

**Jupiter and Juno in Ovid's *Fasti*:
Prismatic Personae and Polarity**

Timothy Sean Brannelly
Dover, Massachusetts

B.A., Cornell University, 2008
M.A., University of Virginia, 2012

A Dissertation presented to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Virginia in
Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Classics

University of Virginia

John F. Miller, Co-Director
K. Sara Myers, Co-Director
Anthony Corbeill, Third Reader
Tyler Jo Smith, Outside Reader

ABSTRACT

The goal of this dissertation is two-fold. The first is to engage with the ways in which Ovid presents the figures of Jupiter and Juno throughout his *Fasti*, in terms of their epithets, their placement within various episodes, their mythological, religious, and political affiliations, and their relationship with one another. Toward this end, I offer a close analysis of the majority of passages in the *Fasti* that feature either of these two deities. I aim to show that Ovid draws upon a multitude of considerations when crafting their variegated personae in each individual episode, while at the same time creating a thread that connects many of these episodes together, despite their chronological separation and disparate contexts. In addition, I argue that calendrical considerations, such as Juno's jurisdiction over the Kalends and Jupiter's over the Ides, play a larger part in the unfolding of their complex and many-sided personae than has been previously acknowledged. This dynamic leads to the second goal of this dissertation, which is to emphasize the polarizing effects that result from Ovid's prismatic representation of these two central deities. One way he achieves this result is by often conflating the religious with the mythological, to the point where the two become inseparable. In the first chapter I discuss the different aspects of Juno's worship and how Ovid's *Fasti* looks back at Juno's characterization in Ennius and Vergil, while at the same time innovating considerably. Analysis there is focused on three episodes, all of which occur on the Kalends, the day sacred to Juno. The second chapter attempts to trace the association of Jupiter and Augustus that is prevalent throughout the *Fasti* and to show that it marks yet another example of Ovid presenting a prismatic and polarizing figure of a god. I argue that Ovid intentionally blends both positive and negative aspects of imperial power into his characterization of Jupiter, such that the reader is meant to see in Augustus a divine figure, who at the same time is subject to some of the less regal features of Jupiter. The third chapter offers a survey of the treatment of Jupiter and Juno as a pair from Homer down to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, before launching into an analysis of Ovid's employment of that motif in his *Fasti*. I posit that Ovid deliberately intermingles the sacred days of these two deities, such that Jupiter infringes upon Juno's Kalends both in February and in May, prompting a destabilization that ultimately leads to Juno's Hellenic persona taking precedence over her Roman characterization. The issue of polarity is once again brought to the forefront, as Jupiter continually is viewed as a protective Roman deity, even in episodes where Juno would more appropriately perform that function.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is an honor and a privilege to have been taught and mentored by such a fine group of scholars and educators. My interest in the field of Classics was first piqued by my high school Latin teacher, Chris Richards, whose enthusiasm for the subject matter was matched only by the care he demonstrated for his students. That interest continued to grow and solidify during my time as an undergraduate at Cornell University under the auspices of Michael Fontaine, Pietro Pucci, Jeff Rusten, Hunter Rawlings III, and especially the late David Mankin, mentor and friend, who offered me my very first introduction to Ovidian poetry, cultivated my interest in the broader field of Classics, and encouraged me to pursue graduate study at his own alma mater, the University of Virginia. My semester in Rome at the ICCS in the spring of 2007 and the mentorship provided by Doug Forasté and Greg Bucher further contributed to my overall Classical education and offered me my first exposure to ancient Roman topography. At the University of Virginia I encountered an exceptionally collegial environment and an equally dedicated faculty that prides itself on training well-rounded Classicists. Among the members of my committee, I owe an extraordinary debt of thanks to my co-directors, John Miller and Sara Myers. Not only did their many courses drastically expand my knowledge of ancient Roman literature and religion, but their unwavering commitment during the dissertation process was invaluable. Throughout countless iterations of this project they never failed to offer constructive criticism, useful bibliographical material, and much-needed encouragement. John Miller constantly pushed me to dig deeper and develop my ideas more concretely, while Sara Myers helpfully rooted out inconsistencies and steered me toward the most recent and relevant scholarship. I am also grateful to Tony Corbeill for providing numerous insightful comments and suggestions that have immensely improved the final version of this project. Thanks is also owed to Tyler Jo Smith, who not only graciously agreed to serve as my outside reader, but did so with great enthusiasm and positivity. There are countless other faculty members at UVA who over the years have assisted me both professionally as well as personally, including Jon Mikalson, Ted Lendon, Elizabeth Meyer, Greg Hays, Tony Woodman, Coulter George, and Jenny Clay. In addition, I am particularly thankful to Jane Crawford for her friendship and for our many conversations about Ovid, Classics, and life. I am also extremely fortunate to have had so many great friends and colleagues who have provided me with ample intellectual, emotional, and spiritual support. I would be remiss if I did not single out a few of them: Danny, Megan, Mary, Courtney, Harriet, Ben, Jennifer, Scott, Jocelyn, Daniel, Kevin, Matt, Brett, Evan, and Nick. My final and most sincere debt of

gratitude goes to my parents, who supported my interest in the Classical World from its inception and championed my progress at every turn. Were it not for their constant encouragement and reassurance, this dissertation would never have found its way to completion.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
I. Topic Overview.....	1
II. Survey of Relevant Scholarship.....	10
III. Chapter One Summary.....	15
IV. Chapter Two Summary.....	19
V. Chapter Three Summary.....	25
 CHAPTER	
1. JUNO ON THE KALENDS OF JANUARY, MARCH, AND JUNE: MYTH, CULT, AND INTERTEXTUALITY.....	32
I. Juno and the Kalends in Ovid's <i>Fasti</i>	36
II. Juno and Janus on the Kalends: Engagement with Ennius and Vergil.....	45
III. Mytho-historical Implications of Juno as <i>Saturnia</i>	56
IV. Juno and the Sabines in the <i>Met.</i> : Intertextuality and Generic Play.....	63
V. A Review of the Evidence of Juno on the Kalends of January.....	73
VI. The Kalends of March: Forging a New Junonian Identity.....	75
VII. Calendrical Competition: The Proem of June.....	89
VIII. Juno's Justifications for June.....	98
IX. Juno and Juventas.....	125
X. The Kalends of June: Janus and Juno again.....	132
XI. Conclusions.....	135
 2. JUPITER AND AUGUSTUS IN OVID'S <i>FASTI</i>.....	137
I. Scholarly Views on Augustan Politics in the <i>Fasti</i>	138
II. Hellenistic and Roman Evidence for Divine Assimilation.....	143
III. Jupiter-Augustus in Horace.....	152
IV. Jupiter-Augustus in Ovid's <i>Met.</i>	155
V. Jupiter-Augustus in Ovid's Exile Poetry.....	166
VI. Jupiter and Janus on the Kalends of January.....	173

VII. The Ides of January.....	182
VIII. The Aftermath of the Ides of January.....	190
IX. The Nones of February: Celebration of Augustus as <i>Pater Patriae</i>	207
X. Jupiter in the Callisto Narrative.....	214
XI. Jupiter on the Feralia.....	218
XII. A Toast to Augustus on the Caristia.....	222
XIII. Jupiter Elicius and the Kalends of March.....	225
XIV. Praise of Veiovis.....	233
XV. An Absent Jupiter on the Ides of March.....	236
XVI. Jupiter and Maestas.....	238
XVII. Jupiter, Augustus, and the Lares on the Kalends of May.....	242
XVIII. Jupiter's Rescue of the Dioscuri.....	247
XIX. Conclusions.....	251

3. JUPITER AND JUNO: THE DIVINE PAIR IN

OID'S *FASTI*256

I. Jupiter and Juno on the Kalends of February.....	263
II. Jupiter, Juno, and Callisto	278
III. Jupiter and Juno on the Feralia.....	291
IV. Jupiter, Juno, and Flora.....	304
V. Looking Forward to June.....	318
VI. Jupiter from the Perspective of Juno.....	322
VII. The Kalends of June and the Gallic Siege of the Capitoline Hill: Juno Moneta and Jupiter Pistor.....	327
VIII. Juno's Hostility on the Matralia.....	334
IX. Final Glimpses of Jupiter and Juno in the <i>Fasti</i>	344
X. Looking Forward to September.....	353
XI. Conclusions.....	355

CONCLUSION362

BIBLIOGRAPHY 373

INTRODUCTION

I. TOPIC OVERVIEW

As Denis Feeney states in the introduction to his influential book *The Gods in Epic*, “The representation of the divine in post-Homeric epic was not and could not be an unmediated response to earlier poetry, but found its form within a rich and complex intellectual environment.”¹ One particular aspect of Feeney’s study engages with the ways in which a deity’s cultic background reflects his/her influence on the poem’s significance and its generic archetype. While the figure of Zeus in Homer, Hesiod, Euripides, and Apollonius is grounded in his abiding religious identity, his portrayal differs considerably amongst the various authors and time periods. So too is the case with the characterization of deities among the Roman poets, who look back toward both Greek and Roman models, while at the same time taking stock of their own contemporaneous cultural milieu. Thus, while the underlying religious conceptions of the deities behind the literary manifestation of the gods remains somewhat constant,² the way in which they are depicted in literature is in a perpetual state of flux.³ This study will concern two deities, namely Jupiter and Juno, from the perspective of a single work, Ovid’s *Fasti*, and will attempt to shed some light on the manifold factors that contribute to their complex characterization in this poem, including cultic, mythological, political, and intertextual considerations.

In addition to cultic concerns, genre plays a significant role in how the gods are portrayed in ancient poetry. While Feeney’s study is concerned wholly with analyzing the ways in which epic poets portray the gods, these same methods can be applied to the analysis of gods in elegiac

¹ Feeney (1991) 2.

