as he describes the location of his exile (1.8.27) on the shores of the Styx, in a way which alludes to the death of Aesculapius at *Aen*. 7.773.

proud spirits of his enemies (1.8.19-20), appears to characterise Cotys as the kind of Roman ruler which Anchises suggests Aeneas should be at *Aeneid* 6.847-53. Cotys, therefore, certainly seems much like the legendary Roman kings who would have received praise in Severus' *Carmen Regale.*

Now that his exilic epistles have named recipients, Ovid is able to craft his poems with particular care, as a means of persuading each specific addressee. Ovid employs epic motifs in what appears to be an attempt to impress or liken himself to Severus, despite their difference of locations and composition of different genres.[473] Reference to epic *topoi* and material can also be found within the second half of the poem, even though Ovid turns away from the topic of epic warfare and focusses on more urbane matters. The poet explains to his addressee how he 'returns' to Rome, travelling back to the city in his imagination to see his loved ones and familiar urban spaces. The monuments which he 'visits' in this poem are carefully chosen, as Ovid returns to more recreational spaces than those listed in *Tristia* 3.1, including many found within the Campus Martius (*Pont*. 1.8.33-8):

> aque domo rursus pulchrae loca uertor ad Vrbis,
> cunctaque mens oculis peruidet illa suis.
> nunc fora, nunc aedes, nunc marmore tecta theatra,35
> nunc subit aequata porticus omnis humo.
> gramina nunc Campi pulchros spectantis in hortos,
> stagnaque et euripi Virgineusque liquor.

> And from my house I return to the places in the beautiful city, and my mind sees everything with its own eyes. Now the fora, now the temples,

[473] This is not the first time Ovid has stepped into the territory of epic composition. In both *Amores* 1.1 and 2.1 he mentions writing epic (although he is interrupted both times by an elegiac stimulus). Sharrock (2013), 164 argues that Ovid 'did not just think of writing epic, but actually did so, and the epic which he claims to have undertaken is nothing to do with the praise of Caesar and the glories of Rome but that epitome of epic greatness, the battle of gods and giants'.

> now the marble-clad theatres, now every portico on levelled ground appears to me. Now the grass of the Campus, which looks towards the pretty gardens, now the artificial lake, and the Virgin water of the Euripus.

The use of these monuments, much like the narrative about Aegisos, appears to be a way of appealing to Severus and referring to elements of his work. The Roman buildings which Ovid 'visits', begin with the theatres, porticoes and fora, spoken of in fairly general terms here,[474] but we then see a switch from familiar Ovidian sites to ones less frequented in his corpus. It seems appropriate that, after providing an epic foundation tale as a means of appealing to the epic poet Severus, when returning to Rome, the poet's narrative is taken up with the field of Mars,[475] the historic mustering point for Rome's soldiers outside of the *pomerium*, and a space for military exercise.[476]

In his description of feats of architectural engineering in the Campus Martius, Ovid also appears to allude to Severus' epic work by referring to Agrippa, a figure who would have featured in Severus' *Bellum Siculum*. Courtney believes that the *Epistulae ex Ponto* is 'silent' about this poem, postulating that Severus would have only begun composing the *Bellum Siculum* while Ovid was writing the *Epistulae ex Ponto.*[477] Yet, considering Ovid's other attempts to refer to the epic genre within which Severus

---

[474] Edwards (1996), 123 suggests that this poem is a depiction vivid with *enargeia*, yet as Reitz (2013), 288 argues much of the poet's exploration of Rome is, in actual fact, merely a list of names and places.
[475] After declaring his role as a 'soldier' in exile (7 *sum miles in exule*), the poet's return to Rome mainly features the buildings in the Campus Martius. It was here that foreign visitors arrived (Favro 2005, 257-8), here where returning generals waited while the senate deliberated whether their actions were worthy of a triumph (See Dyson 2010, 25-27; Jacobs and Conlin 2014, 27). As Ovid appeals and waits for help in the mitigation of his exile from those in Rome, after experiencing life in a war zone, it is seemly that he mentally returns to this place, continuing the notion that he is similar to epic, martial figures.
[476] Cf. Lucr. 2.323-332. See Jacobs and Conlin (2014), 20-42 on the historical military role of the Campus Martius.
[477] Courtney (1993), 320.

wrote, it is possible that there is anticipation of Severus' forthcoming work in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, which Hollis believes was probably written in the final years of Augustus' reign or after the emperor's death in 14BC.[478]

Ovid lists a number of locations constructed or repaired by Marcus Agrippa in the recreational, northern half of the Campus Martius. The *stagna* refers to the *stagnum Agrippae*, an artificially constructed lake which lay to the west of the baths of Agrippa, while the 'Virgin water' refers to the water from the aqua Virgo, the aqueduct dedicated in 19BC by the imperial architect, which supplied the baths. The Euripus,[479] too, was constructed by Agrippa. A canal connecting the baths and the Tiber, it acted as a cold plunge in which swimmers could bathe. It is less clear to which gardens Ovid refers (37). They could be the *horti Lucilliani* on the Pincian, which were situated above the aqua Virgo, but it seems very likely that these were the *horti Agrippae*, which were situated in the Campus Martius adjacent to the *stagnum*.[480]

Edwards suggests that Ovid's portrayal of the open space in urban Rome is an image of charming elegance, which is used as a foil for the barbarian landscapes of Tomis.[481] While this is certainly true, there may be other reasons why these particular monuments and open spaces are named. Ovid strategically chooses the monuments

---

[478] Hollis (2007), 350. As Hollis points out, we can date the *Bellum Siculum* after the *Metamorphoses,* due to Seneca's description of Cornelius Severus (Sen. *Epist.* 79.5): *Quid tibi do, ne Aetnam describes in tuo carmine, ne hunc sollemnem omnibus poetis locum adtingas? Quem quo minus Ovidius tractaret, nihil obstitit, quod iam Vergilius impleverat. Ne Severum quidem Cornelium uterque deterruit. Omnibus praeterea feliciter hic locus se dedit et qui praecesserant, non praeripuisse mihi videntur, quae dici poterant, sed aperuisse.* (Text taken from Gummere 1917).

[479] I read *euripi* as a genitive singular, as Knox (2009), 662-4 does, referring specifically to the Euripus rather than to multiple canals.

[480] See Platner and Ashby s.v. '*horti*'.

[481] Edwards (1996), 123.

which he visits in his memory, listing architectural structures which Agrippa was responsible for constructing and repairing.[482] The Agrippan theme of the architecture depicted could be put down to the addressee of the epistle. It could be argued that Ovid specifically chose to discuss monuments constructed by the imperial architect when writing to Severus who would have been composing a poem (the *Bellum Siculum*) involving Agrippa, who played a crucial role in the Sicilian Revolt.[483]

As he praises the green spaces in Rome, the monuments in Ovid's description are also used as a means of referring to and celebrating the imperial architect. In this, Vergil's *Georgics* 2 provides a topical parallel. Williams has argued that the juxtaposition of the martial and pastoral sections in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 frame Ovid's own version of the Vergilian *laudes Italiae* (*G.*2.136-75), with his celebration of the Campus Martius and *rus in urbe*.[484] In the *laudes Italiae*, Vergil celebrates the military prowess of Rome's leaders, as well as Italy's cultivation of the land. The passage also celebrates water sources and lakes, including the Lucrine and Avernus, and the *portus Iuliae* at Baiae (2.159-61), which was created by Agrippa in 37BC. These connecting waterways depicted by Vergil were used by the architect in preparation for the campaign at Naulochus, which saw the conclusion of the civil war and the Roman victory over Sextus Pompey in 36BC.

---

[482] Although Gibson (2003), 255 suggests that an 'overview of the Campus inevitably involves a focus on Augustus', like Tissol (2014), 157-8, I prefer an Agrippan reading of these monuments. Tissol, however, offers no explanation for why Agrippan monuments are so prominent in this poem.

[483] Hollis (2007), 350, on Severus' composition of the *Bellum Siculum,* remarks that 'it would be interesting to know how much credit Cornelius Severus allowed to Agrippa'. Ovid may, too, have pondered the same thing as he anticipated the publication of Severus' work.

[484] On *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 as a kind of *laudes Italiae*, which is much like Vergil's, see Williams (1994), 33.

In Ovid's case, at the centre of a poem which celebrates Cotys' military victory at Aegisos and recalls the pastoral landscape of his Italian gardens, the exiled poet also describes grand waterworks of Rome which were also related to Agrippa. In an epistle to an epic poet writing about Agrippan feats in his *Bellum Siculum*, the watercourses of Rome are used as a means of celebrating Agrippa's *labor*. While Ovid makes no overt reference to architecture related to the events which were the subject of Severus' epic poem, as Vergil does, his naming of the monuments in the Campus Martius still firmly points to Agrippa's achievements.[485] Ovid provides a Romanocentric version of Vergil's *laudes Italiae,* which nevertheless still alludes to the works of Agrippa, in what appears to be an attempt to persuade Severus and allude to his poetry.

I have already argued that the first half of the poem, and its retelling of the fall and recapturing of Aegisos may recall the content of Severus' *Res Romanae* due to its praise of Cotys. It may also be possible to read Ovid's account of the fall and recapture of Aegisos as a narrative topic which is similar to the historical events of Severus' epic poetry and the *Bellum Siculum.* One could argue that Ovid may have chosen to write about 'epic' events, the fall and capture of Aegisos, due to their similarities with the events about which Severus himself was composing poetry, and the characters who orchestrated these events.

According to Ovid, the fall of Aegisos and its recapture were apparently orchestrated by the king of Thrace (Cotys), who should receive honour in Rome along

[485] The Campus Martius itself was the scene of 'naval battles', as Julius Caesar ordered the creation of a lake near the Tiber so that naval battles could be re-enacted (Jacobs and Conlin 2014, 123-4).

with Caesar (1.8.24 *Martia cum magno Caesare Roma probet*). Yet, elsewhere, the poet explains that the recapture was actually thanks to Vestalis, another addressee,[486] under the command of Vitellius (4.7.25-9) after the city was lost by the Thracian king. This course of events can be compared to chronology leading up to the victory at Naulochus. This event occurred after an earlier defeat by Octavian, [487] and was actually orchestrated by Agrippa's ships, even though both Agrippa *and* Augustus were celebrated as responsible for the defeat of Sextus Pompey.[488] One can see a similarity in the timeline of events, as defeat is followed by victory, and the (imperial/regal) figure who is responsible for the defeat is also honoured for the subsequent victory.[489] Thus, it may be possible to read Ovid's epic episode, and the landscape settings which feature within it, as an homage to Severan poetry, with an awareness of its content and its characters.

**Severus and Ovidian Rome**

It is possible to see that the landscapes of Ovid's poem are used as a means of recalling and alluding to other Roman poetry, as the poet's elegiac epistle recalls epic texts. At the same time, the city remains an Ovidian landscape, bearing reminiscences of the *Ars Amatoria* and earlier texts. Yet, a reading of these corresponding texts, which evoke the same places, highlights the poet's separation from the city and once

---

[486] By contrast, in his epistle to Cotys (*Pont.* 2.9), the poet says nothing about these events, choosing to focus instead on the ruler's poetic talents.
[487] See Gaertner (2005), 441 on general similarities between Cotys and Augustus.
[488] App. *B. Civ*. 5.111-2.
[489] On a record of Augustus' Sicilian defeats in poetry, see the epigram recorded by Suet. *Div. Aug*. 70.2 (Courtney 475): *postquam bis classe victus naves perdidit, / aliquando ut vincat, ludit assidue aleam.*

again emphasises that it is Severus who now has the ability to visit these places, instead of Ovid.

In *Ex Ponto* 1.8, Ovid describes the Roman sights which now appear only in his mind's eye, before going on to describe Severus' experience of Rome in reality. He describes the city and the places which he could once freely visit as if he is still able to walk around Rome (*Pont*. 1.8.29-38). The sights of Rome which appear to Ovid are figured in the present tense (33 *pulchrae loca* ***uertor*** *ad urbis*) and given added immediacy by the repetition of *nunc* (35-7), but the verb *reminiscor* in line 31 highlights that Ovid is seeing the city only through his powers of memory. Ovid's mental recollection of his past life in Rome, which is activated by navigating the urban cityscape, functions similarly to the rhetorical technique of the *loci* method, which uses urban spaces such as houses, temples or architectural monuments as a means of recalling information.[490]

As in *Tristia* 3.1, Ovid's memory of Rome in *Ex Ponto* 1.8 is constructed from traces of his earlier, elegiac texts. The fora, the temples, the theatre and the porticos which the poet describes during his imaginary return to Rome (35-6) are all included in Ovid's erotic tour of Rome (*Ars Amatoria* 1.67-110). The Campus Martius and Aqua Virgo (37-8) both also feature in the *Fasti* and *Ars Amatoria* (*Fast*. 1.464, *Ars Am.* 3.385). Yet, the poet cannot properly return to the places he once freely frequented while writing these texts. Severus, meanwhile, is described frequenting the places which Ovid can now only imagine (*Pont.*1.8.65-68):

[490] See *Rhet. Her.* 3.29 on architecture and the *loci* method. P. Hardie (2002), 290 argues that for the exiled poet 'architectural backdrop functions as a set of memory *loci*'.

te modo Campus habet, densa modo porticus umbra,
  nunc, in quo ponis tempora rara, forum.
Umbria nunc reuocat, nec non Albana petentem
    Appia feruenti ducit in arua rota.

Now the Campus knows you, now the deeply shaded portico, now the forum, although you rarely spend time there. Now Umbria calls you back, or the Appian road leads you, seeking Alba, into the country on burning wheels.

The spaces which Severus visits recall Ovid's earlier poetry, and the demarcation of space which the poet sets out in the *Ars Amatoria*. Reading *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 with this text highlights Severus' freedom to enjoy places associated with Ovidian elegy, while the elegiac poet himself is shut out from the city.

In the *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid describes how the parts of the Campus Martius used for exercise and the cold waters of the Virgo (the very same places he imagined going in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8) are not places which females looking for amatory encounters should visit. Instead, these women are advised to enjoy shaded porticoes and other more suitable monuments like the Circus (*Ars Am*. 3.383-96):

sunt illis celeresque pilae iaculumque trochique
  armaque et in gyros ire coactus equus.
**nec uos Campus habet** nec uos gelidissima **Virgo**
  nec Tuscus placida deuehit amnis aqua.
at licet et prodest **Pompeias** ire per **umbras**,
  **Virginis** aetheriis cum caput ardet equis.
uisite laurigero sacrata Palatia Phoebo
  (ille Paraetonias mersit in alta rates) 390
quaeque soror coniunxque ducis monimenta pararunt
  naualique gener cinctus honore caput,
uisite turicremas uaccae Memphitidos aras,
  uisite conspicuis terna theatra locis.
spectentur tepido maculosae sanguine harenae 395
  metaque **feruenti** circumeunda **rota.**

Men have swift balls and javelins and hoops and armour, and horses compelled to turn in a ring. The Campus does not know you, nor the

> coldest Virgo, and the Tiber does not carry you down-river in its placid water. But it is permitted and profitable to walk through the shade of Pompey's portico, when the head is burnt by the heavenly horses of the Virgin. Visit the Palatine, consecrated by the laurel-bearing Phoebus (that god plunged the Paraetonian ships into the deep), and those monuments which our leader's wife and sister have acquired, and his son-in-law with his head wreathed with naval glory.[491] Visit the incense-burning altars of the Memphian cow, visit the three theatres in striking places. Let the sand, dappled with warm gore, be seen, and the turning post that must be circumvented by burning wheels.

In this poem Ovid highlights how certain parts of the city are off-limits to women (who lead restricted lives), whereas men have the freedom of the city. However, although Ovid characterises men as frequenting the Campus for exercise, we know from *Ars Amatoria* 1 that he expects them to be in places such as Pompey's colonnade, looking for girls.[492] Nevertheless, Ovid's eroto-didactic elegy introduces the demarcation of amatory and non-amatory space. A similar demarcation of space can be seen in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, which considers how different people have liberty to visit locations in Rome. Severus' freedom of Rome (*Pont*. 1.8.56 ***te** modo* ***Campus habet**, densa modo porticus umbra*) is described using very similar terms to this passage of the *Ars Amatoria*.

Both *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8.65 and *Ars Amatoria* 3.385 use the phrase *te/uos Campus habet*, a similarity noted by Tissol.[493] Added to this, one should also consider that both lines feature repetition across the first and second half of the hexameter

---

[491] One should note this passage, to which *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 clearly alludes, bears Agrippan references. The poet describes the *corona rostrata* (*Ars Am.* 3.392 *naualique gener cinctus honore caput*), which Agrippa received for his victory after the battle at Naulochus.
[492] See Introduction.
[493] Tissol (2014), 162. Langley (2016), 114 identifies connections between the similar Roman spaces discussed in *Tr.* 3.12, including the *aqua Virgo,* and *Ars Am*. 3.385-96, but similarities between *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 and *Ars Amatoria* 3 are overlooked. Gibson (2003), 256 briefly notes that the places in *Ars Amatoria* 3 are 'poignantly' recalled in *Tr.* 3.12 and *Pont.* 1.8, but the lexical similarities between the passages are generally overlooked.

line of the couplet (*nec uos…nec uos; modo…modo*). The description of the spaces permitted for love in *Ars Amatoria* 3 begins with the shaded Portico of Pompey (*Ars Am.* 3.387 *licet et prodest Pompeias ire per umbras*) and ends with the image of the burning wheels of the chariots at the Circus (3.396 *metaque* ***feruenti*** *circueunda* ***rota***). The description of Severus' freedom in the city is structured in a similar manner, beginning with the shaded porticoes (*Pont*. 1.8.65 *te modo Campus habet densa* ***modo porticus umbra***) and ending with a description of the burning wheels of his chariot as he speeds down the *via Appia* (1.8.68 *Appia* ***feruenti*** *ducit in arua* ***rota****).*[494]

For Severus, there is no demarcation of space: he may go entirely where he pleases. Severus' visiting of these apparently more masculine, restricted locations in Rome might even indicate his respectability, as he visits the places which were off limits to the women in the *Ars Amatoria*.[495] For Ovid, his imagination enables him to visit all of Rome, and the different places mentioned in the *Ars Amatoria* (as he remembers the porticoes and the theatres eroticised in the *Ars* as well as the northern end of the Campus Martius). Yet in reality, Roman space is now more restricted than it was for the female lover in the *Ars.* He cannot access any of Rome, but only recall them through memory and imagination. Trapped in the midst of real war, the love-elegist who previously advised lovers against entering Roman locations

---

[494]*Ars Am.* 3.396 and *Pont.* 1.8.68 are metrically identical.

[495] Ovid's portrayal of Severus visiting these places may have its own ironies, however, much like the description of these places in *Ars Amatoria* 3. Either Severus is (as his name suggests) more traditional than the men of *Ars Amatoria* 1, or the passages in *Ars Amatoria* 1 and 3 may suggest that he may not be as severe as he seems. Is he really visiting these places? Or, just as the men in the *Ars Amatoria* may not really be in the Campus and male only spaces, is Severus only frequenting these places in Ovid's imagination?

where sport and war-games occurred (*Ars Am*. 3.381-6) now longs for even the more martial spaces found within the city.[496]

Helzle rightly suggests that it is a bitter irony that Ovid, the urbane elegiac poet, is trapped outside of Rome, while Severus, the epic poet, has the leisure to enjoy the peace of the city.[497] Advancing this idea further, I would point out that the landscape which Severus enjoys is one which can be mapped specifically on to and is constructed out of the topographic space explored in Ovid's earlier amatory elegies. The landscape of Rome evokes Ovid's earlier texts, but does so in a way which highlights Ovid's separation from rather than his lasting presence in Rome.

The places which Severus is free to enjoy now become reminders of Ovid's misery and what he has lost. The very same settings which Severus visits are used elsewhere in his exilic elegy as *adynata* to express the greatness of his sorrows. In the *Tristia*, the poet complains that he endures more evils than the Campus Martius has blades of grass (*Tr.* 5.1.32-33) - the only other time in the exilic corpus when Ovid speaks of the grass of the Campus (5.1.32 *gramina campus*, 1.8.37 *gramine…campi*). Similarly, the poet later declares that his heart is more worn out from grief than the Appian Way is from chariot wheels (*Pont.* 2.7.44-5) - the only other occasion in the whole poetic corpus when he speaks of the road.[498] In *adynata* used in earlier poetry,

---

[496] Severus, as an epic poet, is described freely visiting the Campus. His ability to visit the places, described in the *Ars Amatoria*, where men enjoyed martial games and *arma* (a loaded word in terms of genre), may bring out the generic connotations of this landscape.

[497] Helzle (2003), 208 'Der Dichter, der vom Krieg schreibt, lebt in Frieden, der, der friedliche Themen behandelte lebt im ständigen Kriegszustand'.

[498] See also *Pont*. 1.4.15-16 where the poet compares his exilic state of misery and exhaustion to the over-raced horse in the Campus Martius. In *Amores* 3.2 the poet wished to be like the charioteer (5-14), spurring his charges on as a means of impressing his mistress. Now, he describes himself as the exhausted racehorse as a means of appealing to his wife's pity.

the places on the edges of the Empire were used as almost mythological extremes, as a means of comparison to Roman life, including the amount of pain caused by love, the multiplicity of *puellae* in Rome, and the distance of the girl from the lover's bed.[499] Now, Rome itself becomes a kind of inaccessible, mythological unreality which Ovid can recall only in memory, an imagined comparison to his present, painful reality.

In *Tristia* 3.1, as the little exilic book visited Rome, intertextual traces of Ovid's text remained inscribed within the topography there. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 the poet's description of Roman places similarly recalls the works which he previously wrote about the city. Yet, now, it is Severus who is able to enjoy these places, while Ovid can only recall them through memories and poetry.

**Town and country, Rome and Tomis**

The contrast between Ovid's imagined life in Rome and the less pleasant reality of the wilderness of exile is a theme developed from earlier poetry. *Mempsimoiria*, the discontent with one's own lot in life, can be seen as a key part of the established literary tension between life in town and life in the country; the poet is located in one place when another is desired.[500] The synkrisis of urban and rural life was a well-developed *topos*, in poetry and as a rhetorical progymnasma,[501] by the time Ovid was writing. For the poets, this tension was often raised as a means of discussing the achievement of *otium*. The Italian countryside is frequently depicted as a place of

[499] *Ars Am.* 1.57-9, 2.517-19, 3.150. See also Prop. 1.12.3-4, 1.14.5-6; Hor. *Od*. 3.24.1-4.
[500] Cf. Hor. *Serm*. 2.6, 2.7.28-9, *Epist.* 1.1; Lucr. 3.1060-69; Juv. 3. See Rudd (1966), 20-2; Kenney (2014), 224.
[501] See Braund (1996), 232-3; Cairns (2012), 122-131.

leisure (*otium*) (and, often, of poetic production), in contrast with the politics and business (*negotium*) of the crowded city.[502]

These tensions are manipulated in Ovidian poetry as the Roman city and countryside both become spaces which can provide *otium.* Instead, they are now both set in opposition with the landscapes outside of Italy. Ovid creates a new tension between his past life in Rome and his gardens in the countryside, and his life in war-torn Tomis. The leisured life which Ovid 'experiences' in Rome through memory (*Pont.* 1.8.34-8) is clearly exposed as mere illusion by Ovid's descriptions of his true surroundings in the harsh landscape of Tomis, and of Severus' continued leisurely lifestyle in the city and countryside (1.8.65-8).[503]

A salient parallel worth bearing in mind is Horace's description of his leisurely, urban life in Rome in *Sermones* 1.6, which actually stands in contrast with the reality of city life and *negotium*. The satirist's descriptions of his leisured lifestyle are exposed as not entirely truthful by later satires, just as Ovid's memories of Rome are shown to be an illusion by the later description of Severus' real experiences. Horace describes his quiet, domestic life and his freedom to visit the places in Rome on a day of leisure (*Serm.* 1.6.111-14, 125-6). The satirist spends an entirely solitary day (*Serm.*

---

[502] Ferriss-Hill (2015), 45 considers the tension between town and country as a necessary part of the comedic and satiric genres: 'The poet is (not least because this is where his audience is located) inextricable from his urban surroundings, and his genre as it stands cannot exist outside the *locus* these provide. Nevertheless, he expresses a longing for the restfulness of the countryside, and even a desire to leave the city.' On the contrast between town and country in the poetry of Horace, see Harrison (2007a).

[503] The epistolary genre of Ovid's poem highlights the distance between poet and addressee and the contrast between Severus' Italian location and Ovid's exilic situation. This may also be an adaptation of the town and country motif. Harrison (2007a), 241 argues that the epistolary nature of Horatian poetry, in his *Epistles*, emphasises the contrast between town and country, as Horace writes from the country to his addressee in the city, or vice-versa, about the two different locations.

1.6.112 *incedo solus*) which includes going to the market, the Circus, the forum, home for dinner, to the Campus for a ball game and thence to the baths. Horace contrasts a life of *otium* with a life of *negotium*, politics and social climbing.[504] Styling himself as philosophically detached from social and economic privilege (*Serm*. 1.6.17-18 *quid oportet / nos facere a vulgo longe longeque remotos)*, he stresses that this simple Roman existence in the city and at home is his way of life, as a means of suggesting that he has no political ambition and does not engage in parasitism.

The reality of Horace's *otium*, and his freedom to enjoy the Roman city, is called into question, however, when reading Horace's later satires.[505] In *Sermones* 2.7, the slave Davus reveals that Horace enjoys the simple life only when Maecenas does not invite him to join him, but is given to parasitism when Maecenas shows interest in his company (*Serm.* 2.7.28-35). He exposes Horace's *mempsimoiria*, always wishing to be elsewhere, and his commendation of simple, solitary life only when deprived of company and the opportunity to advance his station. Furthermore, in *Sermones* 2.6, the poet personally affirms that the claims he made in 1.6 are not quite as they seem.[506] He speaks of the frantic life he leads when in the city, to keep up his intimacy

[504] Oliensis (1998), 36. Myers (2005), 104 suggests that the practice of *otium* is safer than the engagement in politics.
[505] There may, furthermore, already be some suggestion of the not entirely truthful nature of Horace's proclamations of solo, apolitical leisure. See Freudenberg (2001), 61-2 who highlights how the verbs which Horace uses to describe his entrance to the forum and inspection of goods at the market are normally used when describing engagement in public life and business.
[506] See Gowers (2012), 214-18 who argues that 'Horace works to deflect accusations of pushiness, self-promotion and parasitism', but notes that behind Horace's apparently carefree daily routine 'lies an invisible alternative, the routine of scurrying parasite or client, lobbying and paying respectful calls in return for his keep.'

with Maecenas and those around him (*Serm.* 2.6.1-74).[507] Accordingly, the reader is left to wonder how true Horace's earlier proclamations of freedom and *otium* really were, and leads readers to wonder how much *otium* relies upon social or political favour. Rereading *Sermones* 1.6, it is clear to see that Horace's 'private' and 'detached' position is enabled entirely by his connections with important people.

Like Horace's simple, solo trips around Rome, Ovid's leisurely visit to the urban settings is illusory, as he also 'visits' home, the forum and the northern end of the Campus Martius. Similar locations are visited in *Sermones* 1.6 and *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8.29-38, including more urban sites of the forum and their houses, places of entertainment (the Circus for Horace, the theatre for Ovid), and ending with spaces associated with leisure, the northern end of the Campus Martius and baths.[508]

Alone and removed from his friends and family by exile (*Pont*. 2.11 *longe toto sumus orbe remoti*),[509] Ovid can mentally recall spaces which provided *otium*. In reality, however, true *otium* and exile (and the insecure social status which comes with it) stand in polarity. Rather than being able to enjoy and engage in leisure activities at Roman sites, Ovid is forced to endure a kind of false *otium* in exile.[510] It is Severus, in Ovid's mind, at least, who enjoys the true *otium* which Ovid desires, although whether this is entirely true is uncertain. One of the implications of the

---

[507] In *Sermones* 2.6, Horace describes playing ball in the Campus Martius with Maecenas as an example of his social favour (*Serm.* 2.6.47-9). One wonders, therefore, whether one of the people Horace was playing ball with, on his day of apparent *otium* (1.6.126), was actually his patron.
[508] See also Mart. 5.20, where the same locations are used as an example of a lifestyle of *otium*.
[509] See also *Tr.* 3.4b.47, 4.2.67.
[510] *Pont*. 1.5.5-8, 43-4, 4.2.39-40. Williams (1994), 71: 'The term *otia* now denotes the time-vacuum which Ovid has to fill in Tomis, as opposed to the programmatic kind of leisure which the poet requires for composition.'

synkrisis in texts, for example, Lucretius 3.1060-69 and the frenzied commuter, is that the grass is always greener on the other side, and when one gets there, one finds a less idealised reality.[511] The life which Ovid imagines for Severus may not entirely be the case (just as is seen in Horace's *Sermones* 2.6). Instead, his perception of life in and around the city may have become altered by his distance from Rome.

Trapped outside of Rome, Ovid can only imagine life in the city and is forced to continually appeal for the clemency and approval of imperial figures,[512] seeking the hospitality of friends (1.8.69-70) or a dwelling place other than Tomis. Rather than Maecenas, who is presented by Horace as the source of social success, in the later, imperial age in which Ovid composes, it is the emperor himself to whom the exiled poet must appeal. Severus, too, is also a friend in high places whom he must seek to persuade and procure help from in order to try and attain *otium*, much as Maecenas is presented as a patron figure whom Horace lobbies as a means of attaining the lifestyle he wishes to maintain.

Maecenas was the cause of Horace's carefree lifestyle in town and in the countryside. Horace's countryside estate in Apulia was taken from him by Octavian and handed over to veterans after Philippi.[513] Maecenas, however, gifted Horace with his Sabine estate (*Serm.* 2.6), and is praised for this in Horace's poetry. A similar situation is set up in the post-triumvirate world by Ovid. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, having had his life in Rome and lands in the countryside taken from him by Augustus,

[511] See also Hor. *Epist*. 1.25-9, *Od.* 2.16.17-20.
[512] See Freudenberg (2001), 81-2 on the post-Actian swing to Caesar as the new focal point in poetry, now the main source of power and subject of poetic praise.
[513] See Freudenberg (2001), 54.

Ovid writes to Severus in his poetry, hoping that he might once again achieve *otium* if offered hospitality at Severus' countryside villa (1.8.69-70).

Both poems indicate that location is central to identity. Horace promotes his identity as a man of learning and cultivated leisure by describing his freedom to enjoy the *rus in urbe* and the places of leisure such as the Campus Martius, as well as the forum and urban monuments. Severus takes on this role in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8. By contrast, deprived of the city, Ovid is left to question how he might identify himself, and what the effect on his poetry will be, now that he is no longer able to enjoy the city or the landscapes which previously influenced his identity and inspired his poetry.

### The Urban and Pastoral: Vergil and Ovid

Ovid uses the landscapes within his epistolary poem as a means of recalling both his and Severus' poetic endeavours. At the same time, he also considers how their location within different landscapes affects the poetry which they write. This is indicated most clearly in the poet's descriptions of inability to recreate the idyllic, horticultural world which he once enjoyed thanks to his gardens outside of Rome.[514] Severus, meanwhile, is free to enjoy the countryside outside Rome, staying at the villa to which Ovid hopes to be invited. *Mempsimoiria* can be identified, as the poet highlights his inability to enjoy the kind of life which Severus is at liberty to live. A

[514] In *Tristia* 1.11 the poet briefly states that he is no longer able to write poetry in his gardens (37 *hortis*), as he once did, but he provides no further detail and does not state where these gardens are located.

contrast can also be seen between the kind of life the poet once cultivated, and the gardens which he tended in Rome, and the barren landscape which he is now forced to inhabit. The poet alters the standard contrast between town and country, as town and country become places which are both desirable and, instead, now stand in opposition with the world of exile. As he uses pastoral poetry as a means of lamenting the loss of his city and a fertile landscape to cultivate, his Roman and urban longing continues. The poet uses material from the pastoral genre, which presents an idealised version of the rural life and landscapes written by urban poets,[515] in his elegiac epistles in order to idealise city life (and *rus in urbe*) *and* the countryside and to lament his loss of both.

The poet's separation from the rural landscapes of Italy as well as from the city of Rome is encoded within the etymology of the very word 'exile' (1.8.7 *deque tot expulsis sum miles in* ***exule*** *solus*). The noun *ex(s)ul* is derived from *ex solo*,[516] indicating the separation from one's homeland or native soil.[517] Cut off from his country estate and divested of ground to nurture and cultivate, he emphasises the urban *and* rural loss caused by exile (1.8.41-62):

non meus amissos animus desiderat agros,
   ruraque Paeligno conspicienda solo,
nec quos piniferis positos in collibus hortos
   spectat Flaminiae Clodia iuncta uiae.
quos ego nesciocui colui, quibus ipse solebam        45

[515] Paul Veyne's analysis of elegy as 'pastoral in city clothes' (Veyne 2002) shows off the fictiveness of both genres. Pastoral itself is, despite its appearances, a very urban genre. It is written in the city for the city. Ovid's use of themes from the pastoral, therefore, help to highlight a continued interest in Rome.

[516] It could be that Ovid is pointing out the etymology of *exul* in line 7 (*deque tot expulsis sum miles in exule solus*) as he places the words *exul* and *solus* next to each other. Though *solus* here means alone, rather than soil, the placement of ***ex****ule* ***sol****us* may remind readers of the etymology of *exul* (*ex solo*).

[517] See Claassen (1999), 151 on the etymology of *exul*.

ad sata fontanas (nec pudet) addere aquas:
sunt ubi, si uiuunt, nostra quoque consita quaedam,
sed non et nostra poma legenda manu.
pro quibus amissis utinam contingere possit
hic saltem profugo glaeba colenda mihi. 50
ipse ego pendentis, liceat modo, rupe capellas,
ipse uelim baculo pascere nixus oues;
ipse ego, ne solitis insistant pectora curis,
ducam ruricolas sub iuga curua boues,
et discam Getici quae norunt uerba iuuenci, 55
adsuetas illis adiciamque minas.
ipse manu capulum pressi moderatus aratri
experiar mota spargere semen humo.
nec dubitem longis purgare ligonibus herbas,
et dare iam sitiens quas bibat hortus aquas. 60
unde sed hoc nobis, minimum quos inter et hostem
discrimen murus clausaque porta facit?

My heart does not desire the fields I lost, the remarkable country estate on Paelignian soil, nor the gardens placed on the pine-covered hills which the Flaminian and Clodian roads survey. I don't know for whom I cultivated them; in those gardens I myself – I feel no shame! – was accustomed to give the plants spring water; there are somewhere, if they still live, trees which I myself planted, although their fruit is not to be picked by my hand. For these losses, would that I could obtain, even here in exile, a plot of earth to till. I would myself, if only it were permitted, pasture the goats as they teeter on the rocks, and taking my crook I would feed the sheep. I would myself, so my heart would not dwell on its usual cares, lead the oxen under the curving yoke. I would learn the words which Getic bullocks know and fling the usual threats at them. After guiding the handle of the down-pressed plough by hand, I would try to scatter the seeds in the furrowed ground. I would not hesitate to clear away the weeds with a long hoe, and to provide water for the thirsty garden to drink. But whence shall I have this, when I have only the distance of a wall and a closed gate between me and the enemy?

The language used to describe the loss of gardens and estate further emphasises Ovid's exilic status, and the etymological roots of the term *exul*. At lines 41-2 Ovid describes his separation from his gardens using the term *solum* (*non meus amissos*

*animus desiderat agros, / ruraque Paeligno conspicienda* ***solo).***[518] The poet's description of his desperate inability, as an exile, to cultivate clods of earth (50 *hic saltem profugo* ***glaeba*** *colenda mihi*) also seems to emphasise the relationship between exile and (one's home) soil. At the same time, the poet also uses words beginning with *sol-,* creating pseudo-etymological links (45 *quos ego nesciocui colui, quibus ipse* ***solebam;*** 53 *ne* ***solitis*** *insistant pectora curis****),*** as exile takes Ovid away from his accustomed lifestyle, the tilling and cultivation of the soil.

Unable to access the city or the countryside surrounding it, Ovid dreams of creating a pastoral idyll, much like that imagined by Tibullus and other earlier poets, within the landscape of his exile. Yet, he laments that the lack of peace makes this impossible. This inability to cultivate such a landscape recalls and adapts the traditional motif in elegy of the elegist's idealised pastoral dream-world as a contrast to the reality of elegiac suffering and unrequited love.[519] While elegists are usually unable to create the kind of pastoral idyll they imagine due to unrequited love, here Ovid is unable to exist in such a landscape because of real warfare and the location in which he is situated. This is not the first time in Ovid's epistle that the poet highlights the negative effects of living in Tomis. At the opening of the poem, Ovid

[518] In a later epistle, the poet describes his desire to have his place of exile moved by describing his wish for a change of 'soil' (*Pont.* 2.2.66-7 *detque solum miserae mite, precare, fugae*). The poet seeks a less harsh landscape for his exile - one which is more cultivable (*solum…mite*). Once again, the semantic link between exile and the agricultural landscape is highlighted.

[519] In Tibullan elegy, the poet wishes to play the rustic *miles amoris* on the farm with Delia (Tib. 1.1.1-52, 1.3.36-48, 1.5.21-34) rather than suffering from romantic separation and being caught up in warfare. See also Prop. 2.19 and the poet's hopes for Cynthia's fidelity in love as he imagines them both in the countryside, in contrast to the reality of their separation.

apologises to Severus for the state of his work, as his exilic status means that he is trapped within a warzone (*Pont.* 1.8.9-10):

> quoque magis nostros uenia dignere libellos,
> haec in procinctu carmina facta leges.
>
> And that you might grant my writings greater pardon, these poems which you read were composed on the battlefield.

Ovid's exilic location is the simultaneous cause of his apparent poetic decline and his inability to recreate the kind of rural landscape the poet once enjoyed,[520] thus connecting landscapes with poetic inspiration.

Williams has already argued, regarding this poem, that the landscapes of Italy are inspirational stimuli for the poet's work. He suggests that the descriptions of the harsh Tomitan landscape, and Ovid's inability to cultivate this land, highlights a deprivation of surroundings which are traditionally presented as a *locus* for poetic inspiration and composition.[521] Yet, Ovid does not simply emphasise that the landscape deprives him of poetic inspiration. In this poem, he also addresses the contrast between his own fruitlessness in exile and the possible inspiration granted to other poets, such as Severus, who have the freedom to remain in Rome and the Italian countryside. This acts as a means of persuasion when seeking a home elsewhere and mitigation from his exile in Tomis, a proposition with which 1.8 concludes.

[520] I do not wish to suggest that Ovid's poetry has truly declined, but to discuss how space is presented by the poet as a means of inspiration or the cause of poetic decline. On Ovid's claims of poetic decline, see Nagle (1980), 109-166 and Williams (1994), 50-99, who illustrates how the poet uses the motifs of poetic decline as a means of exercising his poetic skills.
[521] Williams (1994), 27.

Ovid establishes a relationship between the landscapes and poetic inspiration in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 (along with 4.2, the second letter to Severus) which can be compared with that found in triumviral poetry, such as Vergil's *Eclogues* 1, which also explores the connection between town and country, and Italy and lands outside of the Empire. The poet repeatedly refers to and adapts Vergilian material from both the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* throughout his exilic work.[522] Similarities to *Eclogues* 1 have, moreover, been identified within *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, as critics have seen Ovid as a kind of real-life Meliboeus in this and other poems.[523]

In Vergil's *Eclogues* 1, the rustic singer Meliboeus finds himself the victim of land repossession, as he is evicted from his pastoral lands by a barbarian soldier and faces going into exile in a harsh land such as Scythia. By contrast, the other singer in the poem, Tityrus, has had his land returned to him and is able to enjoy a lifestyle of pastoral *otium* and song due to the decree of a young 'god' in the city of Rome.[524] Vergil's poem features two contrasting figures, one of whom (Tityrus) remains at home while the other (Meliboeus) leaves.

The comparisons which have been made between *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 and *Eclogues* 1 have generally been made due to the shared language which both poems

---

[522] See Williams (1994) who discusses the evocation of *Georgics* 3 in Ovid's descriptions of Tomis. On *Tristia* 1.3 and its similarities to the *Aeneid*, see Huskey (2002). On Ovid and Vergilian exilic motifs, see also Putnam (2007) and (2010).

[523] See Williams (1994), 32; Gaertner (2005), 453; Putnam (2010), 80-92. As well as being likened to Meliboeus, Ovid can be seen as a kind of failed Tityrus: Williams (1994), 32n63: 'Ovid may possibly have in mind that Tityrus in *Eclogues* 1 was successful in his plea to Octavian for some measure of restitution of his loss of land. *Pont.* 1.8 will end with Ovid's moderate plea for a *terra proprior*.'

[524] Tityrus offers a pastoral focalisation of Rome at *Ecl*. 1.19-25.

contain. In *Eclogues* 1, Meliboeus laments the loss of his flock, a consequence of exile (*Ecl.* 1.75-8):

> non ego uos posthac uiridi proiectus in antro
> dumosa pendere procul de rupe uidebo;
> carmina nulla canam; non me pascente, capellae,
> florentem cytisum et salices carpetis amaras.
>
> Henceforth, I'll not watch you from far off, hanging from a bushy rock, as I stretch out in a grassy cave. I will sing no more songs. You will crop the blooming clover and the bitter willows, goats, without me pasturing you.

Ovid, meanwhile, describes the agricultural tasks he would undertake in Tomis, if only he were able, in a very similar way to the *Eclogues* (*Pont*. 1.8.51-2):

> ipse ego **pendentis,** liceat modo**, rupe capellas,**
> ipse uelim baculo **pascere** nixus oues
>
> I, if only I might, would wish to pasture the goats myself as they hung from rocks. I would wish to pasture the sheep myself, leaning on my staff.