² As Feeney (1991) 4 goes on to state, extrapolating from Mikalson’s argument regarding the varying treatment of Athenian gods in the literature of the 4th and 5th centuries B.C (Mikalson [1983] 114).

³ See Feeney (1998).

poetry. This is especially true given that the gods in elegiac poetry to some extent act as foils to their epic counterparts.⁴ While Ovid's *Fasti* is not an epic poem according to both its meter and its subject matter, it nevertheless defines itself against the backdrop of epic, at times satirizing established epic tropes, while at other times epicizing elegy such that it mimics the scale and grandeur of epic, but always with an emphasis on reinterpretation. Indeed, the similarity in content between many parts of the elegiac *Fasti* and the epic *Metamorphoses* formed the basis for Richard Heinze's seminal study, entitled *Ovids elegische Erzählung*, in which he endeavored to distinguish between elegiac and epic forms of narrative and define them categorically.

Although his study was met with much skepticism by the majority of scholars, with the primary criticism being that his categories were too absolute and could not be mapped precisely onto the texts, his core concept was eventually revisited and fine-tuned by Stephen Hinds, who recognized the fluidity of genre and espoused the new view that Ovid was deliberately playing with the reader's expectation rather than enforcing strict generic limitations.⁵ This redirection of Heinze's thesis has had considerable influence on more recent studies of the *Fasti* that have focused on cross-generic play, such as Alessandro Barchiesi's *The Poet and the Prince* and Carole Newlands' *Playing with Time*, both of which are central to the current study.

Roman love elegy as a whole constitutes a genre in which the gods themselves are "elegized," to the extent that they act in concert with the poet's erotic world rather than as representatives of actual state religion. This dynamic is most apparent in the representation of the gods concerned with love and desire, principally Venus and Cupid, whom the elegiac poets continually cite for inspiration and assistance amidst their amorous pursuits. Yet, the elegiazation of divine figures in Roman love elegy extends also to gods that have no natural affiliation with

⁴ See Hinds (1987) 103-14.

⁵ Hinds (1987).

love, including Jupiter himself. For example, Tibullus in his first book of elegy has the salacious god Priapus invoke Jupiter as an accomplice in the act of adultery, an image that hardly jibes with the stately and regal personae of Jupiter as a cult deity.⁶ That said, there are several instances of Roman love elegy that anticipate the more cultic and religious-oriented depiction of the gods that we see in Ovid's *Fasti*. Tibullus opens his second book with an invocation to his patron, Messalla Corvinus, while paying homage to various deities associated with the countryside.⁷ Propertius devotes much of his fourth book of elegies to a series of aetiologies concerning Roman rites, which had a substantial influence on the style and form of Ovid's *Fasti*. Even Ovid in his earlier love poetry occasionally veers away from a purely elegized portrayal of the gods. One instance of this, which will be discussed more thoroughly in the body of this study, is *Am.* 3.13, which provides a vivid account of the festival of Juno that took place in Falerii, the town in which Ovid's wife was born. Thus it is fair to say that the underlying cultic and religious subject matter of Ovid's *Fasti* separates it from the majority of the Roman elegiac genre, which casts the gods in a light that primarily reflects their influence within the sphere of the elegiac universe. That is not to say that Ovid's *Fasti* is devoid of typical elegiac topoi (for it is, after all, an elegiac poem), but rather that Ovid has grafted elegiac diction, themes, and humor onto what he himself refers to as a greater form of elegy.⁸ Indeed, one goal of this study to show that Ovid draws upon both epic and elegiac motifs when it comes to his rendering of the characters Jupiter and Juno, to the point where the two genres are constantly in interplay with one another.⁹

⁶ Tib. 1.4.23-4: *gratia magna Iovi: vetuit pater ipse valere, / iurasset cupide quidquid ineptus amor.*

⁷ Tib. 2.1.

⁸ Ov. *Fast.* 2.3: *nunc primum velis, elegi, maioribus itis.*

⁹ As Hinds (1987) argues.

In addition to pushing the boundaries of generic play, Ovid's *Fasti* famously explores Roman culture through the vehicle of the Roman calendar, which relies first and foremost on the inseparable combination of religion and politics. Indeed, Feeney also acknowledges the degree to which Latin epic poets use divine figures to reinforce Roman political concerns, which constitutes yet another part of the complex intellectual environment of the rich literary depiction of the gods.¹⁰ Ovid's treatment of divine figures in the *Fasti*, therefore, offers insight not only into the vast cog of Roman religious rites, but also opens up an avenue of exploration into the contemporary political situation and Augustan ideology, in a way similar to Vergil's *Aeneid*. For not only did Ovid compose his *Fasti* at a time when the Roman government was undergoing permanent change from a Republic to an Empire, but the poem itself allows the reader to experience that change from a fixed point in time through its amalgamation of Republican and imperial festivals. Ovid's explication of these festivals is scarcely without the presence of divine figures, who not only function as an integral part of these sacred days on a granular level, but who also function as a lens into Ovidian style and decision-making. In addition, it is important to point out that while literary motivations most likely drove Ovid's decision to frame his poem around the Roman calendar,¹¹ political motivations ought not be ignored, principally the fact that one of the central components of Augustus's political agenda was his desire to maintain control over the Roman calendar and, by extension, over Roman time.¹² Thus Ovid's portrayal of the divine in his *Fasti* offers the reader a unique opportunity to see the gods of past literary treatments blended with the gods of the Roman calendar.

¹⁰ Feeney (1991) 105-08.

¹¹ For the calendar as the central framework of the poem see Rüpke (1994) 125-29 and Wheeler (1999) 45-47.

¹² See Wallace-Hadrill (1987) 226, Beard (1987), and Newlands (1995) 22-24.

Ovid's *Fasti* is a poem whose reputation as a literary work has been resuscitated by a myriad of scholarly publications over the past thirty years.¹³ What was once merely a mine for details concerning Roman religious festivals, historical events, and etymologies has now nearly universally been recognized as a literary masterpiece, on par with Ovid's other poetic projects.¹⁴ As such, it demands to be read as a complex piece of Latin literature that not only encompasses a wide range of themes, but which also looks back to an immensely diverse group of literary precedents. It has been shown that Ovid's *Fasti* is indebted to Aratus' *Phaenomena*, Varro's *Antiquitates*, Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*, Vergil's *Aeneid*, Propertius' fourth book of elegies, and, perhaps above all, to Callimachus' *Aetia*, which not only provided Ovid with a model for undertaking the role of antiquarian researcher, but was also (together with Callimachus' *Hymns*) responsible for influencing the degree to which Ovid would embed imperial panegyric—or the appearance thereof—into his poetic calendar.¹⁵ In addition, Verrius Flaccus' *Fasti Praenestini*, which was composed contemporaneously under the direction of Augustus, had a considerable influence on Ovid's poetic calendar, both in terms of content and style.¹⁶ The fact that the *Fasti* draws upon so many different authors and genres contributes to its uniqueness and plays into the dynamic of presenting many of its figures in a prismatic way. At the same time, its blend of

¹³ Starting perhaps with the publication of the new Teubner edition in 1978 and championed by the many contributions of J. F. Miller, Fantham, Barchiesi, Newlands, and Herbert-Brown (see bibliography for specific works).

¹⁴ Cf. Fantham (1995b).

¹⁵ Miller (2002a) 175-76.

¹⁶ Miller (2002a) 172-74 offers good insight into Ovid's engagement with Verrius Flaccus, along with the useful suggestion that Flaccus served "as an intertext, not just a source" for Ovid's *Fasti*.

humor and seriousness, coupled with its claim to separate *arae* from *arma* (*Fast.* 1.13), endow it with a certain polarity, reflected in its very choice of meter—the elegiac couplet.¹⁷

Ovid himself tells us that his work on the *Fasti* was interrupted by his fateful exile in the year 8 A.D. (*Tr.* 2.549-52), which no doubt had a dramatic effect on both Ovid’s temperament as well as his poetic output.¹⁸ Heyworth observes that *Tristia* 3, the first book in which Ovid formally comes to grips with the state of his surroundings, evinces a noticeable absence of temporal movement, stemming in part from the lack of civilization that Ovid experiences in Tomis.¹⁹ Heyworth further invites us “to see all parts of the text as issued by a man living, against his will, in Tomi,”²⁰ putting the onus on the reader—Ovid himself included—to expand the range of meaning that can be derived. While Ovid’s *Fasti* lavishes much attention on Augustus himself, it also casts a wider net and pays homage to the other principal members of the imperial family, such as Germanicus, Tiberius, and Livia.²¹ This dynamic emphasizes the fact that the *Fasti* is both an Augustan and a Tiberian poem, which looks forward to the future as well as back to the past. Indeed, the revised dedication to Germanicus at the very beginning of the work is

¹⁷ Ovid’s choice of writing his religiously charged poem in the meter normally reserved for lighter, amatory themes has drawn the attention of numerous scholars, some of whom see Ovid as merely redirecting the scope the elegiac genre (Fantham [1986] 258, [1998] 25), while others grapple with the dichotomy of Ovid’s epic/weighty subject matter slotted into lighter elegiac couplets (Hinds [1992] 81-152, Barchiesi [1997a] 19-23, Miller [2002a] 181-82). See Green (2004a) 37-8 for a summary of the issue, who concludes his survey in open-minded fashion: “No one interpretation, it would seem, can pin down Ovid’s thematic and generic programme in *Fasti*, and it would be prudent to keep all viable interpretations in mind.”

¹⁸ On the issue of revision in exile see Green (2004a) 15-24, esp. n. 5 on p. 16, which outlines the general view of the *Fasti*’s compositional chronology. Cf. also Fantham (1986) and (1998) 3.