Not only do the two passages use the same vocabulary, they also have a similarly repetitive nature as the two speakers stress the personal role undertaken in the farming process (*Ecl.* 1.75, 77 *non ego…non me*, *Pont*. 1.8.51-2 *ipse ego…ipse*). The shared language used to describe features of the rustic lifestyle has lead readers to comment on the likeness between the protagonists of this poem.[525] Like Meliboeus in the *Eclogues,* who laments that his land and crops will be taken by a barbarian soldier (*Ecl.* 1.1-5, 70-8), Ovid is deprived of his Roman home and gardens. The lands he once cultivated outside of Rome and the fruit of his labours there are now enjoyed by a stranger (*Pont.* 1.8.41-48), while Ovid himself must become a soldier in barbarian lands. Added to this, Meliboeus suggests that the repossession of farmland will cause

[525] Williams (1994), 32; Gaertner (2005), 453.

relocation to the outer limits of empire, including Scythia (*Ecl*. 1.65), the land which Ovid names as his own place of exile (*Tr.* 1.3.61 *Scythia est, quo mittimur*).[526]

Ovid presents himself experiencing the same things in real life which the fictional Meliboeus experiences in the poetry of the *Eclogues*. This act itself may look back to Vergil and the ancient biographical tradition, which likened Vergil's poetic persona to Tityrus in *Eclogues* 1, as a rustic poet who regained his lands after confiscation.[527] Yet, it should be pointed out that the exilic poet's use of this material from the triumviral era illustrates the passage of time and changes in the Roman world: the emperor who once gave land to poets in the 40s now takes it away.

Further thematic parallels between *Eclogues* 1 and *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 can be identified which have not yet been explored. Both poems feature two figures with differing fates. Both poems highlight the contrast between the Italian countryside and exile. Both texts are fundamentally interested in poetic composition. Both discuss the composition of poetry in a particular location – either in exile, or indeed

[526] Williams (1994), 8 argues that 'Ovid stretches geographical fact for a purpose which is determined by the traditional depiction of Scythia in Roman literature'. Such a depiction can be found in Vergilian poetry. While Williams' study of how Ovid negotiates the depiction of Scythia in Vergil focusses mainly on *Georgics* 3, it is also possible to see Ovid's current circumstances as a reconfiguration of Meliboeus' Scythian exile.

[527] Servius *ad Ecl*. 1.1 sees Tityrus at the opening of *Eclogues* 1 as Vergil. Petrarch widens this comparison to encompass Tityrus in the whole of *Eclogues* 1, while Meliboeus is also identified as a Mantuan poet (see Lord 1982). See also Suet. *Vit. Verg.* which states that the *Eclogues* were written as a celebration of the men who saved him from ruin at the time of land reassignment. Modern scholars also explore these ideas. Coleman (1977), 93-7 argues that Tityrus should not be seen as an allegory for Vergil, but concedes that the events which the poet describes were clearly the land confiscations of the 40s, experienced by many. See Winterbottom (1976), 55-6 on how *Eclogues* 1 is a Vergilian means of expressing his distress at the land confiscations. Unlike Coleman, he argues that Vergil can be likened to Tityrus: 'In a way Tityrus is Virgil, for Tityrus is personally unscathed by the power politics of the day. He has enough, and he can court the woodland muse (*Ecl.* 1.2) just as Virgil is doing in the very act of composing the *Eclogue*. For Tityrus, as for Virgil, all is well. Misfortune is reserved for others.'

in Rome. Finally, both poems finish with an offer of hospitality from one character to the other.

Like *Eclogues* 1, *Epistulae* ex *Ponto* 1.8 features two contrasting figures. One (Ovid) experiences displacement and dispossession through exile. The other (Severus) has the freedom to remain in the landscape from which the former is evicted. Putnam has compared the situation of Meliboeus and Tityrus to that of Ovid and his exiled *libellus* who, unlike its author, is able to access the city and appeal to Augustus (*Tr.* 1.1, 3.1).[528] At the same time, one could easily compare the dynamic between Ovid and Severus to that of Meliboeus and Tityrus.

While Ovid suffers the cruelties of exile, Severus is apparently able to enjoy a lifestyle of leisure in Rome and the countryside. He freely travels between the two (1.8.65-8), experiencing the kind of *otium* which the divine Augustus grants to all except Ovid (*Tr.* 2.235). Severus' freedom to roam from city to countryside exhibits none of the traditional polarity of town and countryside.[529] Instead, the polarity is shifted to Italy and the exilic landscape. Town and country are both now seen as pleasant places of leisure which Severus can enjoy and Ovid can no longer. Severus' lifestyle is, in short, much like that of Tityrus, who, journeying from country to city and back, does not suffer the same harsh realities as his companion Meliboeus. *He* is granted peace and private *otium* in the countryside after visiting a 'god' in the city

[528] Putnam (2010), 95 n22. See also Cutolo (1991), 281-2 who sees a contrast between Augustus and Ovid which can be compared to that between Tityrus and Meliboeus.

[529] See, for example, Hor. *Serm*. 2.6; Juv. 3. At least, this is the case in Ovid's mind. As mentioned above, the reality of Severus' speedy trips from town to countryside might in fact be more like the frenzied Lucretian commuter.

(*Ecl.* 1.6-10, 19-25). It is this young 'god', whom some have likened to Augustus,[530] who instructs Tityrus to continue to engage in his pastoral pursuits (1.44-5).

McGowan suggests that Ovid's search for a '*praesens deus*' who will provide him safety and relief from exile is similar to Tityrus' discovery of a young god who has provided him with security by granting him land.[531] There are certain discrepancies in this comparison, however. While Tityrus is successful in his trip to the city and appeasement of the god, the exiled poet is able to do neither (as was shown by *Tristia* 3.1). I would suggest, rather, that Ovid is at most a failed Tityrus figure. Severus, however, succeeds where Ovid cannot and stands as an alternative to Ovid, just as Tityrus does to Meliboeus.

In both poems, Rome is imagined from an exterior focalisation, although an apparently naïve one in *Eclogues* 1 (19-25). It is their ability to travel to this city that allows Tityrus and Severus a lifestyle of *otium*. It is Ovid's inability to access the city which means that he lacks *otium*; like Meliboeus, he receives no help from Rome which might allow him to maintain his pastoral livelihood. The characters in the respective poems are very much aware of the contrasts between them: Ovid imagines Severus' happy lifestyle in the places he himself can only access through memory (*Pont*. 1.8.65-8), an act which can be compared to Meliboeus' imagination of Tityrus' freedom to enjoy all the things he cannot (*Ecl.* 1.46-58).[532]

---

[530] On Octavian as the young god in *Eclogues* 1, see Winterbottom (1976), 56; McGowan (2009), 85; Weeda (2015), 59-60; Eckerman (2016), 260. On Augustus as a god in exilic poetry, see McGowan (2009), 65-92.
[531] McGowan (2009), 85. See also Williams (1994), 32n63.
[532] See Putnam (1975), 82 on 'Meliboeus' contemplation of the ideal while suffering the real'.

Both *Eclogues* 1 and *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 also explore the relationship between exile and poetry. Without his rural life, Meliboeus lacks the desire to sing (*Ecl.* 1.77 *carmina nulla canam*), suggesting that it is the pastoral landscape which inspires the shepherd.[533] This inspiration is lost when his lands are acquired by another. Tityrus, by contrast, will continue to sing, as he continues to enjoy a life of pastoral leisure. Meliboeus describes how the woods will echo his song (*Ecl.* 1.4-5):

> nos patriam fugimus: tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra
> formosam resonare doces Amaryllida siluas.
>
> I am a fugitive from my own country. You, Tityrus, at leisure in the shade
> teach the woods how to echo the name of shapely Amaryllis.

In *Eclogues* 1, the loss of Meliboeus' rural home leads to the discontinuation of his pastoral song. When reading *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, one can identify the poem as part of a tradition that connects space and poetry, and which explores how the loss of a particular landscape or setting can have an effect on poetic composition or the continuation of a poetic genre. Ovid's departure from the city raises questions about the necessity of a Roman location for the continuation of the urban genre of elegy.

Ovid also suggests that the exilic world is not a landscape which is conducive to the composition of poetry. He prefaces his poem to Severus with an apology for the quality of his poetry, which was written in the midst of war (1.8.9-10). Like Meliboeus, who suggests that he will no longer sing when deprived of the landscape

[533] Segal (1965), 258 argues that *Eclogue* 1 addresses 'the problem of the writing of poetry, indeed the creation of anything beautiful, in an atmosphere of disruption and disorder'.

which he loved,[534] Ovid sets up a contrast between the poetry which he composed in Rome and the poetry which he is composing in his own personal Scythia.

In *Tristia* 1.11, the poet laments that his poetry has declined due to the location of its composition. His previous poetry was written on the couch in his home or in his gardens, locations of which he is now deprived (*Tr.* 1.11.35-39):

> quo magis his debes ignoscere, candide lector,
> si spe sint, ut sunt, inferiora tua.
> non haec in nostris, ut quondam, scribimus hortis,
> nec, consuete, meum, lectule, corpus habes.
>
> You should forgive me more, dear reader, if these verses be – as they are – poorer than you hoped. I am not writing them in my gardens, as I once did, nor while you hold my body, my familiar couch.

With this in mind, in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, when Ovid describes the landscape he has left behind, where others enjoy the fruits of his labours (*Pont.* 1.8.45-8), it is tempting to speculate that Ovid is not only describing the repossession of his land, but also the poetic space which inspired him. The poet describes the trees which he once cared for and the fruit he grew being harvested by a stranger (65-6 *sunt ubi, si uiuunt, nostra quoque consita quaedam, / sed non et nostra poma legenda manu*), much like the barbarian soldier who enjoys Meliboeus' estate in *Eclogues* 1.

Similar agricultural imagery is used as a metaphor for poetic inspiration in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.2, as the poet writes again to Severus, this time bemoaning his lack of inspiration. Severus is presented as a poet who cultivates a rich crop in

[534] See also *Ecl.* 9.51-3, and the case of Moeris who, driven from his lands, claims that he has forgotten how to sing. See Hardy (1990) 31-35 on how Moeris' move from the country to the town is the cause of the 'death of pastoral'. One should note, however, that Moeris anticipates the return of his song with the return of Menalcas (67). By comparison, Ovid's poetry suggests that a move from Tomis and return to a gentler climate and more peaceful place will allow the return of his song.

Helicon. Ovid uses the imagery of adding leaves to the trees or sending apples to Alcinous as examples of the futility of sending his 'declining' poetry to a man of such great inspiration (*Pont.* 4.2.9-13):

> quis mel Aristaeo, quis Baccho uina Falerna,
> Triptolemo fruges, poma det Alcinoo? 10
> fertile pectus habes, interque Helicona colentes
> uberius nulli prouenit ista seges.
> mittere ad hunc carmen, frondes erat addere siluis.
>
> Who would give honey to Aristaeus, Falernian wine to Bacchus, grain to Triptolemus or apples to Alcinous? You have a fertile heart: among those who cultivate Helicon, none produces a more fruitful crop. To send poetry to this man is to add leaves to the woods.

Trees, apples and fertile crops are all used as imagery to reflect Severus' fruitful poetic inspiration and production.[535] If we read the imagery used in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 similarly, as a reflection of poetic inspiration, it appears that Ovid presents himself as a poet who once cultivated and enjoyed a rich and fertile landscape conducive to poetic composition, in contrast to his present situation which lacks possibility for cultivation or inspiration. One could argue that the poet's depiction of others harvesting his crops back home, while he fails to create a rustic idyll in his new surroundings, could reflect his poetic circumstances. Others in Rome, like Severus himself, are free to enjoy the poetic landscape of which Ovid once made use, while the poet himself presents Tomis as an inspirational wasteland (though this is surely a tongue-in-cheek self-presentation, given the collection in hand!).

[535] Helicon, too, was a famously fruitful landscape. See Paus. 9.28.1.

Ovid states that his apples in Rome are ripe to be plucked by others (*Pont.* 1.8.66 *non et nostra* ***poma legenda*** *manu*). In the *Tristia,* he laments that Tomis is not a landscape which is conducive to growing such fruit (*Tr.* 3.10.73-4):

> **poma** negat regio, nec haberet Acontius in quo
> scriberet hic dominae uerba **legenda** suae.

> That region does not yield fruit, and Acontius would not have had anything on which to write the words to be read by his sweetheart.

Here, fruit is imagined as a poetic medium with which to deliver words of love from Acontius to Cydippe: Ovid suggests that this written communication, which is detailed within *Heroides* 19 and 20,[536] could not have taken place if the mythological hero lived in Tomis. The term which Ovid uses for picking fruit (*poma legenda*) in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 is the same which Ovid uses for reading in *Tristia* 3.10,[537] once again aligning literature and agricultural cultivation. Accordingly, when reading *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, the fruit which Ovid describes other people harvesting could stand as a metaphor for poetic composition: the material which might once have been read within his poems is now free for others to use.[538]

Like *Eclogues* 1, Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 appears to reflect on space as a stimulus for poetic inspiration. Both include exilic characters who, losing the landscapes of their past, turn away from poetry. Both feature characters who are able to freely continue poetic composition. Both poems also conclude in a similar manner.

---

[536] One wonders if these *Heroides* would have ever been written if Acontius had lived in such a place! Once again we are reminded of Tomis' possible negative effects on Ovid's poetic composition.
[537] OLD *s.v.* '*lego*': 1a 'to gather (by picking up, plucking etc.)'; 8 'to read'.
[538] See *Pont.* 3.4.51-64, where the poet uses the metaphors of fresh and brackish water and the untouched and the rifled rose garden to illustrate his lack of novelty compared to poets who hear of and compose poetry about events in Rome first.

Ovid finishes his epistle by imagining Severus inviting him to his villa in the Alban Mountains. Or, if this is not to be, he hopes for a reprieve from Tomis and a life in a milder and more peaceful location (*Pont.* 1.8.69-74):

> forsitan hic optes, ut iustam supprimat iram
> Caesar, et hospitium sit tua uilla meum.
> a, nimium est, quod, amice, petis: moderatius opta,
> et uoti quaeso contrahe uela tui.
> terra uelim propior nullique obnoxia bello
> detur: erit nostris pars bona dempta malis.

> Here, perhaps, you may wish that Caesar will suppress his just anger, and that your villa will welcome me. Ah! What you seek is too much, my friend. Wish more moderately, and – I beseech you – stow the sails of your prayer. I wish for a land nearer to home, which is not subjected to war. Then a good part of my sorrows will be removed.

The poem ends in much the same way that *Eclogues* 1 does. Immediately after Meliboeus has said goodbye to his fruits and crops, and finished with poetry, his companion Tityrus responds by asking him to stay a night with him, in a location which overlooks the shadows of the mountains and the smoke from the villas (1.79-83). He states that crops and fruits are in abundance and describes a shady *locus amoenus* which appears conducive to further song. This offer of hospitality introduces a new landscape, and a temporary moment of reprieve from exile. It is a fruitful location which contains both pastoral and more urban features: the shadows of the mountains and smoke from the villas (82-3). These villas, which are very different to Meliboeus' humble cottage (67), are a reminder of the urban presence which brought about Tityrus' safety and fortune. Titryus' hospitality within this *locus amoenus* landscape suggests that Meliboeus may temporarily continue and experience the poetry with which exile threatened to prevent him from engaging. In

effect, Tityrus becomes a patron figure for Meliboeus, but he is blind to his friend's suffering.

Ovid also broaches the topic of hospitality, as he imagines Severus' wish to invite him to his villa or the possibility of going somewhere other than Tomis. Ovid's situation is, in fact, the particular reversal of that in *Eclogues* 1. Ovid imagines being invited by Severus.[539] He does not have a concrete invitation from Severus, as Meliboeus has from Tityrus, making his position even more precarious. Furthermore, reading the ending of Ovid's epistle with an awareness of the conclusion of *Eclogues* 1 may lead to uncertainty as to whether Severus, as a Tityrus figure, is truly aware of the hardships of exile and whether Ovid's attempts to be nearer to Rome will have any success.

While Ovid has used his current location as a means of emphasising his waning inspiration, his suggestion that he might be invited to Severus' villa (or simply just to go to somewhere more peaceful than Tomis), depicts an environment which is not Rome, but which is still a space of *otium* and poetic convivium.[540] After beginning the poem with an apology to Severus for the quality of the poetry composed in a war-torn landscape, the poet ends with the hope of staying in a landscape which is more

[539] This poem may have influenced Juvenal 3, a poem is narrated by Umbricius who, tired of the city of Rome, goes into self-imposed exile at Cumae. He ends with the suggestion that Juvenal, who remains in Rome, may invite him to his countryside villa from time to time (3.318-22). Geue (2015) has written about the influence of *Eclogues* 1, but in this aspect, the poem is similar to Ovid's elegiac epistle, as it is the narrator, rather than the addressee who invites himself to a villa of a friend.

[540] The poetic community and poetic collaboration that existed in Rome are discussed in exile poetry (*Tr.* 4.10.41-58; *Pont*. 2.4.13-20, 2.10 3.4.67-8, 4.12.23-8). By contrast, Tomis is a space in which the poet has no means of poetic *communia*. The poet complains to Severus in *Pont.* 4.2 about the declining state of his poetry, attributing this to the fact he has no one in Tomis to read or listen to his works (27-38). The image of him visiting Severus' villa, therefore, evokes an environment where he could engage in poetry with others, like the later descriptions in Statius of poetic composition at villas (*Silv.* 1.3.100-110, 3.1.61-67).

conducive to the composition of the style and quality of poetry he produced before exile, suggesting his poetic talents can quickly be restored, if only he is granted a reprieve from Tomis.

**Conclusion**

Ovid uses his exilic corpus to explores his relationship with the city which he has now left, and the effect this separation has on his poetry. While Ovid is physically removed from the city, Rome still stands as the primary location where his poetry will be received and read and one of the main sources of his inspiration.

There is a change of focus when the poet describes Rome in the *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8. While Ovid still expresses his mournful separation from Rome and desperately tries to access the city by means of appeals to his (now named) addressee and through his own imagination, Rome also becomes the realm of others. As the poet imagines the continuing lives of others within the city, Rome both stands as a reminder of Ovid's own elegiac works, and is altered to become a 'Severan city' with reference to the works of the epic poet. The poet uses the monuments of Rome as a means of alluding to Severus' work in an attempt to impress and persuade.

Ovid claims that his poetic works are declining, that his inspiration is lost now he is separated from Rome and that others are able to enjoy the poetic landscape which he once cultivated. Yet, at the same time, his poems about his separation from Rome highlight his continued poetic skill. The poet takes the works of earlier poets

which were written in Rome, both about life in the city and in exile, and adapts this poetry in new and innovative ways to suit his exilic circumstances.[541]

As Ovid describes the civil strife and warfare that interrupts his pastoral life, he refers to poetry which was written about the tensions and uncertainties in the triumviral era preceding imperial rule. Ovid presents his own circumstances as similar to those to which the Augustan age put an end, as a means of persuasion that he too should be granted mitigation from conflict. Yet, in doing so, he actually highlights that Rome is not so necessary for his poetic skill as he might claim. Indeed, at the end of *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, he does admit that he could successfully exist in another landscape other than Rome, if it had the qualities which led to the creation of his earlier poetry: peace and *otium.* In truth, Ovid is able to write poetry about Rome from anywhere in the Empire.

---

[541] Geue (2015), 779 argues that that even when one has left Rome, one still remains the same Roman person. Indeed, even though Ovid claims that he has lost his inspiration in Tomis, he still remains the same, skilled poet as he adapts and develops earlier themes of poetry.

# CODA

## Ovid, the house of *Fama* and Rome.

We have seen, throughout his poetic corpus, Ovid's intense fascination with Roman *monumenta*, both architectural and textual. Ovid repeatedly returns to Rome and its monuments in his work as a deliberate means of considering the nature of his poetry and its relationship to other forms of commemoration and memorialisation. As he 'writes up' and constructs a version of Rome within his text, his texts are monumentalised, becoming lasting memorials of the city. At the same time, Rome becomes a space which echoes with traces of his literature. In the poetry of Ovid, architecture and text are closely imbricated.

A final *monumentum* to be discussed in this analysis can be seen as an extended expression of the ideas which Ovid explores elsewhere in his texts, that is, the relationship between textual and architectural *monumenta*. The house of *Fama* in *Metamorphoses* 12 is a mythological, architectural and textual structure like, yet also radically unlike, any other encountered so far. On one level, this building can be viewed as a Roman architectural structure which bears similarities to other monumental locations in the Augustan city, placing Rome at the heart of Ovid's programmatic discussion of his poetry, even in the pre-Roman era of the *Metamorphoses* narrative. At the same time, it can be seen as an allegorical expression of the evolving Greco-Roman poetic tradition which is, so to speak, housed in Ovid's monumental poem.

The poet vividly describes the dwelling place of *Fama* - 'gossip', 'fame' or 'tradition' in personified form - in *Metamorphoses* 12.[542] The house sits at the centre of the cosmos between sea, earth and sky (12.39-40). Placed on the cusp of Ovid's epic history of the fall of Troy and rise of Rome, the house is described in an extended ekphrasis sandwiched between narration of the sacrifice of Iphigenia (12.24-38) and the Greeks' arrival at Troy, which is itself announced by *Fama* (12.64-66). In this ekphrasis, Ovid describes the extraordinary structure which absorbs information through its thousands of open doors. The cavernous rooms are filled with incorporeal crowds and bizarre personifications, which echo and transmit the narratives sourced by *Fama* as they move through the house, as if playing a game of Chinese Whispers.