¹⁹ Heyworth (2020) 10, noting, “Tomi is a place without ritual, without memorials, without interlocutors.”

²⁰ Heyworth (2020) 11.

²¹ See Fantham (1986), Green (2004a) 17 and Knox (2004).

further evidence of the lateness of its final form.²² Ultimately, the revisionist state of the poem melds well with the polyphony that it exudes in other respects. For as Heyworth astutely observes, “The poet wants us to regard the poem as both finished and unfinished, written in Rome and written in Tomi, composed both before exile and years later, after the death of Augustus.”²³

Of particular interest to this study is the way in which Ovid equates Augustus with Jupiter, both directly and indirectly, and, to a lesser extent, Livia with Juno. The question of how the Augustan poets dealt with the issue of Augustan politics is a notoriously difficult one, especially in the case of Ovid, whose conceptions are masked by what Stephen Hinds has fittingly refers to as his “Hermeneutic alibi.”²⁴ At the beginning of chapter 2 I have attempted to summarize the issue as it relates to the *Fasti*, in the hopes of providing the smallest glimmer of clarification amidst the mountainous volume of varying scholarly opinions. Indeed, one of the primary goals of this study is to show how Ovid deftly imbues his characterization of Jupiter and Juno with a political veneer, while simultaneously activating aspects of their divinity culled from particular literary representations, from broader mythological sources, and from specific Roman cult activities.

From the many divine characters and interlocutors in Ovid’s *Fasti*, I have chosen to focus my analysis on Jupiter and Juno for several reasons. Perhaps the most obvious, but certainly not

²² Heyworth (2020) 10 attributes this late dedication both to Germanicus’ status as “a more sympathetic figure than the emperor himself,” and to Germanicus’ translation of Aratus’ *Phaenomena*, which served as a model for the *Fasti*.

²³ Heyworth (2018) 119.

²⁴ Hinds (1987) 23-9 employs this phrase in his influential discussion of the difficulty of interpreting Ovid in a singularly definitive way. Fantham (1995) 49 in summarizing Hinds’ view speaks of Ovid’s unique ability to “compose a text that bore loyalty on its face but could be read differently by other readers, according to their taste.”

the most compelling, reason for this choice is the fact that Jupiter and Juno represent the epic gods par-excellence, with Zeus/Jupiter and Hera/Juno playing the central divine roles in both the principal Greek and Roman epics, namely the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid*. They also constitute important divine characters in Ovid's epic *Metamorphoses*, where they recur, often alongside one another, as the driving force behind many of Ovid's transformations. As such, there is much room for analysis when it comes to the ways in which Ovid chooses to imitate or veer away from their canonical epic representations, even his own. For the sake of relevance and concision, I do not address here any Greek cult titles of Zeus or Hera and I limit my discussion of Roman cult titles to those that are mentioned or alluded to by Ovid. In addition to their pervasive appearances in epic poetry, Jupiter and Juno are also an interesting case because of their unique familial relationship as both siblings and spouses. Indeed, the third chapter of this study is devoted to the ways in which Ovid manipulates their close connection by constantly drawing them together and then wrenching them apart again. I interpret Ovid's treatment of them as a pair throughout the *Fasti* as a manifestation of their diverse treatment throughout literary history, culminating in a very Roman view of Jupiter amidst a regrettably non-Roman image of Juno.

While the unique relationship of Jupiter and Juno to one another as well as their prevalence in epic literature certainly contributed to my decision to focus squarely upon them in the *Fasti*, the most compelling reason for doing so is their relationship with the calendar itself, the very mechanism by which Ovid unfurls his smorgasbord of festivals and aetiologies. Not only do these two deities maintain their own sacred days of month, with Juno being worshipped on the Kalends and Jupiter on the Ides, but Ovid sees fit to pass along this information to the reader in the extended prologue to his poem (*Fast.* 1.55-6). I argue that Ovid not only acknowledges this special affiliation of Juno and Jupiter with the Kalends and the Ides, but that he also uses those specific days as a way of developing their characterization throughout the

poem—by exploring epic versus elegiac motifs, by highlighting different and sometimes conflicting aspects of their literary and cult personae, and, perhaps most interestingly, by defying the reader's expectations of those sacred days, such that Jupiter more than once intrudes upon Juno's Kalends. While Juno is the goddess of many things, including women, marriage, and birth, she is equally important as a goddess of the Roman Calendar, responsible for initiating the new month, and as the likely contributor to the etymology for the month of June.²⁵ Both of these calendrical considerations that are either entirely suppressed from or merely hinted at by other ancient literary representations of Juno come to the forefront in Ovid's *Fasti*. Yet, they do so not at the expense of, but rather in cooperation with the other prominent attributes associated with the queen of the gods. Likewise, Jupiter's affiliation with the Ides exists alongside his regal Vergilian persona, his elegiac penchant for rape and promiscuity, and a vast array of other characteristics, many of which are imbued with contemporary political resonances.

Add to the aforementioned reasons Ovid's fondness for rewriting the mythological tradition, in which Jupiter and Juno feature prominently, and we are left with a nearly overwhelming number of factors to consider in terms of Ovid's treatment of the divine pair in his *Fasti*. Even within the world of the *Met.* and the *Fasti*, which chronologically overlap in terms of their composition, there are often stark differences amidst similar episodes, if not in content, then in length, diction, or purpose. Therefore, whenever possible, I offer an in-depth textual analysis of how Ovid treats these gods similarly or differently within these two works. References to these two deities abound, even within the reduced form of the six books that have come down to us. As a result, I am unable to provide an analysis for each and every mention of Jupiter and Juno in the *Fasti*. The episodes I have chosen to examine are principally those for which either the

²⁵ See chapter 1 both for Juno's role as a cult goddess associated with the calendar and for the controversy over June's true etymology, which Ovid exploits in his poem to book 6.

calendar plays some pivotal role or where Jupiter and Juno appear together. It is my sincere hope that by analyzing each episode both on its own right and in relation to the wider literary goals of the poem I will show the extent to which Ovid has embedded many layers into his representation of these two principal deities.

II. SURVEY OF RELEVANT SCHOLARSHIP

As mentioned above, Jupiter and Juno are considered the epic gods par-excellence and have prominent roles in Ennius' *Annales*, Vergil's *Aeneid*, and Ovid's *Met.* Their reappropriation for the elegiac genre allows them to be seen in a more fluid light, which is augmented by the generically diverse roles each of them plays in the *Fasti*. While much scholarship exists on episodes involving Jupiter and Juno in the *Fasti*,²⁶ the focus is scarcely ever directed at their multi-dimensional portrayal,²⁷ nor do any of these previous studies aim to comment on the holistic nature of Jupiter and Juno's relationship with the calendar and with each other. Generic concerns certainly arise, but are limited primarily to the discussion at hand, seldom taking into account the plethora of other episodes involving different forms of the same deities. Part of the difficulty in providing a cohesive analysis of these episodes is their disparate nature, not just in content, but also in form. While several of the entries that address Jupiter and Juno do so from the anthropomorphized perspective, there are many in which they appear as static figures, worthy of worship and bearing cult titles, yet unexpressive and fleshed out only by the surrounding context. I have attempted in this study to synthesize the many and varied occurrences of Jupiter

²⁶ Principally the commentaries written on each individual book (see n. 28 below), but also extending to Barchiesi (1997a), Newlands (1995), Murgatroyd (2004), and Pasco-Pranger (2007), to name a few.

²⁷ The exception being Julia Hejduk's recent book *The God of Rome: Jupiter in Augustan Poetry*, which examines the multi-dimensional quality of Jupiter, not only in the *Fasti*, but also in Vergil, Horace, Tibullus and Propertius as well.

and Juno in the *Fasti*, to note the countless strands of connectivity that exist between them, and to comment on how these strands relate to Ovid's ultimate goal of exploring contemporary Roman culture writ large.

On matters of genre, I most closely follow Hinds and his denunciation of the reductive approach in favor of a more nuanced and fluid understanding of the ways in which genre facilitates meaning. Take for instance the episode in the *Fasti* involving Janus' repulsion of the Sabines who were aided by Juno (*Fast.* 1. 265-76). There is a far longer and weightier counterpart to this episode in *Met.* 14 (781-804) that involves a slightly different group of characters with a more pronounced list of casualties at its conclusion. On the other hand, the *Fasti*'s version of these events, which is told from the mouth of Janus, emphasizes the notion of de-escalation, while simultaneously establishing the dichotomy between the war-like Juno and the peaceful Janus on the very day on which these two deities were supposed to work in unison to facilitate the transition between the old and new month. Thus Ovid embeds multiple layers of meaning into both the form and content of that particular entry, as is his wont elsewhere.

While no current scholarship specifically addresses the significance of Jupiter and Juno on their respective sacred days throughout Ovid's *Fasti*, there are several useful works that engage with this premise either directly or indirectly. For instance, Degraffi's *Inscriptiones Italiae* has been invaluable in assessing the days in the epigraphic calendars on which either Jupiter or Juno appears and the cults epithets attached to those particular entries. In addition, Molly Pasco-Pranger's book *Founding the Year: Ovid's Fasti and the Poetics of the Roman Calendar* continues to be an excellent source when it comes to the application of Degraffi to specific festivals within Ovid's *Fasti*. In addition, Feeney's 2007 book *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*, which focuses on the Roman calendar and time more broadly, is useful in its emphasis on the role that history and memory play within the

Roman calendar, which prioritizes events over dates. Although this study is first and foremost concerned with the diverse ways in which Ovid presents the figures of Jupiter and Juno throughout his *Fasti*, it is important to acknowledge the influence that the epigraphic calendars, especially the *Fasti Praenestini* of Verrius Flaccus, had both on the structure and content of his poem. At times Ovid follows closely the epigraphic *Fasti*, while at other times he either changes certain prominent aspects or overlooks them altogether. Each of these instances represents a choice on Ovid's part and serves to help us understand both his poetic process and his desire for innovation.