In the wake of a number of studies on Ovidian *Fama*, not least Hardie's seminal study on *fama* in Latin literature,[543] this final discussion of Ovid's creation of monuments will consider the possible reading of the house of *Fama* as a poetic and architectural space. It will analyse how Ovid sets up an intermedial connection between his work and the city of Rome, informed by the house of *Fama*, as a Roman monument which sheds light on poetic composition. I will first explore the poetological reading of the house of *Fama*, which has most frequently been discussed within scholarship. This will be followed by a discussion of the house of *Fama's* Roman qualities, and comparison with actual buildings. Finally, I will consider how Rome takes on the role of the house of *Fama* in other Ovidian texts, as the city is the main source of literary fame and dissemination of texts, while it also becomes, for

---

[542] See Maltby s.v. '*fama*' on the etymology of the noun. See also Hardie (2012), 1-11 for a comprehensive discussion of the definition of *fama* and the concepts associated with it.
[543] Hardie (2008, 2012).

the exiled poet, a kind of mythological and imaginary space which, nonetheless, is filled with his real texts.

**The house of *Fama* as a poetic space**

*Fama* and the house over which she presides appear to possess more allegorical importance than direct influence on the Trojan War narrative.[544] The seeming lack of congruity with the surrounding narrative leads us to expect that the ekphrasis has a more wholesale programmatic function for the whole of the poem beyond its *sedes* in Book 12 – this is especially so given the propensity of neoteric ekphraseis to have profound implications for readers.[545] The description of *Fama*'s home acts as a discussion of the poetic methodologies both within the *Metamorphoses* and the poetic tradition as a whole (*Met*. 12.39-63):

> Orbe locus medio est inter terrasque fretumque
> caelestesque plagas, triplicis confinia mundi; 40
> unde quod est usquam, quamvis regionibus absit,
> inspicitur, penetratque cavas vox omnis ad aures:
> Fama tenet summaque domum sibi legit in arce,
> innumerosque aditus ac mille foramina tectis
> addidit et nullis inclusit limina portis; 45
> nocte dieque patet; tota est ex aere sonanti
> tota fremit vocesque refert iteratque quod audit;
> nulla quies intus nullaque silentia parte,
> nec tamen est clamor, sed parvae murmura vocis,
> qualia de pelagi, siquis procul audiat, undis 50
> esse solent, qualemve sonum, cum Iuppiter atras

[544] Due (1974), 148: 'In Ovid, there is an obvious incongruity between the amplitude of the ekphrasis […] and the trivial part that *Fama* plays in the text.' Hardie (2012), 152 comments that, compared to Vergil's *Fama*, 'the effects of Ovid's *Fama* are very pale indeed. All she does is ensure the Greek arrival at Troy is not unexpected'.

[545] Ovid fills his epic with ekphraseis. Elsner (2002), 4 on the function of ekphrasis in Hellenistic and Roman epic: 'the descriptive inset […] becomes not only a virtually necessary trope to prove a text's participation in the great tradition, but also an increasingly complex device of authorial self-reflection.'

increpuit nubes, extrema tonitrua reddunt.
atria turba tenet: veniunt, leve vulgus, euntque
mixtaque cum veris passim commenta vagantur
milia rumorum confusaque verba volutant; 55
e quibus hi vacuas inplent sermonibus aures,
hi narrata ferunt alio, mensuraque ficti
crescit, et auditis aliquid novus adicit auctor.
illic Credulitas, illic temerarius Error
vanaque Laetitia est consternatique Timores 60
Seditioque repens dubioque auctore Susurri:
ipsa, quid in caelo rerum pelagoque geratur
et tellure, videt totumque inquirit in orbem.

There is a place at the centre of the world, between land and sea and the heavenly regions, the borders of the tri-formed universe. From here, although far from places, everything everywhere is seen, and every voice penetrates the hollow ears. *Fama* occupies the house: she has chosen a dwelling on the topmost summit. She has added innumerable entrances and thousands of doorways to the house and shut off no threshold with a door. Day and night, it lies open. The whole place is made out of echoing bronze. The whole place roars and repeats voices and iterates what it hears. There is no quiet within, silence in no part. Yet there is no clamour, but only the murmur of a small voice, like waves of the sea when heard from far off. Or the last rumblings of thunder when Jupiter rattles the black clouds. Crowds occupy the atria. They come and go, a fickle mob. A thousand rumours wander everywhere, lies mixed with truths, and confused words tumble around. Some of these fill empty ears with talk, some carry tales to other places. The measure of the fiction grows and each new author adds something to what has been heard. Here is Credulity, here rash Error, vane Happiness and terrified Fears, hasty Sedition and Whisperings of an unknown author. *Fama* herself sees everything which is done on land, sea and in heaven and she searches the world for gossip.

For the first time in ancient literature, *Fama* is granted her own specially designed abode.[546] There are those who have argued that *Fama*'s house may be a space

[546] Clément-Tarantino (2016), 67 notes that a similar building is seen in Euripides' *Helen*, occupied by the all-knowing Theonoe, whose voice (φήμη) inhabits the nooks and crannies of the house (Eur. *Hel*. 815-23). Ovid's text, however, is the first place in which a dwelling is specifically created for, and inhabited by, this Roman personification.

created for Vergil’s monster,[547] yet this dwelling does not simply stand as a house for the Vergilian *monstrum horrendum*, but also takes on its corporeal qualities. *Fama*’s house is furnished with multiple doors and entranceways (*Met.* 12.43-5), standing open night and day (12.46), as an architectural equivalent to the wide eyes and ears of Vergil’s sleepless fury (*Aen.* 4.182-85). The Vergilian *Fama* is metamorphosed as Ovid receives and alters Vergil’s epic material, with the architectural structure standing as a ‘surrogate body’ for *Fama* and becoming an innovative, mythological dwelling.[548] The alteration of Vergilian material and the reception of *Fama* in this way fits with the *Metamorphoses’* main topic: the transformation of living beings into lasting landscape features.[549]

The house of *Fama* is indicative of Ovid’s constant preoccupation with monumental space throughout his corpus, while receiving and adapting epic material from Vergilian poetry. The monuments and landscapes which Ovid describes in his corpus frequently demonstrate poetic reception and alteration of other authors’ works. When reading about the *Aedes Hercules Musarum* in the *Fasti*, the influence and transformation of Ennian and Callimachean material can be seen. The book’s visits to the Palatine temples in *Tristia* 3.1 recall textual memories of, *inter alia*, the

[547] Braun (1991), 117 believes that the House of *Fama* is simply a residence built for Vergil’s *Fama*: ‘Da ihre Funktion die Aufnahme und Weitergabe von Nachrichten ist, braucht sie einen Wohn - und Amtssitz in zentraler Lage’. See also Due (1974), 148; Croisille (1985), 63; Dippel (1988), 27.

[548] Kelly (2014), 83.

[549] Metamorphoses of living beings into the lasting materials of wood and stone include Daphne (*Met*. 1.548-52), the sisters of Phaethon (2.346-66), Aglauros (2.819-32), Niobe (6.303-12), Philemon and Baucis (8.713-24), Attis (10.104-5), Cyparissus (10.136-140) and Myrrha (10.489-502). See Gowers (2005), 353-9 on the narrative of urbanisation in the *Metamorphoses*. She argues that the transformation of Philemon and Baucis into trees is, ultimately, a metamorphosis into material used for building structures, highlighting Ovid’s use of Vitruvian material about architecture’s similarities to trees.

tour of Aeneas and Evander around the future site of Rome. As Ovid and Severus visit the Campus Martius in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, the poet borrows and alters his own earlier work and descriptions of the same location in the *Ars Amatoria*. The house of *Fama,* too, is a space in which the reception of earlier poetry can be seen. This architectural structure goes further, however, and allegorises the very process of reception and alteration undertaken in other texts, as the poet's description of sound production both recalls the crowded poetic tradition of the past and advertises the possible novelty of poetic composition.

There are those who have argued that the polyphonic noise within the house of *Fama* recalls and sheds light on Ovid's narrative methods, with the many different voices heard inside the building (*Met.* 12.47-55) compared to the multiple narrators of the *Metamorphoses.*[550] Others, equally plausibly, see the house as a fantastical representation of the reception, reproduction and dissemination of poetic texts.[551] The voices echoing within this building have understandably been read as a demonstration of the many poetic sources within Ovid's ensuing epic narrative,[552] as *fama* is often used by writers, in the form of the Alexandrian footnote (*fama est*), as

[550] See Tissol (1997), 85-88; Rosati (2002), 297-303; Barchiesi (2002), 195-7; Papaioannou (2007), 45; Davis (2008), 441-3. With her house full of distorted, inflated narratives and problematic inhabitants, including Error and the 'Whispers of doubtful authority' (59-61), Ovid's *Fama* has also been considered as a subversive force which upsets epic values and calls into question the reliability of traditional epic narrators as Ovid begins to retell the tale of the Trojan War. On this view, see Zumwalt (1977); Dippel (1988), 30-1.
[551] Barchiesi (2002), 196; Hardie (2012), 166-7.
[552] Dippel (1988), 31; Tissol (2002), 308; Kelly (2014), 67.

a means of indicating their source material and the texts which have influenced their work.[553]

Hardie has noted that the *orbis* upon which *Fama* continuously gazes (*Met.* 12.39 *orbe locus in medio est*), as the Latin equivalent of the noun κύκλος, can be defined both as 'the world' and 'the epic cycle.'[554] Her house is placed not only at the centre of the geographical world, but at the centre of a poetic tradition.[555] *Fama*'s world, and the landscape from which she sources her material, is a literary one. Once filtered into the house, the material which is plundered by *Fama* from the *orbis* is passed on, repeated and altered by a multitude of different voices (*Met.* 12.47 *vocesque refert iteratque quod audit*).

The actions of the *turba/vulgus* which passes on material and embellishes it (*Met.* 12.57-8 *hi narrata ferunt alio, mensuraque ficti / crescit,*) can be compared to those of a poetic successor who copies and reshapes source material. The noun *turba* is used elsewhere by Ovid himself to describe a group of writers (*Am.* 1.1.6 *Pieridum uates, non tua turba sumus*), while Propertius employs it to describe other poets, [556] who follow after him as he describes the triumph of his poetic fame (Prop. 3.1.12 *scriptorumque meas turba secuta rotas*). At the same time, the image of a *novus*

---

[553] Hardie (2012), 4: 'Locutions of […] the so-called 'Alexandrian footnote' are notoriously self-conscious of their equivocation between being a claim to the (very possibly unreliable) authority of the previous tradition, and the licence for a poet to invent his own 'tradition''.
[554] Hardie (2012), 155. See also Barchiesi (2002), 196.
[555] While the allegorical house of *Fama* can inform readers about the reception of material and production of narratives in the Trojan epic cycle (see, for example, Zumwalt 1977; Papaioannou 2007, 45-48; Davis 2008), as Ovid's *Iliad* immediately follows the ekphrasis, Hardie (2012), 156, convincingly makes a case that 'this *Fama,* then, stands at the threshold not of an *Iliad* or an *Aeneid,* but of an epic cycle, and one of a far greater extent than the Greek original, stretching from the beginning of the Trojan War down to the poet's own day'.
[556] Heyworth and Morwood (2011), 60.

*auctor* adding to and altering the material which he inherits (*Met.* 12.58 *auditis aliquid novus adicit auctor*), as the crowd in the house repeats and passes on material, can also be viewed as symbolic of poetic succession. Barchiesi has noted that the term *auctor* here can refer not only to an 'increaser' of fictions (as *auctor* is derived from *augeo*), but to an 'author' or 'creator'.[557] In light of this, one can compare the actions occurring in the house of *Fama* to the creation of new poetic works or narratives which, although similar to those which have gone before, also alter and embellish source material in new ways, much as Ovid does in this very ekphrasis with material about *Fama* from *Aeneid* 4.

Kelly's observation that *Fama*'s home can be viewed as 'an echo-chamber of intertextuality' appears to be confirmed when Ovid describes the plural voices within the house as one single sound.[558] The cacophony of different voices in the house of *Fama*, which are simultaneously described as the murmurs of a single, small voice (*Met.* 12.50 *nec tamen est clamor, parvae murmura vocis*), can be viewed as a nexus of texts in the same poetic tradition. Although different, these texts all bear fragments of the same, single poetic source. The noun *murmura*, the unified sound of multiple voices, stands as a reflection of these fragments which are repeated within a vast range of different narratives: verbal repetition (***mur**-**mur**a*) is encoded within the pronunciation of the word itself. The absent voice of *Fama*, although audible only through distorted echoes, is the main source to which these fragmented repetitions can be traced back. Her absence reflects, however, the difficulties of

557 Barchiesi (2002), 196.
558 Kelly (2014), 67.

tracking texts in a tradition, by means of intertextual traces, through the layers of reception to one single source. Ovid's personification is an absent presence, much like the Alexandrian footnote, *fama est*, a cryptic and inconclusive reminder of a text's inspiration and origin.

At the threshold of epic tales leading up to the foundation of Rome, Ovid uses programmatic language to depict the reception and production of material in a poetic tradition. The house of *Fama* stands as a monumental reflection of a poetic process, as Ovid highlights that buildings can be used as a way of reflecting upon texts. As he describes how narratives are puffed up (*Met.* 12.57-8 *mensura ficti / crescit*) and perpetuated by the *turba* or *vulgus* within the house, Ovid's language recalls statements by Callimachus and Horace about a hatred of common things (Callim. *Epig.* 30.4 σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια, Hor. *Od.* 3.1.1-4 *Odi profanum* ***vulgus*** *et arceo*), and the Callimachean prescription to avoid any overinflated subject matter (*Aet. fr.* 1 Pf. 23-4).[559]

At the same time, as other critics have noted, the poet provides an image of innovation and transformation within this process. As Hardie and Barchiesi have argued, the poet's use of the term *novus auctor* (*Met.* 12.58 *auditis aliquid novus adicit auctor*) appears to suggest an agent of innovation who brings something different to the tradition, much as the poet of this Callimachean, hybrid *carmen perpetuum/carmen deductum* will do when writing about the historical events leading up to his own times. To quote Barchiesi, 'for Ovid it is thought-provoking that

[559] Hardie (2012), 167-8 sees the *turba/vulgus* as the readers of poetic material, but they are also the means of sound production and alteration within the house.

the word can describe the producer of a text, the guarantor of pre-existing information, or the latecomer who brings a little something new to add to the series of fictions.'[560] Barchiesi appears to believe that it is only the *novus auctor* who brings about innovation, but one can see that the *turba/vulgus,* too, bring about change. The actions of the *turba/vulgus,* as they pass on the narratives in a kind of Chinese Whispers (*Met.* 12.57 *hi narrata ferunt alio*), go against the idea of the *turba/vulgus* as an anti-Callimachean force.[561] Rather than repeating verbatim the words of *Fama*, they are the cause of novelty through metamorphosis. The description *ferunt alio* is, as Hardie comments, another way of saying *trans**ferunt***,[562] further emphasising the metamorphic aspect of reproduction as it recalls the language of Ovid's programmatic proem (*Met.* 1.1 *in nova **fert** animus*…), much as the *novus auctor* does. The house of *Fama*, therefore, presents contrasting imagery of a poetic tradition which is overcrowded and repetitious and one which simultaneously offers up the possibility of novelty and innovation.[563]

As the poet takes on the material of ktistic epic, writing about the well-known events which lead up to his *tempora,* this ekphrasis highlights how fame and mass (re)production can actually facilitate the transformation of narratives and creation of

---

[560] Barchiesi (2002), 196. See also Hardie (2012), 157: '*novus auctor* could also mean 'new-fangled, innovatory author, such as the poet who begins his poem *in nova fert animus.*'

[561] Kaczor (2019), 166 on the *turba/vulgus*: 'They form not merely a large group, but a *turba* and a *vulgus,* the sort of raucous gathering that any poet of Alexandrian leanings would avoid.'

[562] Hardie (2012), 156.

[563] This is not the only time we have seen Ovid present paradoxical statements involving Callimachean images, as is seen in *Tristia* 3.1 and *Metamorphoses* 15 as the poet discusses how his audience will be one which goes against Callimachean ideals. Hardie (2012), 167 considering the *turba/vulgus* as the audience to whom narratives are disseminated to, discusses the paradoxical nature of this: 'This is the last of the paradoxes of Ovid's paradoxical poem, at once an exercise in cultural elitism, and a poem aiming at the widest popularity.'

new material. This process is played out not only in the succeeding books of the *Metamorphoses* as the poet retells events of the *Iliad, Aeneid* and founding of Rome, but throughout his poetic works. Just as the house of *Fama* stands as a surrogate body for the echoing voices within it, Ovid's literature stands as a monumental corpus: a body of poetic narratives, a repository echoing with the different voices of his poetic predecessors, as his works inherit, copy and alter material from the poetic tradition.

By the time Ovid was writing, poetic fame was bound up with Rome and the city's lasting existence, as is shown in Horace, *Odes* 3.30.[564] Thus, the house of *Fama* as a programmatic ekphrasis can shed light on Ovid's poetic methodologies, not only when writing epic about historic events made famous by *kleos*, but also when writing poetry about the city.[565] An example of this can be seen when Ovid writes about the city in the *Fasti*, a poem in which multiple sources about Rome are employed. As the poet describes the festival of Anna Perenna, he notes the multiple versions of the aetiology which have reached him (3.543 *quae tamen haec dea sit, quoniam rumoribus errat*), including one which he believes may have some truth to it (*Fast.* 3.661-2):

> haec quoque, quam referam, nostras pervenit ad aures
> fama, nec a veri dissidet illa fide.

[564] Hor. *Od.* 3.30.7-9: *usque ego postera / crescam laude recens, dum Capitolium / scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex.* See also Verg. *Aen.* 9.446-9 on the correlation between poetic fame and the existence of Rome.

[565] Ovid includes the house of *Fama* in his text as he is on the verge of moving into his own *tempora*. As he writes about his *tempora* elsewhere, such as in the *Fasti*, the same poetic concerns explored within the house of *Fama,* which can be applied to the end of the *Metamorphoses*, can be applied to these texts.

> This *fama* also, which I shall relate, came to my ears, and does not sit far from what we believe to be true.

In this case, Ovid comes close to arguing that the final tale (Anna of Bovillae) is the nearest to the truth. The transmission of this tale to the poet (3.661-2 *pervenit ad aures / fama*) is similar to his description of the entry of material into the house of *Fama* (*Met.* 12.42 *penetratque cavas vox omnis ad aures*). The verb *refero* which Ovid uses to describe his narration of this rumoured origin tale (*Fast.* 3.661) suggests that the poet is now part of the process of verbal repetition and change which was laid out in the house of *Fama* ekphrasis (*Met.* 12.47 *vocesque refert iteratque quod audit*). His comment about the veracity of this aetiology also glances back to his description of how the truth can be distorted as rumours are passed on (12.54-8).

It is interesting to note that, despite Ovid's discussion of this *fama* reaching his ears, this aetiological explanation for the festival is the least well known of all the Anna tales narrated,[566] once again highlighting *fama* as an absent presence, and a source that cannot always be verified. Or is this perhaps Ovid, as the *novus auctor* of the Anna Perenna tradition, adding a new narrative about the mythology of Rome to the many well-known, much narrated tales that he also retells and using *fama* as a guarantee for it? This extended elegy about Rome, like the house of *Fama*, is filled with the echoing voices of different sources and aetiological predecessors. Ovid offers up and recalls multiple different stories about the city in his new aetiological elegy, without complete certainty of whether these tales are entirely trustworthy, or merely extravagantly fashioned fictions.

[566] Heyworth (2019), 291: 'Nothing else is known about this Anna.' See also Harrison (1993), 455.

Ovid's monumental house of *Fama* acts as an architectural expression of the repetition and alteration of source material by different writers, all unified by the same source material and bearing intertextual traces. The ekphrasis allows the reader to meditate on how poetic material is inherited and rewritten by a number of authors and reshaped into new and innovative retellings, a practice which is put into process as Ovid writes about other monuments and the architecture of Rome.

The house of *Fama* stands as a metaphorical structure which allegorises poetic composition and dissemination. It could be viewed as a mythological representation of the function of libraries and buildings which housed *collegia poetarum*: the storage of copies of famous texts from a number of poetic traditions, as well as the facilitation of poetic composition, collaboration and rewriting.[567] In the *Fasti*, Roman monuments were described in a way which invited the reader to imagine the poet composing poetry there. In the house of *Fama*, this monument also invites the reader to imagine and conceive the process of poetic composition. Although this is ultimately an allegorical building, as Ovid makes the process of writing poetry in Rome into a poetic fiction, it nevertheless bears similarities to the very buildings in Rome in which Ovid may have composed his own poetry. Once again, monuments are used and constructed by the poet as a means of helping the reader to conceive how texts are created.

[567] Hardie (2012), 109. has commented that the wakefulness of the Vergilian *Fama* is similar to the '*agrupnie*' of Alexandrian writers and their wakeful production. In the same way, the house of *Fama*, which is open all day and night (12.46) and filled with constant talk, seems like an illustrious literary space where such writers with '*agrupnie*' might be found.