Over the course of this project, I have relied heavily upon the manifold commentaries that exist on all six books of Ovid's *Fasti*, especially as a starting point for many of the ideas presented in this dissertation. In addition to the older more cursory commentaries written by Frazer in the 19th century and by Bömer in the mid-20th century, each and every book of the *Fasti* has received additional attention in the past 25 years in the form of individual scholarly commentaries, with Heyworth's commentary on book 3 debuting in spring of 2020 and J. F. Miller's commentary on book 5 forthcoming.²⁸ Although I have consulted all of these throughout my research, the ones that have proven to be most useful, owing to the episodes that I address, are those of Green, Robinson, and Littlewood for books 1, 2, and 6 respectively. I am extremely thankful for the vast network of Ovidian scholars who have devoted themselves so passionately to the explication of this fascinating yet abstruse poem. Without their efforts and devotion, my task would have been truly Herculean.

²⁸ In addition to Heyworth (2020) and Miller (forthcoming), these include the 1994 Cambridge University Press commentary on book 4 by Elaine Fantham, the 2004 Brill commentary on book 1 by Steven J. Green, the 2006 Oxford University Press commentary on book 6 by R. Joy Littlewood, and the 2011 Oxford Classical Monograph series commentary on book 2 by Matthew Robinson.

On matters of religious rites, I rely principally on Dumézil and Rüpke, but supplement them with a variety of other works. My perspective on Ovid's poetic agenda in the *Fasti* was most acutely shaped by Barchiesi's *The Poet and the Prince* and Newlands' *Playing with Time*, both of which scratch beneath the surface of the text and attempt to flesh out latent meaning. From the opposite perspective, the many works of Herbert-Brown, who reads the *Fasti* as a strait-laced piece of Augustan propaganda, have served as a useful foil for the views of Barchiesi and Newlands. If Barchiesi and Newlands are responsible for taking interpretation of the *Fasti* into new and interesting directions, they build upon the work of J. F. Miller, who in the early 1980s first explored the many didactic elements of the *Fasti* and underscored its connection to Callimachus and Callimachean aesthetics. In subsequent years Miller has continued these researches in other directions, and his 2009 book *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets* in large part shaped the arc of my second chapter, which explores the role of Jupiter from multiple angles vis-à-vis "textual triggers."

The many works of Denis Feeney have also had a tremendous influence upon this dissertation. His ground-breaking book *The Gods in Epic Poetry* has already been mentioned, as has his 2007 book on the Roman Calendar. It is from Feeney that I first conceived of the notion of viewing the gods through a "prismatic" lens,²⁹ a concept later adopted by both Barchiesi and Miller.³⁰ His article, "The Reconciliations of Juno," helped me grapple with the concept of a Juno who is simultaneously Roman and un-Roman and formed the basis for much of my first chapter, which examines the issue of Juno's allegiance to Rome and to Roman ideology. In addition, his article, "*Si licet et fas est*: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate," was instrumental in helping me assess the political implications stemming from the

²⁹ Feeney (1991) 127.

³⁰ Barchiesi (1997a) 60; Miller (2004/2005) 170, (2009) 150.

many deprived and silenced voices throughout the *Fasti*. In his brief yet illuminating book, *Literature and Religion at Rome: Culture, Context, and Beliefs*, Feeney espouses a reading of religion in Roman literature that interacts with the broader cultural milieu and not just with the text itself. He again emphasizes the variability of representations of the divine in literature, commenting, “Poetic mimesis of divinity, then, remains self-conscious about the fact that its manner of representing divinity is an accommodation, with its own powers and failings. This is true even in the case of a single divinity, which may be so various, and may embody so many different powers and meanings, that capturing it in words may seem intractable.”³¹ Feeney’s ideas have been at the forefront of much recent scholarship on the *Fasti* and have prompted scholars to consider its religious components in an altogether different light.

Finally, a significant source that was published only at the tail end of this project is Julia Hejduk’s book *The God of Rome: Jupiter in Augustan Poetry*. In addition to exploring the many subtleties of the god Jupiter throughout Augustan poetry, Hejduk offers insightful analysis on several key episodes of Jupiter in the *Fasti* that are further explored in this dissertation. Many of her ideas build upon those from previously mentioned works and present a broad range of considerations relating to the god Jupiter. She does not, however, adequately address the issue of Jupiter’s relationship with the Roman calendar and his affiliation with the Ides of each month, nor does she attempt to treat Jupiter and Juno as a pair, since the latter falls outside the scope of her book. While I appreciate and value her argument that Jupiter in the *Fasti* represents a “gentler” version of the god that Ovid presents in his *Met.*,³² there are several examples in the *Fasti* where Jupiter’s wrath is swift and fierce. The many comparisons of Jupiter and Augustus—some direct and other indirect—throughout the *Fasti* are double-edged and involve more than just

³¹ Feeney (1998) 99.

³² Hejduk (2020) 255, 267.

the stately and regal persona of Jupiter. I do, however, think that Jupiter is often portrayed in the *Fasti* first and foremost as Roman deity, a feature that flies in the face of Juno's dual Roman/Hellenic persona. This is especially apparent in the sixth and final extant book of the poem. Ultimately, this dissertation seeks to go beyond the classification of Jupiter as a "gentler" version of himself and to show the ways in which Ovid endows the king of gods with multiple personalities that are activated by a variety of internal and external factors.

III. CHAPTER ONE SUMMARY

I begin my first chapter by outlining the established categories of Juno's divinity and by offering a reexamination of the third and most neglected of these, namely Juno's association with the Kalends of each month, which is principally a cultic feature. While Ovid's *Fasti* naturally makes full use of this connection, he does so alongside the other dimensions of Juno's divinity, forging a noticeable and poetically anomalous intersection between myth and cult. Throughout the *Fasti* Juno is presented as a polarizing figure. In book 1 she is the embodiment of the Hellenic Hera, who possesses a palpable anti-Roman disposition and attempts to overthrow a fledgling Rome (*Fast.* 1.265f.). In book 3 she appears as a tutelary Roman cult deity in the guise of Juno Lucina, mother of Mars, and is celebrated with a physical temple (*Fast.* 3.205-55). In the proem of book 6 we see an amalgamation of Juno's diverse personae alongside her desire to be fully integrated into Ovid's poetic calendar and to be recognized as a full-fledged Roman goddess. In each of these episodes Ovid plays with genre, literary precedents, mythological tradition, and cult rituals, all while maintaining Juno's connection to the Roman calendar.

After an extensive analysis of Ovid's introductory remarks regarding the sanctity of the Kalends and the Ides and how his poetic calendar will address those particular days (*Fast.* 1.55-62), I move on to the episode that involves Janus' recollection of how Juno once aided Titus Tatius and Sabines in their attempt to infiltrate and destroy Rome (*Fast.* 1.265-76). I offer an in-

depth analysis of how Ovid's version of this story constitutes a 'window reference' to Ennius' *Annales* by looking through a section of Vergil's *Aeneid* (7.609-20). Although the Juno presented here exists in the post-Vergilian universe, she nevertheless exhibits animosity towards the Romans, since her Ennian reconciliation, which involves Carthage, has not yet been achieved. Moreover, the actions that Juno exhibits here in the *Fasti* constitute the antithesis of the actions of her counterpart in the *Aeneid*, further complicating the matter. In addition, the presence of Janus evokes calendrical considerations that fly in the face of the typical harmonic relationship that Juno and Janus share in the cultic realm. Here, Juno is referenced by her Ennian epithet *Saturnia*, which was mentioned just previously in the text concerning the golden age of Saturn (*Fast.* 1.237), a peaceful era which Janus claims to have shared alongside Saturn, a remark also made in the *Aeneid* (*Aen.* 8.319-23). I then go on to explore the possible resonances of the title *Saturnia*, concluding that Ovid employs the term in the *Fasti*, such that it evokes both positive and negative attributes, while harkening back to its original Ennian usage.

In the next section I undertake a direct comparison between Ovid's version of the aforementioned episode in his *Fasti* and the lengthier version offered in the *Met.* (14.781-92). For my analysis, I am very much indebted to the many excellent observations made by Stephen Green and K. Sara Myers in their respective commentaries on *Fasti* 1 and *Met.* 14.³³ While Juno is the common antagonist in both versions, Janus is replaced in the *Met.* by Venus and a group of Naiads. There are a number of interesting parallels and differences that give the impression that each passage was written with the other in mind. The issue of genre also comes to the forefront with the preceding section of the *Fasti* priming the reader and preparing him/her for an elegiac rendering of a very epic episode.³⁴ The implications of the added descriptive term *invidiosa* at

³³ Green (2004a) and Myers (2009).

³⁴ As Barchiesi (1997a) 21 has observed.

Fast. 1.266 are discussed at length, with the conclusion that Juno's jealousy/anger exists on two different levels. On the one hand, she is antagonistic toward the Romans since she is here depicted as a Sabine deity who has not yet been integrated into the Roman pantheon. On the other hand, she is antagonistic toward Janus himself, who is usurping her principal role as a goddess of the Kalends by depriving her both of speech and of victory. This blend of myth, history, religion, and literary allusion results in a complex and intricate introduction to a goddess who plays an integral part in both Roman cult activity and in Ovid's poetic calendar.