**The house of *Fama* as a Roman monument**

The house of *Fama* thus stands as an allegorical, poetic structure which can be read as a programmatic reflection of poetic composition. At the same time, the structure can itself be viewed as a Roman monument. In depicting the house of *Fama*, Ovid is describing a monument that does not exist and which we cannot see (and, for the most part, can only imagine as unimaginable). The house of *Fama,* its shape and its function are all occluded and impossible without the writing of Ovid. To comprehend the house of *Fama* as a monument, readers must rely entirely on the words of Ovid, highlighting the importance of the poet's text for the creation and understanding of architecture.[568] At the same time, in order to create a visual image of this otherworldly and elusive building structure, Ovid's description of the house uses architectural features from real Roman buildings and depicts it in a way which recalls well-known urban monuments, highlighting how the Roman cityscape is an essential means of comprehending and visualising objects described in Ovid's text.

Set at the medial point of the *orbis*, the house of *Fama* can be connected to the city of Rome as, in Roman thought, the city (*urbs*) was located at the centre of an empire which spanned the limits of the world (*orbis*) (*Fast.* 2.684 *Romanae spatium est Urbis et orbis idem*).[569] Study of the *Metamorphoses*, in Chapter 1, has already highlighted that the poet alludes to Rome even when writing about events before the existence of the city by ascribing Roman architectural features to mythological and

[568] See P. Hardie (2002), 173 on how ekphrasis tests the power of a poet's *enargeia* when providing a lifelike likeness of an object or monument.
[569] Ziogas (2013), 339: '*Fama*'s ability to oversee the entire world and expand her sway to the edges of the earth is reminiscent of the global power of the Roman Empire.'

cosmic dwellings and conflating *urbs* and *orbis*. Accordingly, *Fama*'s hunting ground for information can be viewed (*Met.* 12.63 *videt totumque inquirit in orbem*) in a Romano-centric light. [570]

Much like the house of the Sun in *Metamorphoses* 2, which highlighted the multiple connections which an intermedial reading of Ovid's textual constructions can produce, the house of *Fama* makes itself comparable to different monumental locations in Rome. Ovid's fashioning of *Fama*'s cosmic home with the Roman urban feature of packed *atria* (12.53 *atria turba tenet: veniunt, leve vulgus*) has led readers such as Zumwalt to argue that the house at the centre of the world is actually modelled on a Roman townhouse, with *Fama* as a rich *patrona* surrounded by crowds of clients.[571]

Others have compared the house of *Fama* to the forum, due to the etymological connection between the noun *foramina* (12.44), the innumerable openings to the house, and the noun *fora*. Gladhill has argued that the house of *Fama* should be connected with the *Forum Romanum* as both are spaces filled with 'Republican' free speech.[572] He even suggests that the sounds which can be heard from the house, the *parvae murmura vocis,* are focalised in such a way as to recall the noise which could be heard from the forum in Augustus' own home.[573] One could

---

[570] As Ziogas (2013), 338 has shown, the language describing the centrality of the house of *Fama* (*Met.* 12.39-40 *Orbe locus medio est inter terrasque fretumque / caelestesque plagas, triplicis confinia mundi*) recalls the language of Vitruvius as he describes Rome's orientation at the centre of the known world (*De Arch.* 6.1.10-11).
[571] Zumwalt (1977), 211.
[572] Gladhill (2013), 298: 'The imagery invites us to interpret the *domus* of *Fama* as a cosmological forum, modelled on the *Forum Romanum*, which is a seditious force from the point of view of Jupiter and *Palatia caeli.*'
[573] Gladhill (2013), 309.

also make connections between the house of *Fama* and the *Forum Augustum* as both are house-like structures which recall narratives of the past. Taking the form of a large *atrium*, the *Forum Augustum* was filled with statues and images of the *summi viri*, as is described at *Fasti* 5.561-66, in order to prompt its visitors to visualise and recall the collective memories and tales of the city's grand and heroic past, much as the house of *Fama* stands as a repository of narratives.

Indeed, the fact that the house of *Fama* is an architectural structure filled with, and perpetuating, information, has also led Hardie to compare the house to the record office of the fates described in *Metamorphoses* 15, which itself is a version of the Roman Tabularium (*Met.* 15.809-15):

> cernes illic molimine vasto
> ex aere et solido rerum tabularia ferro,
> quae neque concursum caeli neque fulminis iram
> nec metuunt ullas tuta atque aeterna ruinas:
> invenies illic incisa adamante perenni
> fata tui generis. legi ipse animoque notavi
> et referam, ne sis etiamnum ignara futuri.
>
> You see there a record office of things made from bronze and solid iron, a vast structure, which, safe and everlasting, fears neither the tumult of the heavens, nor the anger of the thunderbolt, nor any ruin: you will find there incised in eternal adamant the fate of your offspring. I myself have read these tablets and made note with my mind, and I shall retell them, so that you are no longer ignorant of the future.

The building which Jupiter describes here appears to be a vast state record office like that which stood on the Capitoline.[574] The lines between the cosmic and real are blurred in Ovid's text. The Tabularium to which Jupiter refers has been viewed as a

[574] See Platner & Ashby s.v. 'Tabularium'; Purcell (1993), 135-42. See Littlewood (2006), 56-8 on the layout of the Capitoline.

vast Olympian structure which contained the tablets of the fates and is much like the *Palatia Caeli*.[575] In chronological terms, however, the real Tabularium (built in 78BC) would have existed at this point in Ovid's narrative. Jupiter's prophecy comes after the death of Caesar (15.801-2) and Venus is seen visiting the curia to rescue the body of Caesar immediately afterwards (15.843-8). It is now possible to locate these two gods in the Roman *urbs* as well as in a cosmic version of the Roman *orbis*. This vast and architecturally developed city now has buildings like those which Ovid's text 'anticipated' using allegorical structures like the house of the Sun and the house of *Fama.*[576]

The building materials from which *Fama*'s home is constructed, and the function of Ovid's allegorical house allow comparisons to be made with the Roman Tabularium.[577] Both the house of *Fama* and the Tabularium in *Metamorphoses* 15 are constructed from bronze (12.46 *tota est ex aere sonanti*; 15.810 *ex aere…*), perhaps an etymologically-derived reference to the vast Tabularium building which was connected to the *Aerarium Saturni* on the Capitoline,[578] the building to which Servius believed Vergil was referring at *Georgics* 2.501-2 (*nec ferrea iura / insanumque forum*

[575] So Gladhill (2012).
[576] One can view the Tabularium in *Metamorphoses* 15 as the hall of the fates which possesses similarities to the real Roman monument. It might also be possible to see this description as an aggrandisement and mythologisation of the Tabularium itself, as an expression of the splendour of Rome.
[577] It seems appropriate that Ovid's house of *Fama* is similar to this building on the Roman Capitoline. On the Capitoline's existence as a guarantor of lasting *fama*, see Hor. *Od.* 3.30.8-9 and Verg. *Aen.* 9.446-9. I will discuss below how the house of *Fama* should be viewed as connected to Rome as a whole.
[578] See Purcell (1993), 140-1. Littlewood (2006), 58 suggests that the Tabularium, Temple of Saturn (with its Aerarium) and Temple of Juno Moneta were all connected by a covered staircase.

*aut populi tabularia uidit*).[579] Both the house of *Fama* and the Roman Tabularium are also linked due to their preservation of material. The record offices in the city were repositories of Rome's mythological and civic history. In *Metamorphoses* 12, the house of *Fama* stands as introduction to, and is followed by, the poet's narration of the Trojan War and events up to the rise of Rome. It can, therefore, be likened to the monument in which, as Jupiter suggests in *Metamorphoses* 15, Rome's history was stored in the form of public records.[580]

Hardie argues that the house of *Fama* was vastly different to the Tabularium in *Metamorphoses* 15 in its function. He posits that the house of *Fama* promotes oral change and fluidity, while the Tabularium holds adamant and immovable inscriptions of Roman fate.[581] In spite of these differences, however, the house of *Fama* plays on the idea of the urban monuments as markers of commemoration and visual cues for recollection of the past, much as the Tabularium was in Rome.

Further similarities can be seen between the house of *Fama* and the Tabularium described in *Metamorphoses* 15. Just as the house of *Fama* stands as a monumental expression of how poetry is made famous and preserved, the Tabularium is also in fact presented in poetic terms. The language which Jupiter uses to describe the impervious nature of this bronze record office (811-13), unaffected by war, weather or ruin, recalls Horace's description of the lasting fame of his *monumentum aere*

---

[579] Servius *ad Georg.* 2.501-2: *POPVLI TABVLARIA, ubi actus publici continentur, significat autem templum Saturni, in quo et aerarium fuerat et reponebantur acta, quae susceptis liberis faciebant parentes*…

[580] We might wonder whether the events which Jupiter narrates as the future of Rome to Venus, and which are now the recent past for Ovid's readers, would have made it into Rome's public records. This could, instead, be a case of Ovid adding to the annals of Rome, as he did in the *Fasti* (see Chapter 2).

[581] Hardie (2012), 166.

*perennius* (3.30.1-5), particularly due to the use of the noun *aes* (810 *ex aere*) and the adjective *perennius* (813 *adamante perenni*). Propertius' proclamations of the durability of his elegiacs (3.2.23-4), due to his fame, also suggests that only poetic *monumenta* will not succumb to these ravages of time. In Ovid's text, the record office takes on the everlasting, impervious qualities which poets traditionally suggest are only available to their famous poetry.

As Jupiter then goes on to narrate the fate of Venus' descendants in Ovid's poem (*Met.* 15.816-42), it is his text which takes on the role of the Tabularium as Jupiter's relation of these records is embedded within his narration. Hardie argues that Jupiter's retelling and paraphrasing of the records (*Met*. 15.814-5), rather than letting Venus read them for herself, is a comment on control over information.[582] However, Jupiter's refusal to let Venus simply read the tablets facilitates their dissemination in this narrative and allows Ovid's text to become a version of the Tabularium: a monumental text which contains the records of the rise of Rome.[583] The *Metamorphoses* becomes a lasting reminder of Roman events fixed within the poetic tradition. Jupiter's proclamation of the ever-lasting nature of the record office is thus transferred to Ovid's text: the statements which other poets make about the

[582] Hardie (2012), 166 argues that Jupiter attempts to control the *fama* of the events recorded in the Tabularium, as 'the sole reader of this text'. At the same time, one could see him as part of the process described in the house of *Fama.* In the case of Ovid's text, it is his retelling of what he has read (*Met.* 15.814-5 *legi ipse […] / et referam ne sis etiamnum ignara futuri*) which allows the *fama* of these events to be perpetuated in Ovid's text. Hardie's comments focus on the *ipse* of Jupiter's speech and his single narration, but one should note that *referam* looks back to the repetition of multiple narratives the house of *Fama* (*Met.* 12.47 *vocesque refert iteratque quod audit*).

[583] On another level, as Smith (1997), 126 points out, the records to which Jupiter refers can also be seen as an allusion to Jupiter's prophecy at *Aeneid* 1.261-96: 'the words of Jupiter are the same as those 'housed in' the *Aeneid*'. Ovid confirms, ratifies and preserves the poetic tradition. Accordingly, one could see the poetic tradition as a whole like the Tabularium, much as one could see the poetic tradition monumentalised in the house of *Fama*.

lasting fame of their poetry become connected to the *Metamorphoses* due to the fact that it now has the same function as this architectural structure.

Similarities can be seen between the house of *Fama* and the Tabularium, both as a divine record office of the fates and as a real Roman monument. They are vessels of information about famous events and the annals of the past. Yet, these two structures need not be seen as opposing or competing entities. Both highlight different means of memorialisation: through fixed, inscribed architecture and through the everlasting, everchanging verbal echoes of poetic fame. Nevertheless, both are also used by the poet also to indicate a connection between text and architecture, as they both illustrate how narratives about Rome's history can be preserved. As was discussed in the previous analysis of the *Fasti* in Chapter 2, architecture and texts are often shown by Ovid to be different, yet co-dependent, means of monumental memory, rather than conflicting alternatives. Thus, the house of *Fama* and the monuments of Rome can be compared in terms of their function and the way in which they are described in Ovid's texts.

**The house of *Fama* and Rome**

Readers of the house of *Fama* ekphrasis have identified Roman connections and tried to identify it as specific urban monument, yet it is clear that the house of *Fama* cannot be compared to or aligned with one single Roman monument. The multiplicity of identifications is reflective of the fact that a single identification is impossible, and that the readerly *vulgus* are free to receive and identify as appropriate and as *they*

see the monument. As a matter of fact, despite being a single dwelling, the house of *Fama* should be viewed as synonymous with the whole of the city, much as Ziogas has suggested.[584] This inanimate house promotes the idea that Rome itself, and the people within the city (and wider empire), will be the poet's means of lasting fame, commemoration and poetic immortality.

As has been shown already, particularly in the chapters on exile poetry, lasting poetic fame is a key concern for Ovid, as he explores the necessity of Rome for his poetic production, potential readership, and lasting fame. Reformulating sentiments expressed in Horace, *Odes* 3.30, Ovid's discussion of *fama* in the *Metamorphoses* is the most overt declaration of his own poetic fame, as he confirms that Rome's lasting presence is essential for the longevity of his poetry. At the end of the epic poem, the poet describes how his work will continue to gain fame throughout the Roman empire even after his death, depicting Rome much like the house of *Fama* is in *Metamorphoses* 12 (*Met.* 15.875-9):

> parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis
> astra ferar, nomenque erit indelebile nostrum,
> quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris,
> ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama,
> siquid habent veri vatum praesagia, vivam.

> I shall be carried immortal, in my better part, beyond the high stars and my name will be indelible. Wherever Roman power extends through conquered lands, I shall be spoken of on the lips of the people, and I shall live, throughout the ages, because of my fame, if the prophecies of the bards have any truth.

[584] Ziogas (2013), 338-42.

This passage recalls the language used in Horace's description of his poetic *monumentum*, especially given the use of *perennis* at 15.875,[585] as Horace posits that, as long as Rome stands (*Od.* 3.30.8-9), he will continue be spoken of throughout the ages (3.30.10 *dicar*). Ovid's use of *legar* (*Met.* 15.878) in first-person passive future form, to recall the mode of his future fame, recalls Horace's expression of his renown, as does Ovid's description of the vocal transmission of his work (*ore…populi*). Ovid nuances Horace's passage, however, in spatial terms. Rome is no longer restricted to the boundaries of the city (Horace uses the Capitol as a metonym for Rome), but is figured as a vast and expanding empire (877), as Ovid proclaims that his fame will extend as far as Rome's empire now does – his fame is guaranteed not just as long as Rome exists, but wherever Rome exists.[586] 'Rome', in whatever form that might take – as *urbs* or *orbis* – is the ultimate guarantor of Ovid's poetry.

As Hardie points out, the poet's anticipated catasterism after death recalls the concept of fame as laid out in the house of *Fama* ekphrasis: the advancement of the poet, now in incorporeal form, through the heavens (15.876 *astra* ***ferar***) recalls the transferal of information through the cosmological house on the boundaries of earth, sea and the heavens (12.46 *vocesque re**fert** iteratque quod audit*; 57 *hi narrata* ***ferunt*** *alio*).[587] It is Rome which is the cause of this fame and catasterism. Much like the open

[585] Hardie (2004), 624 reads *perennis* in line 875 as an allusion to Hor. *Od.* 3.30.1 and *perennius*. He also suggests (2012), 51 that Ovid's *parte…meliore* in line 875 looks back to Horace's statement that he shall not entirely die (*Od.* 3.30.6 *non omnis moriar*).
[586] This concept is considered by the poet in exile, as discussed in Chapter 4, as Ovid's work explores where in the empire one needs to be to find poetic inspiration and gain fame while writing about Rome. On the sphragis of the *Metamorphoses* and exile poetry, see Hinds (1985), 23-27.
[587] Hardie (2012), 167n40 states that '*ferar* itself is a fame word': 'literally 'carried', but also 'borne in report, spoken of'.

doors of the house of *Fama* (12.47 *nocte dieque* ***patet***) which are filled with the echoing voices which perpetuate rumours, Rome stands as an ever-expanding and borderless space (877 ***patet*** *…Romana potentia*) which will supply the poet with fame by means of the transmission of his work. As Hardie has noted, the passing on of information in the house by the *leve vulgus* will become an actuality as Ovid anticipates the dissemination of his poetry, in a highly Ennian fashion,[588] by the mouths of the Roman people (878 *ore populi*).[589] In short, Rome, as a physical place and a body of readers, offers a real version of the metaphorical process which Ovid imagines occurring within the house of *Fama*.[590]

Gladhill has suggested that Ovid himself becomes a kind of *Fama* figure in the afterlife. Reading *fama* in *ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama* (*Met.* 15.878) as a nominative, with the anceps as a short vowel, he interprets this as the final metamorphosis of the poem: the transformation of the poet into *Fama.*[591] Even though the ambiguity of the metre means that it is uncertain whether or not we should view Ovid as a *Fama* figure, Rome itself, it certainly seems to me, stands as a

---

[588] Cic. *Tusc.* 1.34.8 *volito vivos per ora virum.* It is interesting that Ovid's house of *Fama*, which anticipates Ovid's declaration of Ennian fame in *Metamorphoses*, is placed at the start of the most Ennian part of the epic, and the historical events leading up to contemporary times in Rome (See Ziogas 2013, 341 on the fall of Troy as the starting point of the *Annals)*. One might compare the house of *Fama,* which opens Ovid's narrative of historical events surrounding the foundation of Rome, to the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, with its Ennian connections, which stands at the end of Ovid's aetiological *Fasti*. Both are the abode of Muses or a Muse-like figure (*Fama*), and are programmatic structures which bear some connection to Ennius.

[589] Hardie (2012), 167: 'In entrusting his eternal fame to the mouths of the *populus,* Ovid gives himself up to the *leve vulgus* who come and go in the house of *Fama*.'

[590] Ziogas (2013), 341: 'The mindset of Ovid's Roman readers was ready to convert the personified abstraction of *Fama* into physical space and associate the hollow house with the image of Rome and her far-reaching dominion.'

[591] Gladhill (2013), 316: 'If we interpret the noun as nominative, then one might suggest that Ovid undergoes his own metamorphosis; he becomes *Fama* herself. Ovid's ego has been replaced completely by *fama*.'

kind of house of *Fama*, especially given the Horatian intertext. Ovid's memory is sustained by the *populus* in this place and Rome, in its lasting existence as a city and an empire (877), is a container for the voices which perpetuate the words of the poet (878).[592]

In *Metamorphoses* 15, then, the co-existence of Ovid's poetic fame and the city is established. This relationship is explored further in Ovid's exilic epistles, where Ovid raises the idea that a move out of Rome will see an end to his poetic *fama* (*Pont.* 1.5.84-5 *famaque cum domino fugit ab Urbe suo*). Rather than taking these statements at first hand, as some are wont to do,[593] the validity of this claim should be questioned, much like the statements about Ovid's lack of poetic inspiration outside of Rome, which are shown to be false.[594] Whatever the case, Ovid's statement reinforces the great importance of Rome, in his mind, as a source of fame.

As was discussed in Chapter 3, *Tristia* 3.1 highlights the importance of Rome as a space of readership and memorialisation not just in terms of the city's monumental architecture and literary collections, in its libraries, but also in terms of its readers of Ovid's poetry. The importance of Rome and the readers in the city is once again expressed in *Tristia* 3.7, as the poet iterates material from *Metamorphoses* 15, and considers his fame after death (*Tr.* 3.7.50-2):

> me tamen extincto fama superstes erit,
> dumque suis uictrix septem de montibus orbem

[592] Ziogas (2013), 339: 'In the sphragis, the Roman Empire becomes the vessel through which *fama* effects a temporal and spatial metamorphosis of Ovid's life. The global sway of the Roman Empire affords space for the innumerable and tendentious voices of Ovid's *fama*.'
[593] Michalopoulos (2016), 106-7: 'This is a striking twist, which runs contrary to our (and Ovid's) familiar conception of *fama* as ever-lasting, ever-flying and omnipresent.'
[594] See Chapter 4.

prospiciet domitum Martia Roma, legar.

> Yet when I have perished, my fame shall survive. While Martian Rome looks down, as a victor, on the subdued world from her seven hills, I shall be read.

Here, Ovid employs themes and language which are found in the sphragis of the *Metamorphoses* and Horace, *Odes* 3.30, as he imposes the same condition on his poetic fame and immortality: the existence of Rome. He considers the lasting dominance (15.877 *domitis,* 3.7.50 *domitum*) of Rome as a global power, and his existence in the world after death. The poet also uses the first-person passive verb *legar* (15.878, 3.7.52) expressing his expectation of *fama* (15.878, 3.7.50) through continued readership. The personified Rome, who looks on her empire from her lofty citadel, also becomes a *Fama*-like figure. *Roma* here is portrayed as victorious over her empire (51 *victrix*), much as *Fama* is a figure who is associated with the Roman triumph.[595] As Ovid imagines that his fame will continue as long as Rome stands, he portrays the city as a female figure who triumphantly surveys her empire (51-2 *orbem prospiciet*) from an elevated position (the seven hills of the city), much as *Fama* was described, surveying the world (or empire) around her (12.63 *videt totumque inquirit in orbem*).