In the next section I turn to the Matronalia, a festival of Juno, and the mention of Juno Lucina on the Kalends of March, as described by the interlocutor Mars (*Fast.* 3.201-58). Here Juno is portrayed as a contributing factor in the peace treaty forged between the Romans and the Sabines via the Sabine women, who act as arbitrators. This portrayal represents the antithesis of the Juno we met on the Kalends of January and operates under a mythological framework in which Juno is the mother of Mars. I argue that these two episodes are very much in dialogue with one another and offer opposing perspectives on Juno's role in the war against the Sabines, in part owing to the disparate agendas of the two respective interlocutors. While Janus seeks to bask in the glory of his pacific actions and gain the upper hand against his calendrical rival, Mars attempts to appropriate the festival of the Matronalia, which belongs to his mother Juno, through a retelling of the similarly peaceful actions of the Sabine women, who congregate in an unspecified temple of Juno immediately prior to brokering an amnesty. At the end of the account, the reader learns of the construction of the temple of Juno on the Esquiline, likely that of Juno Lucina, and Juno's affiliation with women, birth, and prosperity. Throughout this passage Ovid engages with the concept of mutable memory, such that the aetiological story of Mars, who represents an elegiacally-charged version of his epic self, eclipses that of Janus and reintroduces Juno as both a benevolent and pro-Roman deity. At the same time, elements of

Juno's militaristic persona are not altogether absent, but rather get absorbed into this new jurisdiction of hers. Ultimately the episode allows Mars to vicariously lay claim to the Kalends of his month through Juno's festival, which in actuality had little, if any, relevance to the war against the Sabines, despite comprising the bulk of the aetiology. By allowing Mars to be the mouthpiece for this day and to promote a gentler and more productive side of Juno, Ovid plays with mythological tradition, generic expectations, intertextuality, and Roman cult activity.

The final section of this first chapter is devoted to Juno's speech in the proem of book 6 (*Fast.* 6.21-64), by far our most in-depth example of Juno's self-characterization in the *Fasti*. Here she speaks on behalf of herself, as a full-fledged Roman deity, seeking to solidify her claim to the month of June within the Roman calendar. Much scholarship has been written on this speech and on the proem as a whole, whose three speeches by the three etymological contenders mimic those of the three Muses in the proem of book 5. I outline the various approaches that have been used, which include examinations of Ovid's programmatic agenda, his debt to literary predecessors, his generic experimentation, and his acknowledgement of the contemporary political climate. While these scholarly analyses are many and varied, none of them show the extent to which Ovid engages with Juno's characterization elsewhere in the *Fasti* and how truly prismatic Juno's self-identification is. For she draws on aspects of myth, cult, and politics, demonstrating an acute awareness both of her role within the rest of Ovid's poem and beyond. She acknowledges her former anti-Roman Hellenic identity and pledges fealty to the Roman state through a variety of different avenues. Other Italic calendars are presented as evidence, along with the ubiquity of Juno's name under the month of June, further emphasizing her connection with actual epigraphical *fasti*. Despite the preponderance of evidence and Juno's elite status as the most significant of the three contenders, Ovid elects to declare a mistrial and refrains from giving the month's name to any of the three goddesses.

I first offer a comparison between the final portion of the proems of books 5 and 6, which at first glance appear quite similar. Upon further scrutiny, however, one notices that the dismissal of the goddesses in book 6 is accompanied by an addendum, namely Ovid's acknowledgment that he does not wish to repeat the harm caused by the judgment of Paris. Juno, of course, was on the losing end of that contest and Ovid himself alludes to her involvement in that affair as soon as the deities appear before him (6.15-17). After examining the diction, style, and force of the various parts of Juno's speech in relation to her previous appearances in the *Fasti* and reviewing the historical and literary merit for naming the month after her, I go on to weigh the responding speech of Juno's daughter Juventas against that of her mother. Not only does Juventas self-identify as the daughter of Juno, but she also promotes herself multiple times as the proud wife of Hercules, one of Juno's biggest adversaries, whose tumultuous relationship will resurface twice in the remainder of book 6. This chapter then comes full circle with an examination of Janus and Juno on the Kalends of June. While Janus is presented in a much different light than the jovial and avuncular interlocutor whom we met in book 1, he nevertheless appropriates the majority of the Kalends of Juno's own month through his rape of Cranaë and his transformation of her into the deity Carna. Juno becomes a mere footnote on the day and the description of the temple of Juno Moneta functions not as a moment of celebration, but rather as an opportunity to issue a warning against Marcus Manlius, who strove for kingship and paid the ultimate penalty.

IV. CHAPTER TWO SUMMARY

In chapter 2 the focus is directed upon Jupiter and the ways in which Ovid associates and disassociates the figure of Jupiter with contemporary Roman politics. After a concise summary of the varying scholarly viewpoints on the issue of Ovid's political agenda within the *Fasti*,³⁵ I

³⁵ Including that of Green, McKeown, Herbert-Brown, Fantham, Barchiesi, Hinds, Newlands, Boyle, Feeney, J. F. Miller, and Toohey.

turn to the issue of divine assimilation, giving an overview of the ways in which the concept developed from the time of Alexander the Great through the rise of Augustus as the first Roman emperor. I also stress the importance of separating Augustus' self-identification with Apollo and his promotion of that image in all facets of contemporary Roman culture from Augustus' association with Jupiter that came about in a more organic fashion. From the examination of several coins dated to around the time of the Battle of Actium in 31 B.C., we can already see this association starting to take shape, as images of the victorious Octavian are combined with those of Jupiter.

Our earliest poetic examples of this phenomenon come from Horace's *Odes* (1.12 and 3.5), where Jupiter and Octavian are paralleled, but kept in their distinct spheres, with Jupiter ruling in the heavens and Augustus on earth. This concept undergoes a noticeable change in Ovid's *Met.*, where Jupiter's celestial home is referred to as the Palatine of the sky (*Palatia caeli* 1.176). Ovid goes on to develop this connection throughout his poem, especially at the very end, where Augustus' deification takes center stage. One prominent feature of many of these episodes is the recurrence of either direct or latent references to Jupiter's *ira*, which takes on altogether different meaning in Ovid's exile poetry, where it predominantly is used to describe the *ira* of Augustus that resulted in Ovid's own banishment. While the tone of the Jupiter/Augustus references in the *Met.* range from critical to reverential, there is nevertheless a recognizable separation between the mythological god and the historical emperor. In the exile poetry, the two become morphed into a singular identity that most often addresses Augustus in the guise of Jupiter. All of these examples provide the perfect backdrop for discussion and analysis of Jupiter in the *Fasti*, a work whose composition very much overlaps with that of the *Met.* and the exile poetry. In addition, the *Fasti* does not merely focus on Roman religious matters, as it pledges to

do in its opening lines (1.9-14), but it does so from an Augustan perspective. Thus, most if not all of the mentions of Jupiter throughout the poem ought to be viewed through an Augustan lens.

I then proceed chronologically through the *Fasti*, analyzing the various appearances of Jupiter that involve some sort of textual trigger that activates association with Augustus.³⁶ It is important to clarify that even though I believe there is a direct or latent connection to Augustus with each and every example of Jupiter brought forth in this chapter, I do not think that the reader can or should divorce the figure of Augustan Jupiter from other aspects of his domain that are relevant to the surrounding text. This goes back to the comments made earlier regarding the appropriation of Jupiter by the elegiac love poets, Ovid included. Tibullus in 1.4 had manufactured a scenario in which Jupiter is thanked for voiding the efficacy of false love oaths, but that very act is only humorous or relevant because of Jupiter's role in upholding the validity of oaths in the non-elegiac universe.

The first example we encounter is Janus' comical overriding of Jupiter's celestial jurisdiction (*Fast.* 1.117-26). As mentioned earlier, Hejduk argues for a "gentler" Jupiter in the *Fasti* than in the *Met.* Here we encounter an allegedly weaker Jupiter, whose omnipotence is held in check by the celestial gatekeeper. Janus goes on to describe what is likely an earlier version of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus that held in its cramped space a statue of Jupiter with a thunderbolt forged of clay rather than gold (1.201-02). I outline the many Augustan allusions in this passage, its interaction with a section in Vergil's *Aeneid*, and the way in which it preemptively references and then negates the etymological connection that Ovid will put forth on the Ides of January between *summus Iuppiter* and *aug-ustus*. That brings us to the Ides of January, the day on which Jupiter as a cult figure was honored with sacrifices. That sacrifice is

³⁶ Miller (2009) 6 in describing his method for detecting examples of Augustan Apollo speaks of the importance of "a textual trigger that activates political meaning."

described in the first couplet of the entry, while the rest is devoted to honoring Augustus as an embodiment of Jupiter, both in terms of accomplishments and in terms of nomenclature. This represents the first of two passages in that *Fasti* that involve explicit comparison between Augustus and Jupiter. Building on the observations of Barchiesi and Pasco-Pranger,³⁷ I posit that Ovid's imperial panegyric is interlaced with problematic elements and that the grandeur of the imagery is immediately called into question by the foreboding episode that follows.

On the entry for the 16th of January, a mere three days after the Ides, the marital situation of Augustus and his wife Livia is likened to that of Jupiter and Juno (1.649-50). A discussion ensues as to the force of this couplet, both on its own right and in relation to the surrounding text, including the potentially controversial mention of Jupiter as part of an astrological notice that comes immediately afterward and resurfaces again in book 2 at an even more inopportune time. In this section I also delve deeply into the implications of conflating Livia with Juno and cite evidence of this connection elsewhere. The Nones of February provide us with the second of the two explicit comparisons between Augustus and Jupiter (2.119-44). The day is that on which Augustus was hailed as *pater patriae* and although the comparison begins quite innocuously, the entry once again descends into controversial territory with the inclusion of Romulus as a foil and the recurrence of the astrological sign Aquarius that possibly alludes to Jupiter's rape of Ganymede (2.145-48), thus aligning him more closely to Romulus than to Augustus. Rape is again the subject in the longer narrative that follows (2.153-92), which offers a redacted and arguably more chilling retelling of Jupiter's rape of Callisto than that of Ovid's epic version (*Met.* 2.401-530).

³⁷ Barchiesi (1994) and Pasco-Pranger (2007).

On the 21st of February Ovid tells the origin story of the Feralia (2.571-616), which concludes the broader Parentalia, a festival honoring the spirits of the dead. Jupiter initially features as a heavily elegiacally-charged character in a clear parody of his epic persona. He is referred to as *victus amore* (2.585), a clear inversion of his common title Jupiter *Invictus*, and summons a council of nymphs, not gods, in his amorous pursuit of the nymph Juturna. We have engagement here with the much more regal and fear-inducing Jupiter who summons the council of the gods in *Met.* 1 and who bears a striking resemblance to Augustus. The following day marks the Caristia, a festival of merry-making and cheer that concludes with a celebratory toast to Augustus. Yet, Jupiter himself is curiously absent from this celebration, which deliberately casts aside a group of mythological sinners, one of whom, Tereus, evokes the actions taken by Jupiter on the previous day when he removed the tongue of the insubordinate nymph, Lara. While the Feralia most conspicuously offers a humorous parody of the more regal Jupiter, similar to that of Tibullus 1.4, it also exposes his cruel and sinister side through his treatment of Lara. Jupiter's association with the Lares, the children of Lara, will recur more explicitly on the Kalends of May, where they are described from a wholly Augustan perspective, inviting the reader to think back to the Feralia the manner of their original conception.

Ovid continues to weave back and forth between presenting a parodic version of epic Jupiter and a more authentic cultic representation of the chief Roman deity. We witness this dichotomy quite clearly on the Kalends of March when Ovid tells the aetiological story of Jupiter Elicius or "Jupiter who is drawn down from the sky" (3.285-372). Although Jupiter Elicius represents a different version of the god from that of Jupiter Tonans, they both very much involve the use or disuse of the powerful thunderbolt. The connection between Jupiter Tonans and Augustus is described in detail, as are the many nuances of this complicated episode, which draws from aspects of Ovid's own life and may very well allude to the aforementioned *ira* of

Augustus/Jupiter that Ovid identifies as the source of his banishment in the exile poetry. Once again, heavily epic components are lightened by well-timed elegiac insertions, such as the laughter Jupiter emits after Numa refuses to sacrifice a human life and offers up that of a fish in its place (3.342-3). In a similar vein, on March 7th we hear of Veiovis or “little Jove,” who has not yet even acquired the thunderbolt and is rendered powerless (3.429-48). I explore this passage both in relation to other mentions of Jupiter throughout the *Fasti* and to its immediate surrounding entries, which include a section that pays homage to Augustus’ role as the Pontifex Maximus (3.419-22).

While one might expect Jupiter to feature prominently on the Ides of March and to be a central component in an extended section devoted to the assassination of Julius Caesar, neither of those two things are the case. Instead, Ovid devotes the majority of the episode to the Plebeian festival of Anna Perenna, relegating Caesar’s murder to a footnote, which itself provides a fleeting reference to Jupiter (*Iovis atria* 3.703) as a mere indicator of the direction to which Caesar ascended upon his death. We then move to the section in Polyhymnia’s speech in the proem of May that assesses the role *Maiestas* played in thwarting the Giants and bringing about the era of Olympian hegemony (5.35-47). Here I owe a great debt to J. F. Miller, who generously afforded me access to the manuscript of his forthcoming commentary on *Fasti* 5. In accordance with the magisterial portrayal of *Maiestas*, Jupiter is depicted as the powerful Olympian king par excellence, hurling his thunderbolt with full force. Ovid’s mini-Gigantomachy is the vestige of several other references, including a section of the aforementioned Veiovis entry (3.439-442) as well as a *recusatio* from *Am.* 2.1. The message that results, however, is a mixed one; despite the victory that is procured by the Olympians over the hostile Giants, the reader is left to grapple with the idea of autocratic rule and *Maiestas*’ true place within such a regime.

As mentioned above, the Lares play a central role on the Kalends of May, following an extended description of Jupiter's upbringing on Crete and his ascent to power (5.111-58). Here, Ovid again engages with the Jupiter/Augustus dynamic, calling attention to several other episodes throughout the poem. The final episode discussed in this chapter is that of Jupiter's rescue of the Dioscuri on May 20th (5.693-720). Jupiter's thunderbolt is here thrown with success, albeit demonstrating a weaker version of the potency seen in Polyhymnia's earlier Gigantomachy, but incurs the disdain of the very one it was sent to protect. This passage also carries Augustan resonances that connect with other episodes throughout the *Fasti*. Ultimately, Ovid presents the reader with a varied portrayal of Jupiter, who is at times fully armed, at other times disarmed, and occasionally armed with a less powerful thunderbolt that is hurled in haste. While the vast majority of episodes involve the issue of Augustan politics from either a laudatory or a critical perspective, they do so not at the expense of, but rather in tandem with traditional mythological, literary, and cultic representations of the prismatic god known on a most basic level as Jupiter.

V. CHAPTER THREE SUMMARY

In the third and final chapter of this study, I examine Jupiter and Juno as a pair throughout the *Fasti*, with a focus on the ways in which Ovid establishes their relationship as simultaneously symbiotic and antithetical. This chapter begins with an overview of the treatment of this divine duo by an assortment of previous Greek and Roman authors, all of whom apply their own unique touches. For the relationship of Zeus/Hera or Jupiter/Juno often functions as a plot device, as it does most clearly in the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid*. At the same time, Hellenistic authors such as Apollonius of Rhodes and Callimachus experimented with more creative and interesting ways of presenting these two divine figures. Despite the fragmentary state of Ennius *Annales*, it is clear he too put his own unique stamp on the representation of the divine pair and

may have been the first to make use of local cultic epithets. For his own multifaceted portrayal of the divine pair in the *Fasti*, Ovid drew upon many if not all of the aforementioned literary traditions, yet innovated considerably by combining broader mythological topoi with local cultic resonances and embedding elements of the contemporary political scene into those representations. The first instance in which Ovid's *Fasti* juxtaposes the two deities is on the Kalends of February (2.55-72), the day sacred to Juno. Yet, no sooner do we arrive at this entry than we learn that the temple of Juno Sospita is no longer standing, having been erased by the ravages of time. Questions of topography and authorial purpose abound, as we attempt to unravel this rather perplexing example of a temple that was NOT restored by Augustus. The passage concludes not with sacrifices to Juno, as one would expect, but rather with sacrifices to Jupiter, resulting in the first instance of Jupiter encroaching upon Juno's sacred day of the month. Although neither deity is portrayed anthropomorphically, Ovid sows the seed of dissent so characteristic of the *Fasti* as a whole by providing the reader with images contrary to expectation.

Although we touched upon the significance of the Callisto narrative (2.153-92) and the Feralia aetiology (2.571-616) in the previous chapter, we here offer an extensive analysis of how Ovid pits Jupiter and Juno against each other, relying both on literary tradition and innovation. With regard to the former, discussion centers on elements that are similar to or different from Ovid's significantly longer epic version in his *Met.* (2.401-530) as well as the many ways in which Ovid departs from previous literary versions of the same story. The issue of purification, which is the focus of the month of February, is also essential to the Callisto narrative, picking up on the absent and thus "unpurified" temple of Juno Sospita on the Kalends. On the Feralia, Ovid engages both directly and indirectly with Vergil's treatment of Juturna in the *Aeneid*, where she became a chief nymph with an extended jurisdiction as recompense for her rape at the hands of

Jupiter. There, Juturna is treated surprisingly well by Juno, who, however, has an ulterior motive for procuring Juturna's assistance. In addition, the episode of Echo and Narcissus in Ovid's *Met.* (3.359-401) provides an inverse parallel for examining the punishments levied upon third parties by Jupiter and Juno as a result of being wronged.

Another example of Jupiter usurping the Kalends that rightly belong to Juno arises in the month of May. There, Ovid begins *ab Iove surgat opus* (5.111), a phrase that has both astrological and literary significance. The phrase simultaneously speaks to the rise of constellation Capricorn, related to the horn that nourished the infant Jupiter, as well as to his physical upbringing on Crete. In addition, it engages with several other references in the *Fasti*, while also alluding to other previous poetic variants, principally that of Aratus, who served as one of the principal sources of inspiration for Ovid on matters of astronomy and astrology. It is no coincidence that a few entries later Ovid provides an unparalleled account of the birth of Mars with Juno as his primary progenitor. This story is told on the Floralia by none other than Flora herself, to whom Juno had turned after finding out about Jupiter's parthenogenetic birth of Minerva. I argue that part of the reason for Juno's bitterness stems from the redirection of her sacred day of the month to Jupiter a few days prior. The story of Mars' conception also harkens back to Juno's anger at Callisto for giving birth to Arcas, who was sired by Jupiter. While Juno's maternal instincts and desire for procreation take center stage, her desperation makes her particularly vulnerable, to the point where she is at the mercy of a much less important deity. Ultimately, Flora takes pity on Juno and offers her the very thing she seeks. Together, they become joint female parents of Mars, the god of war, referencing the earlier pairing of Mars and Juno on the Matronalia and again emphasizing the inversion of gender roles.