In exile, the poet considers his own poetic *fama* now that he has left the city. At the same time, *fama* brings news about Rome to the poet. As was discussed in Chapter 4, in the context of *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, the exiled poet expresses fears for the quality of his poetry, and for his connectedness to Rome and his friends there.

[595] In Propertius' elegy, *Fama* is the cause of his poetic triumphal procession (Prop. 3.1.9-12).

It is unsurprising, therefore, that, as he desperately seeks to maintain his relationship with the city, recalling and imagining the places he once frequented there, he tries to acquire information about the imperial capital.[596] Ovid describes how *Fama*, once again in personified form, visits him and brings news from Rome. This news is about Sextus Pompeius' consulship (*Pont.* 4.4.15-16 *en ego laetarum uenio tibi nuntia rerum / Fama, per inmensas aëre lapsa uias*).

The idea that *Fama* is situated in Rome while the poet is in exile has already been discussed by Ziogas. He argues that 'in the exile poetry, *Fama* is centrally located at Rome, while her news reaches the edges of the known world.'[597] Going further, it is possible to argue that, in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.4, Rome is in fact specifically figured in a way which is similar to Ovid's descriptions of *Fama*'s abode in the *Metamorphoses*. Although Kossaifi has argued that the house of *Fama* 's'incarne dans la terre getique',[598] the way in which the poet describes the urban celebrations surrounding the consulship of his addressee, Pompeius, recalls the language used to describe the house of *Fama* (*Pont.* 4.4.27-8, 35-42):

> cernere iam uideor rumpi paene atria turba,
>     et populum laedi deficiente loco,
> […]
> curia te excipiet, patresque e more uocati
>     intendent aures ad tua uerba suas.
> hos ubi facundo tua uox hilarauerit ore,
>     utque solet, tulerit prospera uerba dies,
> egeris et meritas superis cum Caesare grates
>    (qui causam, facias cur ita saepe, dabit),
> inde domum repetes toto comitante senatu,

[596] This news arrives long after events have occurred, however, as Ovid laments in *Pont.* 3.4.57-60.
[597] Ziogas (2013), 340.
[598] Kossaifi (2012), 112 argues this due to the fact that Pontus and Tomis is filled with 'les voix bruissants qui nourrissent *Fama*'.

officium populi uix capiente domo.

> I seem to see now *atria*, full to bursting with crowds, and people bruised from a lack of space. […] The curia will receive you, and the fathers summoned by custom will extend their ears to your words. When your voice, from eloquent lips, has delighted these men, as it is accustomed to, when the day has offered words of good omen, and you have given due thanks to the gods and Caesar (who is the reason why you will do so often), then you shall return home with the senate accompanying you, and that house will scarcely be able to hold the people.

This text reinforces the ideas, expressed in the exilic epistles, that it is Rome which provided fame for the poet, and now provides fame for others who remain there, while Ovid himself is trapped at the edge of the world, attempting to flatter his Roman addressees and seek sympathy for his plight. Here, *Fama* allows the poet to see Rome (27 *cernere uideor*),[599] although he is not there, and the city which celebrates Pompeius' success is set out much like *Fama*'s house.[600] The poet describes the *atria* which are filled with crowds (4.4.27 *rumpi paene* ***atria turba***), much as the *atria* of the house of *Fama* are crowded with masses of voices (*Met*. 12.53 ***atria turba*** *tenet: veniunt, leve vulgus, euntque*). The crowds within Pompeius' private house (*Pont.* 4.4.42 *officium populi uix capiente domo*), as the senate accompanies him home through the city, also recall the descriptions of *Fama*'s busy household. As Ovid describes the senators stretching out their ears to catch the words spoken by the single, eloquent voice of Pompeius in the curia (4.4.36-7

---

[599] Comparing this description of vague sensation (*Pont.* 4.4.27 *cernere uideor*) to the jussive subjunctives and second person verbs used in the *Fasti* when scene setting (*videas* etc.: see Chapter 2), it is possible to identify how Ovid depicts his division from Rome. No longer is the poet at the centre of the city, enabling others to see Rome. His vision of the city is now more uncertain; here it is dependent on *fama*.

[600] Discussing this poem, Kelly (2014), 89 believes that by leaving Rome, Ovid has been 'removed from the house of *Fama*', yet he does not expand upon the ways in which Rome is physically like the structure.

*intendent **aures** ad tua uerba suas. / hos ubi facundo tua **uox** hilarauerit ore*), one can imagine the words of Pompeius being heard and passed on through the crowd much like the voices in *Fama*'s home (*Met.* 12.42 *penetratque cavas **vox** omnis ad **aures***). Here, in the curia on the edge of the forum, and in the rooms of Pompeius' own house,[601] the scenes which are imagined in the *atria* of *Fama*'s forum-like house play out in the city.

Rome is a monumental space which can provide fame and express the renown of its inhabitants. Yet, for the poet, Rome exists only in his imagination (and his texts), as he laments his inability to be physically present in the city (43-4 *me miserum, turba quod non ego cernar in illa, / nec poterunt istis lumina nostra frui*!). One can, therefore, see new similarities between Rome and the house of *Fama* in exile. Rome becomes a monumental marker of fame and a source of news and narratives for the exiled poet. At the same time, it is, for the poet, now only an illusory and imagined space. The crowds which Ovid 'sees' here are incorporeal figures, much like the *leve vulgus* within the house of *Fama*. Indeed, the senators and the people are a figment of the poet's imagination: faceless and unidentified crowds. They are ears to hear Pompeius' words and crowds to fill his halls as a means of emphasising the new consul's greatness, as Ovid seeks to flatter his addressee. In some ways, Rome now seems as much an imagined, poetic illusion as the house of *Fama* did in the *Metamorphoses.*

---

[601] See also *Pont*. 4.5.9-10: *protinus inde domus uobis Pompeia petatur: / non est Augusto iunctior ulla foro.*

Yet, in spite of his lack of presence, Rome's *fama* is so strong that it is continually present in Ovid's poetry, despite his claims he can no longer see or be part of it. Kelly has suggested that, in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.4, Ovid's voice 'is no longer discernible among the crowd'.[602] Yet the poet's voice is the one which informs the reader about this event: his is the only voice to reach our ears. One can, accordingly, see the exiled poet as similar to the personified figure of *Fama* in *Metamorphoses* 12 as one who, although absent and removed from the melee and crowds, reports all in the city from afar.

As the poet imagines this celebratory day of consular inauguration, and the words of good omen which are spoken on this occasion (*Pont.* 4.4.38 *tulerit* ***prospera uerba dies***), he uses language found in *Fasti* 1 where, also describing the inauguration of the consuls, the poet defines the *fasti dies* (*Fast*. 1.71-2 ***prospera*** *lux oritur: linguis animisque favete / nunc dicenda bona sunt bona* ***verba die)***.[603] Both texts describe this event in Rome in an identical manner, (*Fast.* 1.75-88 *vestibus intactis* ***Tarpeias*** *itur in arces,*[…] ***quos aluit campis herba Falisca suis***, *Pont.* 4.4.29-32 *templaque* ***Tarpeiae*** *primum tibi sedis adiri*, […] ***quos aluit campis herba Falisca suis***). In the *Fasti*, this scene is overseen by Jupiter (*Fast.* 1.85 *Iuppiter arce suo totum cum spectat in orbem / nil nisi Romanum, quod tueatur, habet*), who surveys 'nothing that is not the Roman world', much as *Fama* sees all at *Met.* 12.63 (*videt totumque inquirit in orbem*).

[602] Kelly (2014), 89. See also P. Hardie (2002), 314.
[603] By referring to this definition in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.4. Ovid may also be making an indirect reference to *fama.* The *fasti dies* (Varro *Ling*. 6.29 *dies quibus fari licet*) shares an etymological root with *fama* (*fari*) and is also associated with speech.

In the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, it is *Fama* herself who surveys the world, and it is thanks to *Fama* that the exiled poet is able to see anything Roman.

As Hardie argues, Ovid also reaches and sees Rome in exile through the medium of his earlier text: he is 'led back in mental vision both to the public centre of the city and to his house, the one-time scene of his poetic imaginings.'[604] Rome's *fama* is so great that, whether in his house on the Capitoline (*Fast*. 1.93-4) or on the exposed edges of empire, the poet is still able to evoke for himself, and his readers, a vivid vision of the city. Yet, at the same time, Rome's *fama* comes from Ovid's texts. This depiction of Pompeius' triumph is sourced from the earlier language of the *Fasti*. This recycling of topographic descriptions is seen elsewhere in Ovid's corpus, such as in *Tristia* 3.1, where the little book visits a version of Rome constructed out of texts from the *Fasti* and *Ars Amatoria*, and in the *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, where the Campus Martius was evoked by Ovid's use of the same language with which he described the space in the *Ars Amatoria*. The poet remembers Rome by means of his own work, and presents Rome as an Ovidian city: it is now impossible to remember Rome without remembering Ovid's texts. While it is *Fama* who provides him access to Rome, it is Ovid's texts which ultimately help to conjure up the city.

The house of *Fama* shows how Ovidian *monumenta* can be viewed as architectural structures and read as poetic entities. In *Metamorphoses* 12, for the poet who embarks on an epic narration of the creation of Rome, the house of *Fama* explores the possibility of creating new texts about the city. It also stands as a Roman

[604] P. Hardie (2002), 315.

architectural structure which allows the poet, in his wider corpus, to explore the relationship between Rome and poetic fame. For Ovid, Rome is the ultimate poetic monument, and his own poetry is a Roman *monumentum*.

# CONCLUSION

Suetonius wrote that Augustus found a ‘city of brick’ and left a ‘city of marble’ (*Aug*. 28.3). Throughout the Ovidian corpus, Rome undergoes a further transformation, into a ‘city of song’. For the Ovidian reader, Rome becomes a space inscribed with Ovidian literature. The monuments and open spaces of the city echo with the words of the poet.

Following the recent ‘spatial turn’ in the study of literary and material culture, the aim of this research has been to consider the relationship between poetry and place across the arc of Ovid’s entire corpus. This study has illustrated how the topography of Augustan Rome offers the poet a chance to reflect upon the nature of his poetry and his relationship with the city, its political structures and its people. Ovid’s poetry clearly confirms the close relationship between the architectural and the textual. The poet’s texts are used as a means of ‘constructing’ a version of the city. They offer up an architectural overview of the city of Rome, as spatial descriptions allow readers to access and explore the monuments and topography of the city (particularly in the case of modern readers, where many of the monuments which are described no longer exist).

Ovid even becomes, in the *Fasti*, a kind of tour guide, who leads the readers around Rome; monuments are ‘visited’ and pointed out to his readers. Using poetic simultaneity, the poet constructs a version of the city within his text which allows his reader to see Rome and to imagine him composing poetry there, whether in the study

of his home or at temples such as the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*. The poet also highlights the ability of poetry to conjure up images of Rome, as he himself, when separated from Rome in exile, using fragments of his previous poetry as a way of recalling and revisiting the monuments amongst which he once wrote poetry. A number of his extended descriptions of Rome in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* bear close similarities to descriptions in works such as the *Fasti* and *Ars Amatoria.*

At the same time, Ovid's spatial interests and depictions of monuments frequently offer the reader a chance to explore the symbolic and programmatic potential of Roman space, as both buildings and texts are constructed objects, liable to the same ordering, editing and refashioning. This research has shown how the landscapes of Rome, repeatedly referred to in different texts, offer the reader opportunity to evaluate the nature of the poetry which Ovid writes, as the poet's depiction of Rome alters in different genres, and depending on the context of composition. Rome is expressed by means of cosmic allegory in the *Metamorphoses*, reflecting Ovid's own global and epic ambitions as well as the present-day architectural celebration of peace and stability at urban, imperial and even universal (cosmic and astrological) levels. In the *Fasti,* Rome is a space which embodies and celebrates renovation and renewal. The poet himself becomes a Roman architect and renovator as he transforms the *fasti* from a calendrical record which is ordered and inscribed on architecture to an aetiological narrative composed in elegiac couplets. He alters the annalistic tradition which chronicled urban development and even renovates his own text, editing it in exile and cutting it short half-way through his composition. In the exilic epistles, as Ovid draws near to the end of his career and

considers his poetic legacy, Rome stands as a far distant memory and elusive space which the poet fears will fade or be forever inaccessible, much as he fears for the lasting dissemination of his work.

This study has illustrated the fruitfulness of cross-corpus readings and highlighted that study of Ovid's depiction of Roman space and monuments should not be limited to one specific text or genre. When coming to conclusions about Ovid's relationship with monuments, scholars often grant a privileged status to the *Ars Amatoria*, or read other texts solely in light of Ovid's urban commentary in this poem, as he adds an erotic layer of meaning to the Roman monuments. While it is certainly important to be aware of this, there are many detailed explorations of the city elsewhere in the corpus which are informed by other Ovidian texts or by wider Roman literature. The less well studied corners of the Ovidian oeuvre, particularly his exilic literature, are integrated into this study to highlight how, throughout Ovid's corpus, similar motifs and *topoi* can be identified, although altered and transformed, as a means of addressing similar issues in different contexts.

Ovid's urban and monumental preoccupation can certainly be traced back to the well-established relationship between *amor* and *Roma* in traditional elegy, as the Roman lover also becomes the lover of Rome. In Ovid's case, this obsession with Rome is found within his epic poetry, extended elegy and elegiac epistles, as well as in traditional elegy. Rather than suggesting that a relationship with Rome is not a key facet of traditional elegy, the poet's preoccupation with Rome leads us to consider how he twists and manipulates amatory elegy in different ways. In the *Fasti*, Ovid writes about imperial monuments as a means of praising Augustan matrons, rather

than composing elegiac, textual *monumenta* for his mistress and recusing himself from political involvement. In exile, he becomes the *exclusus amator,* not outside the *puella*'s household, but rather in front of public monuments. The poet explores traditional amatory motifs and elegiac intertexts as a means of helping his reader to understand novel circumstances, such as his exilic experience and separation from the city. The reuse of this material also provides a new kind of novelty, as the poet manipulates and alters elegiac material to suit different circumstances.

An elegiac awareness is certainly important, but Ovid also negotiates the *topoi* of ktistic epic in his poetry, responding to the works of poets such as Ennius and Vergil within his texts. In a novel interpretation of epic chronology, anticipation of the rise of Rome is implanted within the *Metamorphoses* long before the traditional starting point of annalistic epic about Rome, the fall of Troy. Ovid aggrandises the impact of Rome on the universe, and widens the scope of the ktistic epic narrative. In the *Fasti,* Ovid presents himself as the literary successor to the tradition of annalistic epic when writing about the religious rites and architecture of Rome. At the same time, his extended elegiac narrative recalls Callimachean aetiological poetry as he celebrates temples and those involved with their construction in similar ways to other instances of elegiac praise. His work is similar to those who inherit the epinician tradition from Callimachus' *Victoria Berenices* and describe monumental poetic constructions in both epic and elegiac poetry.

In the *Tristia*, Ovid introduces an exiled figure, in the form of his little poetry book, who arrives and tours Rome, a reconfiguration of the arrival of Aeneas at the

future sight of Rome. In doing so, he indicates that, in spite of literary precedent and epic mythology surrounding the city, his own protagonist will not find a welcome on the Palatine. In the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, Ovid uses the motif of the foundation myth, regularly seen in epic as poets catalogue the rise and fall of cities in the *translatio imperii*. Yet this is dramatically altered, as the foundation myth provided is not for Rome but for Aegisos, a barbarian backwater. The poet uses epic motifs usually employed when writing about Rome in order to write about his place of exile. In these epistolary elegies, the poet sets himself up as a poet who can write epic poetry as a means of impressing his addressee. Thus, writing about Rome provides Ovid with the opportunity to manipulate and alter the traditional expectations of genre.

Rome is an enduring presence in Ovid's literature. Writing in or outside Rome, about the city or other subject matter, an urban awareness can be identified within the different texts of the poet. Yet, this ever-constant relationship is also one of contrasts. Anticipation of Rome is set out from the outset of the *Metamorphoses,* emphasising the Romanocentric nature of the universe, as the newly formed cosmos takes on the properties of architectural order and design which are displayed in imperial temples of the post-Actian age. At the same time, this cosmological landscape is threatened by a chaos and confusion which can be mapped onto the formation of empire, a reminder of the unavoidable turmoil which led to the peace and stability of imperial Rome, and the chaos and ruin which preceded urban renewal and the monumental construction of the Augustan era.

The *Fasti* is a celebration of the Roman, monumental values of the Augustan age, yet, at the same time, Ovid stands as a kind of alternative, or complementary architect to the *princeps*. In the background to the poet's description of temples can be seen the tension, germane to elegy, between the architectural and the textual. In this elegiac text, however, Ovid fuses the two concepts, as he ties his own work to the monuments of Rome. Furthermore, Ovid chooses to end his poem with a monument which celebrates the annalistic traditions of Rome, while disrupting this very tradition and ending his poem prematurely. The discussion of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* both celebrates Rome's grand Republican past and contemporary Augustan renovation, while also looking forward to the exilic, Rome-less future as the praise of Marcia appears similar to Ovid's persuasion and flattery in his later epistles.

Ovid's relationship with Rome is understandably dislocated in exilic epistles, due to the distance between him and the city. His relationship with Rome is played out by exploring the interaction of others with the city. The personified poetry book in *Tristia* 3.1, which acts as a proxy for the poet, emphasises how firmly embedded memories of his work are within the architecture of the city, as Rome has become a literary – and even an Ovidian city. At the same time, it expresses Ovid's division and rejection from the imperial homes, temples and libraries there. Yet, we, as readers, have to question whether this is a conscious act: has the poet moved beyond a need for acceptance from these monuments, as they are now overwritten with his works? The monuments of the Palatine cause the barbarian book to quote the *Fasti* and the *Ars Amatoria* when surveying them. Rome is now such an Ovidian city that to gaze upon the monuments, it seems, is to read the poet's apparently censored texts. As

the poet returns to Rome in *Tristia* 3.1 and describes the monumental structures there, this poem is used to confirm his readership by the general public, an idea which was also expressed at the end of the *Metamorphoses.* This return can also be identified as a way of revisiting his poetry: as Ovid embarks on writing about the exilic experience for the first time, this rejection from Roman monuments hints that his attention is about to turn away from Rome and engagement in public themes, to engaging with more personal topics and his thoughts about the exilic environment. In spite of the poet's apparent desperation to return to Rome, this rejection from its monuments gives him an opportunity to explore new avenues in his poetry.

Ovid also explores other people's relationships with Rome as he writes to friends who remain in the city. In *Epistles* 1.8, the poet imagines and recalls Rome, lamenting his inability to reach Rome, as others continue to enjoy a life of leisure there. He cites this as the cause of his poetic infertility. Yet, one could argue that it is partly his audience's existence in Rome which allows him to continue to write about the city and its structures in new ways. In this poem, he constructs a version of the city that expresses not only its Ovidian but also Severan qualities, as a means of alluding to his addressee's poetry. At the same time, Ovid also describes Italian and Tomitan landscapes. He turns his spatial interest to places outside the city and adapts the techniques used when writing about Rome to write about his place of exile. Rome is the poet's central and obsessive focus, as he exclaims that he cannot exist or write poetry without it, and yet, at the same time, his learned and poetic production highlights his ability to write poetry about the city from any location.

Ovid's change of focus, seeking a less harsh exile rather than a return to Rome, makes us question whether Rome is now really the city and its monuments, or a collection of readers and a state of peace and *otium.* Rome is so embedded within his memory and in the canvas of his texts that one wonders whether a home in the city is really necessary.

Ovid considers the contrast between texts and architectural monuments in exile, as he expresses the possibility that poetic texts can stand as lasting monuments in their own right. However, this is not the first time that Ovid uses architectural language to create a poetic structure which does not actually exist as a real building. In the *Metamorphoses,* as he writes about the house of *Fama*, he provides his readers with a poetic *monumentum*, which stands as an expression of his future fame and an allegory for poetic composition, intertextuality and dissemination. Nevertheless, he overturns the idea that poetry can be represented by one single monument, like the house of *Fama.* He ascribes to the building clear Roman qualities, and highlights that it is the city itself which has now come to stand as inspiration for poetic production, and the means of publication and preservation of one's work. Yet, at the same time, the poet shows in his work that Rome has many of the qualities of the house of *Fama*, not least the fact that, for the exiled poet, the city becomes an elusive and almost imaginary setting. Rome is no longer simply a construction of bricks and mortar, but a collection of readers, a space which secures the preservation of his poetry, and a concept which, however far away, perpetually inspires the poet.

The purpose of this research was primarily to investigate the importance of Rome in Ovid's texts, but a study of these texts also leads one to consider the

importance of Ovid to Augustan Rome. Rome and its readers provide the poet with inspiration and fame, a stimulus and a memorial for Ovid, but the Roman architectural topography is constructed from the pages of the poet's work, and the poet becomes a major architect of the Augustan landscape. Inasmuch as Ovid is a Roman author, it is difficult not to view Rome as an Ovidian city.

It is also difficult to avoid drawing conclusions about the poet's relationship with Augustus when analysing Ovid's relationship with the city, as the architect behind the landscape which Ovid's texts survey. Over the course of Ovid's work, Augustus is presented in as many different ways as the city itself is. The *princeps* is the bringer of order and stability to Rome, like the Sun in the *Metamorphoses*, and the master-architect and renovator in the *Fasti*. He is the absent and forbidding presence behind the closed doors of Rome in the *Tristia*, the figure who once gave land to poets and now deprives Ovid of his place in Rome, but might yet be persuaded to mitigate Ovid's exile in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. Yet, whatever one's thoughts are about Ovid's views on Augustus, the necessity of Augustus for Ovid's poetry cannot be doubted. Without Rome there would be no Ovid, but without Augustus, the Rome of Ovid's poetry would not exist. The construction and restoration of monuments by Augustus and Agrippa gives Ovid a landscape against which to express himself and to offer the reader different vistas of and possible ways to read Rome. At the same time, one is also led to wonder how necessary Ovid was to Augustus (and Augustan Rome): while critics have repeatedly explored how poets have reacted to the Augustan building project, one should also question how Augustus' building project was affected by Ovid's poetry. As Ovid continually writes about Rome, the monuments

which Augustus built are memorialised and live on, to the extent that many of these buildings have long since perished, but in Ovid's poetry they are as solidly real as ever.

The legacy of Ovid's exploration of Roman space can be seen in later imperial poetry, including Statius and Juvenal, as was briefly discussed in Chapters 2 and 4. Although Statius' poetry focusses on monuments outside of the city, study of the end of the *Fasti* highlights how Ovid's descriptions of the Temple of Hercules and the Muses at Rome also provides a model for Statian poetry on Pollius' temple of Hercules, as Ovid's work was one of many in a poetic tradition which influenced Statius' medial, programmatic poem. Similarly, Ovid's descriptions of his relationship with the city and Severus after exile, which recalls the dynamics between Tityrus and Meliboeus in *Eclogues* 1, can also be seen to prefigure the relationship between Umbricius, the city and Juvenal in *Satires* 3. Previous critics have studied the relationship between these later texts and texts which have also influenced Ovid's work, yet the vital Ovidian presence in these texts themselves has not been fully explored. Further research on later imperial poetry in general and not just in these specific poems, could be fruitful in considering how, as these poets seek to find their place within a developing, imperial landscape, Ovid's poetry informs their descriptions of space.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY


Altieri, C. (1973), 'Ovid and the Mycologists', *Novel* 7.31-40.

Alton, E.H., Wormell, D.E., and Courtney, E. (eds), (2005), *Publius Ovidius Naso Fastorum libri sex,* Berlin.

Anderson, W.S. (ed.) (1998), *Publius Ovidius Naso Metamorphoses,* Berlin.

Bailey, C. (ed.) (1921), *Lucreti: De Rerum Natura: Libri Sex,* Oxford.

Barchiesi, A. (1991), 'Discordant Muses', *PCPhS* 37.1-21.

Barchiesi, A. (1997a), *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse,* Berkeley.

Barchiesi, A. (1997b), 'Endgames: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 15 and *Fasti* 6', in D.H. Roberts, F.M. Dunn and D. Fowler (eds), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature,* Princeton, 181-208.

Barchiesi, A. (2002), 'Narrative Technique and Narratology in the *Metamorphoses*', in P. Hardie (ed.), *A Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge, 180-199.

Barchiesi, A. (2005), *Ovidio Metamorfosi, Volume I (Libri I-II),* Milan.

Barchiesi, A. (2007), 'Women on Top: Livia and Andromache', in R.K. Gibson, S.J. Green, A.R. Sharrock (eds), *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*, Oxford, 96-120.

Barchiesi, A. (2009), 'Phaethon and the Monsters' in P.R. Hardie (ed.), *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture,* Oxford, 163-88.

Barchiesi, A. (2011), 'Roman Callimachus', in B. Acosta-Hughes, L. Lehnus and S. Stephens (eds), *Brill's Companion to Callimachus,* Leiden, 509-33.

Birt, T. (1926). *Horaz' Lieder: Studien zur Kritik und Auslegung.* Leipzig

Bömer, F. (1969), *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen: Buch I-III,* Heidleberg.

Boyle, A.J. (2003), *Ovid and the Monuments: A Poet’s Rome*, Victoria.

Braun, L. (1991), ‘Wie Ovid sich die "Fama" Gedacht hat (*Met*. 12,39-63)’, *Hermes,* 119.116-19.

Braund, S. (ed.) (1996), *Juvenal: Satires, Book 1*, Cambridge.

Buchner, E. (1982), *Die Sonnenuhr des Augustus. Nachdruck aus RM 1976 und 1980 und Nachwort über die Ausgrabung 1980/81*, Mainz.

Cairns, F. (1995), ‘Horace's first Roman Ode (3.1)’, in R. Brock and A.J. Woodman (eds), *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*, *Eighth Volume: Roman Comedy, Augustan Poetry, Historiography,* Leeds, 91-142.

Cairns, F. (1971), *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Edinburgh

Cairns, F. (2012), *Roman Lyric: Collected Papers on Catullus and Horace*, Berlin.

Chiu, A. (2016), *Ovid’s Women of the Year: Narratives of Roman Identity in the Fasti*, Ann Arbor.

Ciccarelli, I. (2003), *Commento al II Libro dei Tristia di Ovidio,* Bari.

Claassen, J.M. (1999), ‘The vocabulary of exile in Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*’, *Glotta* 75.134-171.

Claassen, J.M. (2008), *Ovid Revisited: The Poet in Exile,* London.

Claassen, J.M. (2013), ‘Word Pictures: Visualising with Ovid’, *Acta Classica* 56.29-54.

Clément-Tarantino, S. (2016), ‘Wanderings of *Fama* and ‘Fame’s Narratives’ in the *Aeneid*’, in S. Kyriakidis (ed.), *Libera Fama: An Endless Journey,* Cambridge, 55-70.

Coleman, R. (ed.) (1977), *Vergil: Eclogues,* Cambridge.

Conte, G.B., Solodow J. (tr.) (1994), *Latin Literature: A History*, Baltimore.

Courtney, E. (1990), *P. Papini Stati: Silvae*, Oxford.

Courtney, E. (1993), *The Fragmentary Latin Poets,* Oxford.

Croisille, J.M. '(1985), 'Remarques sur l'episode Troyen dans les *Metamorphoses* d'Ovide', in J.M. Frecaut and D. Porte (eds), *Journees Ovidiennes de Parmenie: actes du colloque sur Ovide*, Brussels, 57-81.

Cutolo, P. (1991), 'Captatio ed Apologia in *Tristia* II', in I. Gallo and L. Nicastri (eds), *Cultura, Poesia Ideologia nell'Opera di Ovidio,* Naples, 265-86.

Davies, P.J.E. (2000), *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary monuments, from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius*, Cambridge.

Davis, P.J. (1995), '*Praeceptor Amoris*: Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and the Augustan Idea of Rome', *Ramus* 24.181-95.

Davis, P.J. (2008), 'Narrative Authority in Ovid's *Iliad*', *Studio in Onore di G.Arico*,1.429-440.

Debrohun, J.B. (2003), *Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy,* Ann Arbor.

Dickie, M. (2002), 'Who Were Privileged to See the Gods?', *Eranos* 100.109-27.

Diggle, J. (ed.), (1970), *Euripides: Phaethon*, Cambridge.

Dinter, M. (2011), 'Inscriptional Intermediality in Latin Elegy', in A. Keith (ed.), *Latin Elegy and Hellenistic Epigram. A Tale of Two Genres at Rome,* Cambridge, 7-18.

Dinter, M. (2013), 'Inscriptional Intermediality in Latin Literature', in P. Liddel and P. Low (eds), *Inscriptions and their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*, Oxford, 303-16.

Dippel, M. (1988), *Die Darstellung des trojanischen Krieges in Ovids Metamorphosen (XII 1 – XII 622)*, Frankfurt.

Due, O.S. (1974), *Changing Forms: Studies in the Metamorphoses of Ovid*, Copenhagen.

Dufallo, B. (2013), *The Captor's Image: Greek Culture in Roman Ekphrasis*, Oxford.

Dupont, F. (2009), 'The Corrupted Boy and the Crowned Poet, or The Material Reality and the Symbolic Status of the Literary Book at Rome', in W.A. Johnson and H.N. Parker (eds), *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, Oxford, 143-63.

Dyson, S.L. (2010), *Rome: A Portrait of a Living City,* Baltimore.

Eckerman, C. (2016), 'Freedom and Slavery in Vergil's *Eclogues* 1', *WS* 129.257-80.

Edwards, C. (1996), *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*, Cambridge.

Elliot, J. (2013), *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annals*, Cambridge.

Elsner, J. (2002), 'Introduction: The Genres of Ekphrasis', *Ramus* 31.1-18.

Evans, H.B. (1975), 'Winter and Warfare in Ovid's Tomis (*Tristia* 3.10)', *CJ* 3.1-9.

Faber, R. (2005), 'Poetics of Closure in Horace *Odes* 3.1', *AJPh* 126.93-106.

Faber, R. (2018), 'Intermediality and Ekphrasis in Latin Epic Poetry', *G&R* 65.1-14.

Fantham, E. (1986) 'Ovid, Germanicus and the composition of *Fasti* V', in F. Cairns (ed.) *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar 1985,* Liverpool, 243-81.

Fantham, E. (ed.) (1994), *Ovid: Fasti IV*, Cambridge.

Fantham, E. (2007), 'Dialogues of Displacement: Seneca's Consolations to Helvia and Polybius', in J.F. Gaertner (ed.), *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond,* Leiden, 173-92.

Farrell, J.A. (2004), 'Precincts of Venus: Towards a Prehistory of Ovidian Genre', *Hermathena* 177.27-69.

Farrell, J.A. (2014), 'The Poet in an Artificial Landscape: Ovid at *Falerii* (*Amores* 3.13)', in D. Nelis and M. Royo (eds), *Lire la Ville: Fragments d'une Archéologie Littéraire de Rome Antique*, Bordeaux, 215-236.

Favro, D. (1992), '*Pater Urbis*: Augustus as City Father in Rome' *JSAH* 51.61-84.

Favro, D. G. (1993), 'Reading the Augustan City', in P.J. Holliday (ed.), *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art,* Cambridge, 230-57.

Favro, D.G. (1996), *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome,* Cambridge.

Favro, D. (2005), 'Making Rome a World City', in K. Galinsky (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus,* Cambridge, 234-63.

Feeney, D. (1984), 'The Reconciliation of Juno', *CQ* 34.179-84.

Feeney, D. (1999), '*Mea Tempora:* Patterning of Time in the *Metamorphoses'*, in P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi and S. Hinds (eds), *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception*, Cambridge, 13-30.

Feeney, D. (2006), '*Si licet et fas est*: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate' in P. Knox (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Ovid,* Oxford, 464-488.

Feeney, D. (2007), *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and Beginnings of History*, Berkeley.

Feldherr, A. (2016), 'Nothing like the Sun: Repetition and Representation in Ovid's Phaethon Narrative', in L. Fulkerson and T. Stover (eds), *Repeat Performances: Ovidian Repetition and the Metamorphoses,* Madison, 26-46.

Ferriss-Hill, J. (2015), *Roman Satire and the Old Comic Tradition,* Cambridge.

Fitzgerald, W., and Spentzou, E. (eds), (2018), *The Production of Space in Latin Literature,* Oxford.

Fowler, D.P. (1997), 'On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies', *MD* 39.13-34.

Fowler, D.P. (2000), *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*, Oxford.

Fuhrer, T., Mundt, F., and Stenger, J. (eds), (2015), *Cityscaping: Constructing and Modelling Images of the City*, Berlin.

Freudenburg, K. (2001), *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal,* Cambridge.

Gaertner, J.F. (2005), *Ovid: Epistulae ex Ponto, Book I*, Oxford.

Gaertner, J.F. (2007), 'Ovid and the 'Poetics of Exile': How Exilic is Ovid's Exile Poetry', in J.F. Gaertner (ed.), *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond,* Leiden, 155-72.

Gale, M. (1994), *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius,* Cambridge.

Gale, M. (2013), 'Vergil's Caesar: Intertextuality and Ideology', in J. Farrell and D.P. Nelis (eds), *Augustan Poetry and the Republic*, 278-296.

Gardner, H.H. (2010), 'The Elegiac *Domus* in the Early Augustan Principate', *AJPh* 131.453-93.

Garrod, H.W. (ed.), (1901), *Q. Horati Flacci: Opera,* Oxford.

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

Geue, T. (2015), 'The Loser Leaves (Rome's Loss): Umbricius' Wishful Exile in Juvenal *Satire* 3', *CQ* 65. 773-787.

Geyssen, J. (1999), 'Sending a Book to the Palatine: Martial 1.70 and Ovid', *Mnemosyne,* 52.718-38.

Gibson, B. (1999), 'Ovid on Reading: Reading Ovid. Reception in *Tristia* II', *JRS* 89.19-37.

Gibson, R.K. (2003), *Ovid: Ars Amatoria Book 3*, Cambridge.

Gibson R.K. (2007a) *Excess and restraint: Propertius, Horace and Ovid's Ars Amatoria*, London.

Gibson, R.K. (2007b), 'Ovid, Augustus, and the Politics of Moderation in *Ars Amatoria* 3', , in R.K. Gibson, S.J. Green, A.R. Sharrock (eds), *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*, Oxford, 121-42.

Gibson, R.K. (2009), 'The *Ars Amatoria'* in P.E. Knox (ed.) *A Companion to Ovid,* Malden.

Gildenhard, I. (2007), 'Virgil and Ennius, or: The Undoing of the Annalist', in W. Fitzgerald and E.Gowers (eds), *Ennius Perennis: The Annals and Beyond*, Cambridge, 73-102.

Gildenhard, I., and Zissos, A. (1999), 'Problems of Time in *Metamorphoses* 2', in P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi and S. Hinds (eds), *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception*, Cambridge, 31-47.

Gildenhard, I., and Zissos, A. (2004), 'Ovid's *Hecale*: Deconstructing Athens in the *Metamorphoses*', *JRS* 94.47-72.

Gladhill, B. (2012), 'Gods, Caesars and Fate in *Aeneid* 1 and *Metamorphoses* 15', *Dictynna* 9.

Gladhill, B. (2013), ‘The *domus* of *Fama* and Republican Space in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*’, in J.A. Farrell and D.P. Nelis (eds), *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*, Oxford, 297-318.

Goold, G.P. (1998), *M. Manilii Astronomica*, Berlin.

Gow, A.S.F. (1952), *Theocritus Volume II: Edited with a Translation and Commentary*, Cambridge.

Gowers, E. (2005), ‘Talking Trees: Philemon and Baucis Revisited’, *Arethusa* 38.331-365.

Gowers. E. (2012), *Horace: Satires Book 1*, Cambridge.

Graverini, L. (2004), ‘A Book-like Self: Ovid and Apuleius’, *Hermathena* 177-78.225-50.

Green, S.J. (2004a), *Ovid’s* Fasti *1: A Commentary*, Leiden.

Green, S.J. (2004b), ‘Playing with Marble: Monuments of the Caesars in Ovid’s *Fasti*’, *CQ* 54.224-39.

Gummere, R. M. (ed.) *Seneca. Epistles 1-65*, Cambridge, Mass.

Gutzwiller, K. (1992), ‘Callimachus' Lock of Berenice: Fantasy, Romance, and Propaganda’ *AJPh* 113.359-85.

Hall, J.B. (ed.) (1995), *Publius Ovidius Naso Tristia,* Berlin.

Hannah, R., and Magli, G. (2011), ‘The Role of the Sun in the Pantheon’s Design and Meaning’, *Numen* 58.486-513.

Hannah, R. (2013), ‘Time in Written Spaces’, in G. Sears, P. Keegan, R. Laurence (eds), *Written space in the Latin West, 200 BC to AD 300*, London, 83-102.

Harder, A. (2012), *Callimachus Aetia: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford.

Hardie, A. (2002), ‘The *Georgics*, the Mysteries and the Muses at Rome’, *PCPhS* 48.175-208.

Hardie, A. (2007), ‘Juno, Hercules and the Muses at Rome’, *AJPh* 128.551-592.

Hardie, A. (2010), ‘An Augustan Hymn to the Muses (Horace *Odes* 3.4). Part II.’, *PLLS* 14. 191-317.

Hardie, A. *forthcoming,* ‘Singing with Clio: Image and Inspiration in the Shrine of the Muses’.

Hardie, P.R. (1991), ‘The Janus Episode in Ovid’s *Fasti*’, *MD* 26.47-64.

Hardie, P.R. (1992), ‘Augustan Poets and the Mutability of Rome’, in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman poetry and propaganda in the age of Augustus*, Bristol, 59-82.

Hardie, P.R. (2007), ‘Phrygians in Rome, Romans in Phrygia’, in G. Urso (ed.), *Tra Oriente e Occidente: indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia Minore*, Pisa, 93-103.

Hardie, P.R. (2002), *Ovid’s Poetics of Illusion*, Cambridge.

Hardie, P.R. (2008), ‘The Word Personified: Fame and Envy in Virgil, Ovid, Spenser’, *MD* 61.100-115.

Hardie, P.R. (2012), *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature*, Cambridge.

Hardie, P.R. (comm.) (2015), *Metamorphosi VI, Libri XIII – XV,* Rome.

Hardy, R.B. (1990), ‘Vergil’s Epitaph for Pastoral: Remembering and Forgetting in *Eclogue* 9’, *SyllClass* 2.29-38.

Harrison, S. (1993), ‘A Roman Hecale: Ovid *Fasti* 3.661-74’, *CQ* 43.455-457.

Harrison, S. (2002), ‘Ovid and Genre: Evolutions of an Elegist’, in P.R. Hardie (ed.), *The Cambridge Comparison to Ovid*, Cambridge, 79-94.

Harrison, S. (2007a), ‘Town and Country’, in S. Harrison (ed.), *The Cambridge Comparison to Horace*, Cambridge, 235-47.

Harrison, S. (2007b), ‘Exile in Latin Epic’, in , in J.F. Gaertner (ed.), *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond,* Leiden, 129-154.

Harrison, S. (2013), ‘Time, Place and Political Background’, in T. Thorsen (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy,* Cambridge, 133-150.

Helzle, M. (1988), 'Ovid's Poetics of Exile', *ICS* 13.73-83.

Helzle, M. (2003), *Ovids Epistulae ex Ponto: Buch I-II Kommentar*, Heidelberg.

Henderson, J. (2007), 'Bringing it all back home: Togetherness in Statius' *Silvae* 3.5', *Arethusa* 40.245-77.

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

Herbert-Brown, G. (2002), 'Ovid and the Stellar Calendar', in G. Herbert-Brown (ed.), *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium,* Oxford, 101-128.

Heslin, P. (2007), 'Augustus, Domitian and the so-called Horologium Augusti', *JRS* 97.1-20.

Heslin, P. (2015), *The Museum of Augustus: The Temple of Apollo in Pompeii, the Porticus of Philippus in Rome, and Latin Poetry,* Los Angeles.

Heyworth, S.J. (ed.) (2007a), *Sexti Properti Elegos*, Oxford.

Heyworth, S.J. (2007b), *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius,* Oxford.

Heyworth, S.J. (2019), *Ovid, Fasti Book 3,* Cambridge.

Heyworth, S.J., and Morwood, J.H.W. (2011), *A Commentary on Propertius Book 3,* Oxford.

Hinds, S. (1985), 'Booking the Return Trip. Ovid and *Tristia* 1' *PCPhS* 31.13-32.

Hinds, S. (1992a), '*Arma* in Ovid's *Fasti* Part 1: Genre and Mannerism', *Arethusa* 25.81-112.

Hinds, S. (1992b), '*Arma* in Ovid's *Fasti* Part 2: Genre, Romulean Rome and Augustan Ideology', *Arethusa* 25.113-154.

Hinds, S. (1998), *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge.

Horsfall, N. (1976), 'The Collegium Poetarum', *BICS* 23.79-95.

Horsfall, N. (1989), 'Aeneas the Colonist', *Vergilius* 8-27.

Hunter, R. (2006), *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome*, Cambridge.

Huskey, S. (2002), 'Ovid and the Fall of Troy in *Tristia* 1.3', *Vergilius* 48.88-104.

Huskey, S. (2006a), 'Ovid's (Mis)Guided Tour of Rome: Some Purposeful Omissions in *Tr*. 3.1', *CJ.* 102.17-39.

Huskey, S. (2006b), 'Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in *Tristia* I, I', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XIII*, Brussels, 335-357.

Hutchinson, G. (1988), *Hellenistic Poetry,* Oxford.

Hutchinson, G. (ed.) (2006), *Propertius. Elegies Book IV.* Cambridge.

Ingleheart, J. (2010a), *A Commentary on Ovid, Tristia, Book* 2, Oxford.

Ingleheart J. (2010b), 'The Literary 'Successor': Ovidian Metapoetry and Metaphor', *CQ* 60.167-72.

Ingleheart, J. (2015), '*Exegi Monumentum*: Exile, Death, Immortality and Monumentality in Ovid *Tristia* 3.3', *CQ* 65.286-300.

Innocenti Pierini R. degl' (1980), 'Echi delle elegie ovidiane dall'esilio nelle Consolationes ad Helviam e ad Polybium di Seneca', *SIFC* 52.109-43.