We return once again to Juno's speech in the proem of book 6 (6.21-64), this time directing our focus toward Juno's own treatment of Jupiter, whom she cites several times in

order to bolster her claim. While Juno attempts to fashion her persona as inextricably linked to Jupiter, in the hopes of convincing Ovid, the judge of the contest, that the month of June truly derives from her name, in a clever piece of praeteritio she acknowledges her past hatred for the Trojans, exposing her Hellenic, non-Roman persona. I posit that Ovid's non-decision at the end of the contest has ramifications that extend throughout the remainder of the book. For nowhere else in book 6 is Juno portrayed as a pro-Roman deity. On the contrary, her temple of Juno Moneta is given minimal attention at the end of the Kalends of June (6.183-190), where the aetiological story of Marcus Manlius and the 'warning' geese, which is told in Livy (5.47), is replaced by the more macabre events concerning the aftermath of the Gallic siege of Rome when Manlius was tried, convicted, and put to death for treason. The Gallic siege of Rome again becomes the topic of choice on the Vestalia, where Ovid relates the story of Jupiter Pistor (6.349-94), or Jupiter the Baker, an otherwise unattested, mock-epic account of the Roman will to survive in the face of extreme adversity. Not only does the obscure story of Jupiter Pistor replace the more prevalent account of Juno's sacred geese, but it also excludes Juno entirely from the broad assemblage of Olympian deities, who come together to aid Rome during this dire crisis. Further, the Jupiter Pistor passage interacts closely with Vergil's *Aeneid* and in doing so creates a parallel environment that may very well reflect Juno's role as a Roman antagonist. While this is mostly an *argumentum ex silentio*, one cannot ignore the fact that in Ovid's account Jupiter rather than Juno becomes the 'warner' (6.385-6) and is the one celebrated with an altar for his contributions to the Roman victory. Thus Ovid here adapts aspects from both Vergil and Livy, yet innovates considerably by creating a story that imports mock-Vergilian characters into a Livian setting, the events and outcome of which are then shifted to account for the *Fasti*'s aetiological focus and its broader character considerations.

If the truncated and misdirected entry for Juno Moneta on June 1st alongside Juno's absence from the story of the Roman defense of the Capitoline hill on June 9th are evidence of a reduction in Juno's influence over or regard for Roman prosperity, then her role as the antagonist of the future Roman deities Leucothea and Palaemon on the Matralia of June 11th seriously undermines the reader's ability to interpret her as a pro-Roman deity of any sort. Despite the Matralia being a festival devoted to Mater Matuta that pays honor to motherhood and good mothers, Juno, who had earlier in the *Fasti* fulfilled the role of the dutiful mother,³⁸ is now stripped of her motherly associations and is motivated purely by spite and vengeance. Attention is given to the festival's complex background, Ovid's longer engagement with it in his *Met.* (4.416-552), and the many failures of Juno here in the *Fasti* version. For not only does Juno fail in her attempts to prevent Ino and her infant son Melicertes from fleeing safely from Greece to Italy, but the very agent who thwarts her vengeful plans is none other than Hercules, who suffers Juno's hatred for the same reason Ino does. Ovid then rubs salt in Juno's wounds by having Carmenta turn the two into full-fledged Roman deities, which marks the sort of Roman integration that Juno had laid claim to in the proem of book 6, only to be summarily dismissed by Ovid.

The last couple of entries in the extant poem provide final glimpses of both Jupiter and Juno. On June 27th we learn of the dedication of the temple of Jupiter Stator alongside that of the Lares (6.791-4). This pairing stresses the protective nature of these two otherwise unrelated religious figures. We had heard about Jupiter's connection to the birth of the Lares on the Feralia in February and Augustus' connection to the Lares Praestites on the Kalends of May, immediately following the story of Jupiter's rise to power. The epithet "Stator" at once evokes

³⁸ Both on the Matronalia (3.229-58) and on the Floralia (5.229-60).

both permanence and antiquity, as Ovid admits it was a temple dedicated long ago by Romulus adjacent to the Palatine. On the contrary, Juno's final mention in the *Fasti* is fraught with negativity and showcases her Hellenic persona. In poem's final extant entry on June 30th Ovid addresses the Muses and asks them who connected their temple with that of Hercules. In doing so, Ovid identifies Hercules as the one "to whom his defeated stepmother unwillingly surrendered (6.800)." Thus the poem's final identification of Juno is linked not with the month of June or with her many Roman cult associations, but rather with her anti-Roman persona that only reluctantly begrudges Hercules his role as a Roman deity. The poem's final image of a triumphant Hercules twanging his lyre (6.812) and assenting to the words of the Muses constitutes a reformulation of the famous conclusion of the *Aeneid*, in which Juno ultimately assents to the eventual rise and success of the Romans, provided that they adopt native Latin customs in addition to Trojans ones (*Aen.* 12.791-842). At the same time, Juno's surrender to Hercules on this final entry harkens back to original debate over the naming of June in the book's proem and serves to validate the argument of Juno's daughter Juventas, who several times self identifies as the wife of Hercules.

The final portion of the study is devoted to hypothesizing about several of the most prominent days involving Jupiter and Juno that belong to the months of the *Fasti* that were either never written or were never published, namely July through December. Although there was ample opportunity for Ovid to address various aspects of Jupiter and Juno on many of these lost days, two in particular come to mind. The various epigraphical *fasti* record dedications of the temples of Juno Regina, Jupiter Libertas, and Jupiter Tonans on the Kalends of September.³⁹ Two of these temples have direct ties with Augustus' building program, with the cult of Jupiter

³⁹ Degrassi (1963) 504.

Tonans holding a special significance for Augustus. In addition, among the multitude of temples dedicated on Sept. 23rd, Augustus' birthday, were those of Jupiter Stator and Juno Regina, which were rededicated in the Porticus Octaviae adjacent to the temple of Apollo Sosianus. While it is merely permitted for us to speculate as to how Ovid might have incorporated these temples or cult epithets into his entries for these particular days, it is worth mentioning that such days existed on which simultaneous dedications were made to this pair of deities. It is likely that Ovid would have dealt with them in a way similar to his treatment of temple dedications elsewhere in the *Fasti*. Perhaps one or more of them may have warranted an extended narrative, such as the near-death experience of Augustus in Cantabria that prompted him to build the temple of Jupiter Tonans on the Capitoline.⁴⁰ Either way, they would not simply exist as isolated entries. Instead, they would interact both with surrounding entries as well as with other examples of Jupiter and Juno throughout the poem, as is certainly the case for the six books that survive.

⁴⁰ As told by Suetonius (*Aug.* 29).

CHAPTER ONE: JUNO ON THE KALENDS OF JANUARY, MARCH, AND JUNE:

MYTH, CULT, AND INTERTEXTUALITY⁴¹

Speaking purely from the perspective of religion, Georges Dumézil offers the following statement regarding the Roman goddess Juno: “Juno is the most important of Rome’s goddesses, but also the most baffling.”⁴² This observation can also stand as a reflection of her treatment by the Roman poets, who address many aspects of her divinity.⁴³ Fritz Graf in his entry on Juno in the *New Pauly* has separated her identity into three categories: Juno and Women, Juno and war-like men, and Juno and the Kalends.⁴⁴ While these designations serve to highlight the breadth of Juno’s domain, they ought not be viewed as wholly independent of one another. As queen of the gods, she bears the title *Regina*,⁴⁵ wielding power as the sister and husband of Jupiter. She also holds a prominent position in the Capitoline triad alongside Jupiter and Minerva.⁴⁶ At the same

⁴¹ All citations of Ovid’s *Fasti* are taken from the 1997 Teubner edition by Alton, Wormell, and Courtney. All translations are my own.

⁴² Dumézil (1966) 291. Anderson (1958) 522 also acknowledges Juno’s prominent position in Roman religion, calling her “by far the most important goddess of the pantheon.”

⁴³ All of these dimensions are part and parcel of a singular Junonian identity. Cf. Dumézil (1966) 300: “Juno did not develop from an original *Lucina* or *Mater* into a simple *Regina* or a *Seipes* plus *Regina*. From the beginning she was multivalent.”

⁴⁴ *New Pauly, Antiquity* vol. 6 1108-10 [Graf]. Servius on *Aen.* 1.8 offers the following comments on Juno’s multivalence: *Iuno multa habet numina: est Curitis, quae utitur curru et hasta...est Lucina, quae partibus praeest, ...est regina; sunt et alia eius numina.* (“Juno has many dimensions of divinity: she is Juno Curitis, when she wields the chariot and the spear...she is Juno Lucina, when she presides over births...she is (also) Juno Regina; there are also other dimensions of her divinity”).

⁴⁵ A title established in the wake of the transfer of Juno Regina from Veii to Rome via *evocatio*. See Liv. 5.22.4-7 and G. Wissowa (1912), *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 187-88.

⁴⁶ See Dumézil (1966) 291-96 for a discussion concerning Juno’s role within the Capitoline triad, which has Etruscan origins.

time, she is recognized as a goddess of marriage and of child-birth.⁴⁷ While Roman poets of all genres are prone to incorporating some or all of these aforementioned Junonian associations into their poetic works, they often overlook her central position with respect to the Roman calendar, which comprises one of Graf's three primary categories for Juno's identity. Outside of the poetic world, there is much evidence for Roman ritual practices that took place on the Kalends of each month in honor of Juno.⁴⁸ The most rudimentary explanation for Juno's connection with the Kalends is that her association with birth, vis-à-vis her epithet Juno Lucina, was extended to reflect the renewal of time within the lunar cycle, such that the first of each month coincides with

⁴⁷ In the guise of Juno Iuga (equivalent to the Greek Ἥρα Ζυγία) and Juno Lucina (Wissowa [1912] 184-86).