Jacobs, P.W., and Conlin, D.A. (2014), *Campus Martius: The Field of Mars in the Life of Ancient Rome*, Cambridge.

Jaeger, M. (1990), *Poetics of Place: The Augustan Writers and the Urban Landscape of Rome*, PhD Thesis, University of Berkeley.

Jaeger, M. (1997), *Livy's Written Rome*, Michigan.

Jones, F.M.A. (2014), 'Roman Gardens, Imagination and Cognitive Space', *Mnemosyne* 67.781-812.

Kaczor, S. (2019), *The Ovidian Soundscape: The Poetics of Noise in the Metamorphoses*, PhD Thesis, Columbia University.

Kampakoglou, A. (2013), 'Victory, Mythology and the Poetics of Intercultural Praise in Callimachus' *Victoria Berenices*', *Trends in Classics* 5.111-43.

Kaster, R.A. (2011), *Saturnalia, Volume I. Books 1-2,* Cambridge, Mass.

Keith, A. (2007), 'Imperial building projects and architectural ecphrases in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Statius' *Thebaid*', *Mouseion* 7.1-26.

Keith, A. (2015), 'Cityscaping in Propertius and the Elegists', in T. Fuhrer, F. Mundt and J. Stenger (eds), *Cityscaping: Constructing and Modelling Images of the City,* Berlin, 47-60.

Kelly, P. (2014), 'Voices within Ovid's house of *Fama*', *Mnemosyne* 67.65-92.

Kenney, E.J. (ed.) (1994), *P. Ovidi Nasonis: Amores; Medicamina Faciei Femineae; Ars Amatoria; Remedia Amoris*, Oxford.

Kenney, E.J. (ed.) (2014), *Lucretius: De Rerum Natura Book III*, Cambridge.

Kent, R.G. (ed.), (1938), *Varro. On the Latin Language, Volume I,* Cambridge, Mass.

King, J.E. (1927), *Cicero: Tusculan Disputations*, Cambridge, Mass.

Knox, P.E. (1986), *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the traditions of Augustan poetry,* Cambridge.

Knox, P.E. (2009), 'Texts and Topography', *CQ* 59.658-664.

Kossaifi, C. (2012), 'La Parole Tronquée: Fama dans les Tristes et les Pontiques d'Ovide', in P. Hummel (ed.), *De Fama: Études sur la Construction de la Réputation et de la Postérité,* Paris, 101-14.

Kyriakides, S. (2013), 'The Poet's Afterlife: Ovid between Epic and Elegy', in T.D. Papanghelis, S.J. Harrison and S. Frangoulidis (eds), *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations,* Berlin, 351-366.

Labate, M. (1984), *L'Arte di Farsi Amare. Modelli Culturali e Progetto Didascalico nell'Elegia Ovidiana*, Pisa.

Labate, M. (1987), 'Elegie Triste e Elegia Lieta. Un Caso di Reconversione Letteraria', *MD* 19.91-129.

Langley, B. (2016), 'Written on Running Water: Ovidian Poetics in the Roman Waterscape.', PhD Thesis, University of Washington.

Littlewood, R.J. (2006), *A Commentary on Ovid: Fasti VI*, Oxford.

Lieberg, G. (1982), *Poeta creator. Studien zu einer Figur der antiken Dichtung,* Amsterdam.

Lieberg, G. (1986), 'Poeta creator: Some Religious Aspects', in F. Cairns, S. Cairns and F. Williams (eds), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, Fifth Volume,* Liverpool, 23-32.

Lindheim, S.H. (2010), 'Pomona's *pomarium*: the 'mapping impulse' in *Metamorphoses* 14 (and 9)', *TAPhA* 140.163-194.

Lord, M. L. (1982), 'Petrarch and Vergil's First *Eclogue*: The *Codex Ambrosianus*', *HSPh* 86.253-76.

Lovatt, H. (2005), *Statius and Epic Games: Sport, Politics, and Poetics in the Thebaid*, Cambridge.

Lowrie, M. (2009), *Writing, Performance and Authority in Augustan Rome*, Oxford.

Lynch, K. (1960), *The Image of the City,* Cambridge, Mass.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1987), *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid,* Oxford.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (2007), *Collected Papers on Latin Poetry,* Oxford.

Maciver, C.A. (2020), 'Triphiodorus and the Poetics of Imperial Greek Epic', *CPh* 115.164-85.

Mader, G. (1988), 'Ovid the Iconoclast. Argumentation and Design in *Ars* III,101-128', *Latomus* 47.365-75.

Mader, G. (1993), 'Architecture, *Aemulatio* and Elegiac Self Definition', *CJ* 88.321-40.

Maltby, R. (2006), *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies,* Cambridge.

Martelli, F. (2009), 'Plumbing Helicon: Poetic Property and the Material World of Statius' *Silvae*', *MD* 62.145-77.

Martelli, F. (2013), *Ovid's Revisions: The Editor as Author*, Cambridge.

McGowan, M.M. (2009), *Ovid in Exile: Power and Poetic Redress in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto*, Leiden.

McKeown, J.C. (1984), '*fabula proposito nulla tegenda meo*: Ovid's *Fasti* and Augustan Politics', in A.J. Woodman and D. West (eds), *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, Cambridge, 169-87.

Merli, E. (2000), *Arma canant alii: Materia Epica e Narrazione Elegiaca nei Fasti di Ovidio,* Florence.

Michalopoulos, A.N. '*Famaque cum domino fugit ab urbe suo*: Aspects of *Fama* in Ovid's Exile Poetry', in S. Kyriakidis (ed.), *Libera Fama: An Endless Journey,* Cambridge, 94-110.

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

Miller, J.F. (1978), *Roman Elegiac Aetia: Propertius 4 and Ovid's Fasti in light of the poetry of Callimachus*, PhD Thesis, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Miller, J.F. (1983a), 'Ennius and the Elegists', *IllClass* 8.2.277-95.

Miller, J. F. (1983b), 'Propertius 3.2 and Horace', *TAPhA* 113.289-99.

Miller, J.F. (1992), 'The *Fasti* and Hellenistic Didactic: Ovid's Variant Aetiologies', *Arethusa* 25.1.11-31.

Miller, J.F. (2002a), 'The *Fasti*: Style, Structure and Time', in B. Weiden Boyd (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ovid,* Leiden, 167-196.

Miller, J.F. (2002b), 'Ovid on the Augustan Palatine (*Tristia* 3.1)', in J.F. Miller, C. Damon and K.S. Myers (eds), *Vertis in usum: studies in honor of Edward Courtney,* Munich, 129-39.

Miller, J.F. (2009), *Apollo, Augustus and the Poets*, Cambridge.

Miller, P.A. (2004), *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*, Princeton.

Mordine, M.J. (2010), '*sine me, liber, ibis*: The Poet, the Book and the Reader in *Tristia* 1.1.' *CQ* 60 524-544.

Morgan, L. (1999), *Patterns of Redemption in Vergil's Georgics,* Cambridge.

Morwood, J. (1991), 'Aeneas, Augustus and the Theme of the City', *G&R* 38.212-223.

Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.) (1958), *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina,* Oxford.

Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.) (1969), *P. Vergili Maronis: Opera,* Oxford.

Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.) (1990), *Virgil, Georgics*, Oxford.

Myers, K.S. (1994), *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*, Ann Arbor.

Myers, K.S. (2005), '*Docta Otia:* Garden Ownership and Configurations of Leisure in Statius and Pliny the Younger', *Arethusa* 38.103-29.

Myers, K.S. (2014), 'Ovid's Self-Reception in his Exile Poetry', in J.F. Miller and C.E. Newlands (eds), *A Handbook to the Reception of Ovid,* Malden, 8-21.

Nagle, B.R. (1980), *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid*, Brussels.

Nelis, D. (2005), 'The Roman Callimachus: Structure and Coherence in the Propertian *Corpus*', in A. Kolde, A. Lukinovich and A.-L. Rey (eds), *Koryphaiō andri: Mélanges offerts à Hurst*, Geneva, 235-48.

Nelis, D. (2008), 'Caesar, the Circus and the Charioteer in Vergil's *Georgics*' in J. Nelis-Clément and J.M. Roddaz (eds), *Le Cirque Romain et Son Image,* Paris, 497-520.

Nelis, D. (2015), 'Vergilian Cities. Visions of Troy, Carthage and Rome' in T. Fuhrer, F. Mundt, J. Stenger, (eds) (2015), *Cityscaping: Constructing and Modelling Images of the City,* Berlin, 19-46.

Nelis, D., and Royo, M. (eds), (2014), *Lire la ville: fragments d'une archéologie littéraire de Rome antique,* Bordeaux.

Nelis-Clement, J., and Nelis, D. (2013), '*Furor epigraphicus*: Augustus, the Poets, and the Inscriptions' in P. Liddel and P. Low (eds), *Inscriptions and their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*, Oxford, 317-347.

Nelis-Clement, J., and Nelis, D. (2014), 'Poésie, topographie et épigraphie à l'époque augustéenne' in D. Nelis, M. Royo (eds) (2014), *Lire la ville: fragments d'une archéologie littéraire de Rome antique,* Bordeaux, 125-60.

Néraudau, J.P. (1985), 'Rome dans *l'Art d'Aimer*' in J.M. Frecaut and D. Porte (eds), *Journées ovidiennes de Parménie. Actes du Colloque sur Ovide* (24-26 juin 1983), 25-39.

Newlands, C.E. (1991), '*Silvae* 3.1 and Statius' Poetic Temple', *CQ* 41.438-52.

Newlands, C.E. (1992), 'Ovid's Narrator in the *Fasti*', *Arethusa* 25.33-54.

Newlands, C.E. (1994), 'The Ending of Ovid's *Fasti*', *Ramus* 23.129-43.

Newlands, C.E. (1995), *Playing With Time,* New York.

Newlands, C.E. (1997), 'The Role of the Book in *Tristia* 3.1.', *Ramus* 26.1.57-79.

Newlands, C.E. (2002), *Statius' Silvae and the Poetics of Empire*, Cambridge.

Newlands, C.E. (2006), 'Ovid's Narrator in the *Fasti*', in P. Knox (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Ovid*, Oxford, 351-69.

Nisbett, G.M., and Rudd, N. (2004), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III,* Oxford.

Noreña, C.F. (2013), 'Locating the *Ustrinum* of Augustus', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 58.51-64.

O'Gorman, E. (1997), 'Love and the Family: Augustus and Ovidian Elegy', *Arethusa* 30.103-23.

Oliensis, E. (1997a), 'Return to Sender: The Rhetoric of *Nomina* in Ovid's *Tristia*', *Ramus* 26.2.172-193.

Oliensis, E. (1997b), 'The Erotics of *Amicitia*: Readings in Tibullus, Propertius and Horace', in J. Hallett and M. Skinner (eds), *Roman Sexualities*, Princeton, 151-71.

Oliensis, E. (1998), *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority,* Cambridge.

O'Sullivan, T.M. (2015), 'Augustan Literary Tours: Walking and Reading the City', in I. Östenberg, S. Malmberg and J. Bjørnebye (eds), *The Moving City: Processions, Passages and Promenades in Ancient Rome*, London, 111-122.

Owen, S.G. (ed.) (1915), *P. Ovidi Nasonis: Tristium Libri Quinque; Ibis; Ex Ponto Libri Quattuor; Halieutica Fragmenta*, Oxford.

Pandey, N. (2014), ‘Reading Rome from the Farther Shore: *Aeneid* 6 in the Augustan Urban Landscape’, *Vergilius* 60.85-116.

Pandey, N. (2018), *The Poetics of Power in Augustan Rome: Latin Responses to Early Imperial Iconography*, Cambridge.

Papaioannou, S. (2007), *Redesigning Achilles: ‘Recycling’ the Epic Cycle in the ‘Little Iliad’ (Ovid Metamorphoses 12.1-13.622)*, Berlin.

Pasco-Pranger, M. (2006), *Founding the Year: Ovid’s Fasti and the Poetics of the Roman Calendar*, Leiden.

Pinotti, P. (2015), ‘*Dulcius urbe quid est?*: Roma negli elegiaci’, *Annali Online di Ferrara* 10.37-57.

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

Prioux, E. (2011), ‘Callimachus’ Queens’ in B. Acosta-Hughes, L. Lehnus and S. Stephens (eds), *Brill’s Companion to Callimachus,* Leiden, 201-224.

Purcell, N. (1989), ‘Rediscovering the Roman forum’, *JRA* 2.156-66.

Purcell, N. (1993), ‘Atrium Libertatis’, *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 61.125-155.

Putnam, M.C.J. (1975), ‘Vergil’s First *Eclogue*: Poetics of Enclosure’, in A.J. Boyle (ed.), *Ancient Pastoral: Ramus Essays on Greek and Roman Pastoral Poetry,* Victoria, 81-104.

Putnam, M.C.J. (1994), ‘Virgil’s Danaid Ekphrasis’, *ICS* 19.171-189.

Putnam, M.C.J. (2001), ‘Ovid, Virgil and Myrrha's metamorphic exile’, *Vergilius* 47.171-93.

Putnam, M.C.J. (2007), ‘Troy in Latin Literature’, *NECJ* 34.195-205.

Putnam, M.C.J. (2010), ‘Vergil, Ovid and the Poetry of Exile’, in M.C.J. Putnam and J. Farrell (eds), *A Companion to Vergil’s Aeneid and its Tradition,* Oxford, 80-95.

Ramsby, T. (2007), *Textual Permanence: Roman Elegists and the Epigraphic Tradition,* London.

Reitz, C. (2013), ‘Describing the Invisible: Ovid’s Rome’, *Hermes* 141.283-93.

Rebeggiani, S. (2013), ‘The Chariot Race and the Destiny of the Empire in Statius' *Thebaid*’, *ICS,* 38.187-206.

Rehak, P. (2006), *Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius,* Madison.

Richmond, J.A. (ed.) (1990), *Publius Ovidius Naso Ex Ponto libri quattor*, Berlin.

Rimell, V. (2015), *The Closure of Space in Roman Poetics: Empire’s Inward Turn*, Cambridge.

Robinson, M. (2011), *A Commentary on Ovid’s Fasti Book 2,* Oxford.

Rohr Vio, F. (2017), ‘*Clari Monumenta Philippi: Poesia e Politica nei Fasti di Ovidio*’, *Paideia* 72.279-91.

Rolfe, J.C. (ed.) (1914), *Suetonius. Lives of the Caesars, Volume I,* Cambridge, Mass.

Roller, M. (2013), ‘On the Intersignification of Monuments in Augustan Rome’, *AJPh* 134.119-31.

Rosati, G. (2002), ‘Narrative Techniques and Narrative Structures in the *Metamorphoses*’, in B.W. Boyd (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Ovid,* Boston, 271-304.

Rudd, N. (1966), *The Satires of Horace*, Cambridge.

Rüpke, J. (1995), ‘Fasti: Quellen oder Produkte römischer Geschichtsschreibung?’, *Klio* 77.184-202.

Rüpke, J. (2006), ‘Ennius’ *Fasti* in Fulvius’ Temple: Greek Rationality and Roman Tradition’, *Arethusa* 39.489-512.

Schiesaro, A. (2014), ‘*Materiam Superabat Opus*: Lucretius Metamorphosed’, *JRS* 104.73-104.

Schmitzer, U. (1990), *Zeitgeschichte in Ovids Metamorphosen: Mythologische Dichtung unter politischem Anspruch*, Stuttgart.

Schütz, M. (1990), 'Zur Sonnenuhr des Augustus auf dem Marsfeld: eine Auseinandersetzung mit E. Buchners Rekonstruktion und seiner Deutung der Ausgrabungsergebnisse aus der Sicht eines Physikers', *Gymnasium* 432-57.

Segal, C. P. (1965), '*Tamen Cantabitis, Arcades*: Exile and Arcadia in *Eclogues* One and Nine', *Arion* 4.237-66.

Segal, C.P. (1969), *Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Study in the Transformations of a Literary Symbol*, Wiesbaden.

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.) (1999), *Cicero. Letters to Atticus, Volume I*, Cambridge, Mass.

Sharrock, A. (1994a), 'Ovid and the Politics of Reading', *MD* 33.97-122.

Sharrock, A. (1994b), *Seduction and Repetition in Ars Amatoria 2*, Oxford.

Sharrock, A. (2013), 'The poeta-amator, nequitia and recusatio', in T. Thorsen (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy,* Cambridge, 151-65.

Shaya, J. (2013), 'The Public Life of Monuments: The *Summa Viri* of the Forum of Augustus' *AJA* 117.83-110.

Shea, K.J. (2011), (*Re)visions of Love: Augustan Visual Culture in Ovid's Amores*, PhD Thesis, New Brunswick.

Simpson, C.J. (2002), '*exegi monumentum*: Building Imagery and Metaphor in Horace, *Odes* 1-3' *Latomus* 61.57-66.

Solodow, J. (1988), *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Chapel Hill.

Skutsch, O. (1944), 'Enniana I', *CQ* 38.79-86.

Skutsch, O. (1985), *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*, Oxford.

Smith, A. (1997), *Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Virgil,* Michigan.

Spencer, D. (2009), 'Roman Landscape: Culture and Identity', *New Surveys in the Classics,* 39.1-236.

Spentzou, E. (2005), 'Silenced Subjects: Ovid's Heroines in Exile', in R. Ancona and E. Greene (eds), *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry,* Baltimore, 318-40.

Spentzou, E. (2018), ‘Propertius’ Aberrant Itineraries’, in W. Fitzgerald and E. Spentzou (eds), *The Production of Space in Latin Literature,* Oxford, 23-41.

Squire, M. (2009), *Image and Text in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, Cambridge.

Tarrant, R.J. (ed.) (2004), *P. Ovidi Nasonis: Metamorphoses*, Oxford.

Taylor, L.R., and Holland, L.A, (1952), ‘Janus and the *Fasti*’, *CPh*, 47.137-42.

Thomas, R. (1983), ‘Callimachus, The *Victoria Berenices*, and Roman Poetry’, *CQ* 33.92-113.

Thorsen, T.S. (2018), ‘Intrepid Intratextuality: The Epistolary Pair of Leander and Hero’, in S. Harrison, S. Frangoulidis and T.D. Papanghelis (eds), *Intratextuality and Latin Literature*, Berlin, 257-71.

Tissol, G. (1997), *The Face of Nature: Wit and Narrative and Cosmic Origins in Ovid’s Metamorphoses,* Princeton.

Tissol, G. (2002), ‘The House of Fame: Roman History and Augustan Politics in *Metamorphoses* 11-15’, in B.W. Boyd (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Ovid*, Boston, 305-336.

Tissol, G. (2005), ‘Maimed Books and Maimed Authors: *Tristia* 1.7 and the fate of the *Metamorphoses’*, in W.W. Batstone and G. Tissol (eds), *Defining Genre and Gender in Latin Literature: Essays Presented to William S. Anderson on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday,* New York, 97-112.

Tissol, G. (2014), *Epistulae ex Ponto Book I,* Cambridge.

Tueller, M.A. (2008), *Look Who’s Talking: Innovations and Identity in Hellenistic Epigram,* Leuven.

Vasaly, A. (1993), *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*, Berkeley.

Veyne, P. (2002), ‘The Pastoral in City Clothes’, in P.A. Miller (ed.), *Latin Erotic Elegy: An Anthology and Reader*, Abingdon, 366-85.

Volk, K. (1997), ‘*Cum carmine crescit et annus*: Ovid’s *Fasti* and the Poetics of Simultaneity’, *TAPhA* 127. 287-313.

Volk, K. (2002), *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manlius*, Oxford.

Walker, A.D. (1997), 'Oedipal narratives and the exilic Ovid', *Ramus* 26.2.194-204.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1987), 'Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus and the *Fasti*' in M.Whitby, P.Hardie and M.Whitby (eds), *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, Bristol, 221-230.

Watson, P. (1982), 'Ovid and *cultus*: *Ars Amatoria* 3.113-28', *TAPhA* 112.237-44.

Weeda, L. (2015), *Vergil's Political Commentary in the Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid*, Berlin.

Welch, T.S. (2005), *The Elegiac Cityscape: Propertius and the Meaning of Roman Monuments,* Columbus.

Welch, T. (2012), 'Elegy and the Monuments', in B.K. Gold (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*, Malden.

Wheeler, S.M. (2000), *Narrative Dynamics in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Tübingen.

Williams, C.A. (2012), *Reading Roman Friendship,* Cambridge.

Williams, G. (1978), *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire*, Berkeley.

Williams, G. (1991), 'Conversing after Sunset: A Callimachean Echo in Ovid's Exile Poetry', *CQ* 41.169-77.

Williams, G. (1994), *Banished Voices: Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry*, Cambridge.

Winterbottom, M. (1976), 'Vergil and Confiscations', *G&R* 23.55-9.

Wyke, M. (1987), 'The Elegiac Woman at Rome', *PCPhS* 33.153-78.

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

Ziogas, I. (2013), 'The Topography of Epic Narrative in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', in M. Skempis and I. Ziogas (eds), *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Configurations of Space in Greek and Roman Epic*, Berlin, 349-72.

Zumwalt, N. (1977), ‘*Fama Subversa.* Theme and structure in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 12’, *CSCA* 10.209-22.