⁴⁸ Macrob. *Sat.* 1.15.18-19: *ut autem Idus omnes Iovi ita omnes Kalendas Iunoni tributas et Varronis et pontificalis adfirmat auctoritas...Romae quoque Kalendis omnibus, praeter quod pontifex minor in curia Calabra rem divinam Iunoni facit, etiam regina sacrorum, id est regis uxor, porcam vel agnam in regia Iunoni immolat* ("Moreover just as all of the Ides are assigned to Jove so too are all of the Kalends assigned to Juno and the authority of both Varro and the pontiffs confirms this...at Rome also on every Kalends, not only does the lesser pontiff sacrifice to Juno in the curia Calabra, but even the queen of the sacred rites, that is the wife of the rex sacrorum, sacrifices either a pig or a lamb to Juno in the Regia"); John Lydus *de mensibus* 3.10: ἰστέον δὲ, ὅτι αἱ καλάνδαι Ἥρας ἐορτὴ ἐτύγχανον, τουτέστι Σελήνης; οἱ γὰρ φυσικοὶ ὡς ἔφθημεν εἰπόντες, Δία μὲν τὸν Ἥλιον, Ἥραν δὲ τὴν Σελήνην ἐνόμιζον εἶναι καὶ τὴν μὲν νεομηνίαν αὐτῇ, τὰς δὲ Εἰδούς, τουτέστι τὴν μεσομηνίαν, Δίῃ ἤγουν Ἥλιφ ἀνέφερον πληνιλόυνιον τὰς Εἰδούς χαλοῦντες οἰονεῖ πληροσέληνον. ("And one ought to know that the Kalends were in fact a festival of Hera, that is of Selene. For the natural philosophers, as I said earlier, considered Helios to be Zeus, and Selene to be Hera; and they dedicated the new moon to her, and the Ides, that is the mid-moon, to Zeus, namely Helios, calling the Ides plenilunium, meaning 'full-moon'"). See Rüpke (2011) 24-27 for the technical process of observing and declaring the Kalends.

the new moon or the “rebirth” of the moon.⁴⁹ In fact, following the customary sacrifice of the sow or the ewe lamb on every Kalends, a *pontifex minor* would invoke the name of Juno Covella,⁵⁰ an epithet strictly related to Juno’s role in the birth of the new month.⁵¹ Thus, apart from her prominence in festivals throughout the year, Juno is a principal figure within the Roman calendar, helping to facilitate the movement of one month to the next.⁵² It should come as no surprise then that Ovid, in constructing a poem using the framework of the Roman calendar, would carve out a special place for Juno on the Kalends.⁵³

⁴⁹ Dumézil (1966) 295. Cf. also Shields (1926) 5ff. who offers a brief summary of Juno’s relationship with the moon, followed by a lengthy list of possible etymologies for *Iuno*. Plutarch, *Moral.* 4.77 also discusses Juno Lucina’s connection with the moon.

⁵⁰ Renard (1952) 408 analyzes the many possible etymologies for the epithet *Covella* and concludes, “mon interprétation de *Covella* permet de saisir Junon, divinité de la fécondité terrestre, animale et humaine, au moment où elle devient une déesse lunaire.” Thus Renard sees the epithet as inherently multivalent. Rüpke (2011) 24-25 suggests that while the *pontifex minor* is fulfilling this duty (see Macrobius in n. 8 above), the wife of the *rex sacrorum* makes her sacrifice to Juno in the Regia.

⁵¹ Varro *LL* 6.27. See also Michels (1967) 214 for the distinction between Juno Covella and Juno Regina and Wissowa (1912) 116 for a description of the ritual formula and Juno Covella as a version of the Moon Goddess.

⁵² Dumézil (1966) 295 says of Juno’s epithet Covella, “the epithet is obscure, but the act has meaning only if the ritual entrusts to Juno the ‘growing’ of the moon in succeeding days.” Rüpke (2011) 25 sees the ritual invocation of Juno Covella as centered on the impending announcement of the date on which the Nones shall fall. He believes that Juno Covella is invoked every day until the arrival of the Nones on the fifth or seventh of each month. At the same time, this notion further tethers Juno to the cycle of the moon, leading Rüpke to assert, “A conceptual link between Juno and the moon is, therefore, undeniable.”

⁵³ Juno appears in competition with Janus on the Kalends of January (1.264-76), the temple of Juno Sospita is featured on the Kalends of February (2.55-72), as is the temple of Juno Lucina on the Kalends of March (3.247-56), Juno delivers a monologue in the proem of book 6 (6.21-64), and mention is made of the temple of Juno Moneta on the Kalends of June (6.183-84).

As one would expect, however, Ovid in his treatment of Juno in the *Fasti* does not focus solely on her association with the Kalends. Rather, he balances that dimension of her worship with more traditional poetic considerations, including her Homeric and Vergilian hatred for the Trojans, her Ennian sympathy for Roman enemies, and her mythological predisposition to general acts of cruelty, as seen throughout Ovid's own *Metamorphoses*.⁵⁴ In commenting on Juno's presence within the first two hundred lines of the *Aeneid*, Feeney acknowledges that in Vergil's epic universe she can be viewed consecutively as a chief Carthaginian deity, the Hera of Homer, the allegorical representation of *aer*,⁵⁵ and the outraged tragic divinity.⁵⁶ Ovid, on the other hand, in forging Juno's identity in the *Fasti*, goes a step beyond his literary predecessors by combining aspects of myth and cult that take into account Juno's association with the Kalends and with the calendar itself. He has synthesized a Juno that is at once pro-Roman and anti-Roman, supportive and vindictive, peaceful and bellicose. In the world of the *Fasti* she is a protean figure whose appearance often activates associations with multiple dimensions of her divinity within Roman cult and prior literary treatments. Each of these dimensions deserves adequate attention, and it must be acknowledged that they all contribute to the formation of a singular Junonian identity that is an amalgamation of its many parts. It is the aim of this chapter to show the ways in which Ovid's *Fasti* draws upon all three dimensions of Juno's worship, as described by Fritz Graf in his entry for Juno in the *New Pauly*,⁵⁷ and how these dimensions continuously overlap with one another in order to create a uniquely polyvalent Juno who is self-

⁵⁴ A few such examples include Juno's persecution of Io (1.622-41), Callisto (2.466-530), Semele (3.273-315), and Hercules (9.159-210).

⁵⁵ For the equating of Ἥρα and ἄήρ see Feeney (1984) 184 n. 32 and Hardie (1986) 30, 229 n. 175.

⁵⁶ Feeney (1991) 132.

⁵⁷ See n. 44 above.

conscious about her position within the Roman calendar. At the same time, I explore the ways in which Ovid plays with the reader's expectations by revisiting and reformulating the treatment of Juno by his literary predecessors. The culmination of this melting-pot of Junonian identities takes place in the proem to the Kalends of June, where Juno pleads her case in an attempt to procure naming rights for the month. In her impassioned speech, she draws upon her relationship with Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Romulus, and various Italic cities with a focus, of course, on Rome itself. Her speech simultaneously alludes to her previous poetic treatments, with a particular emphasis on her Vergilian persona. Ultimately Ovid is showing the reader that Juno's identity is not static, but fluid, and that it is the product both of her worship in Roman cult as well as her rich mythological and literary history.

I. Juno and the Kalends in Ovid's *Fasti*

Before beginning his explication of festivals and aetiologies within his *Fasti*, Ovid offers the reader some background information about the history of the calendar (1.27-44) and the rules that govern particular days (1.45-62). It is in the latter section that Ovid clarifies the sacred nature of the Kalends and the Ides and their association with Juno and Jupiter respectively:

vindicat Ausonias Iunonis cura Kalendas;	55
Idibus alba Iovi grandior agna cadit;	
Nonarum tutela deo caret. omnibus istis	
(ne fallare cave) proximus ater erit.	
omen ab eventu est: illis nam Roma diebus	
damna sub averso tristia Marte tulit.	60
haec mihi dicta semel, totis haerentia fastis,	
ne seriem rerum scindere cogar, erunt.	

The worship of Juno claims the Ausonian Kalends; a greater white lamb falls to Jupiter on the Ides; the Nones lack any tutelary deity. The day after all of those will be "Black" (take care that it not escape your notice). The ill-omen is from past events: for on those days Rome suffered grim losses in unfavorable warfare. These things, though they apply

to the entire calendar, will be said by me once, lest I be forced to break off the thread of events. (Fast. 1.55-62)

The first couplet of this passage denotes the significant place that both Juno and Jupiter hold within the epigraphical *Fasti*. The couplet is organized in chiasmic fashion with the verbs at either end (*vindicat...cadit*) and with the marked days juxtaposed, one at the end of the first line (*Kalendas*), the other at the beginning of the next line (*Idibus*). These days are further connected by the sacrifices made on behalf of the two honored deities: a larger white lamb to Jupiter and, presumably, a smaller white lamb to Juno.⁵⁸ The phrase *cura Iunonis* is most naturally understood as containing an objective genitive and thus rendered, “concern for Juno.”⁵⁹ One could, however, also translate *Iunonis* as a subjective genitive, which would alter the meaning of the phrase to “concern of/belonging to Juno.” In light of the inherently aggressive demeanor of Juno both in Ovid’s *Fasti* and elsewhere in the Roman poetic universe,⁶⁰ the latter reading deserves adequate consideration. The fact that the Nones are said to lack a tutelary deity of any sort lends support to the construing *Iunonis* as a subjective genitive, thus emphasizing that the Kalends contrarily possesses such a deity, namely Juno. This rendering is also supported by the strong tone of the verb *vindicat*, “lays claim to.” The legal connotation of this word is particularly noticeable later on at *Fast.* 4.90, where Venus asserts her rights over the month of April: *quem Venus iniecta vindicat alma manu* (“[April] which kindly Venus lays claim to,

⁵⁸ Macrobius says that either a pig or a lamb is sacrificed to Juno (see n. 48 above), but the language here implies that a ewe-lamb (*agna*) is sacrificed to both Juno and Jupiter and that only the size of the animal differs (see Green [2004a] 55).

⁵⁹ *TLL* 4.0.1465.65 includes this usage of *cura* under the section called *cultus religiosus*. A good parallel elsewhere in the *Fasti*, supplied by *TLL* is 6.369: *nil opis in cura scirent superesse deorum* (“They would know that no strength remains in worshipping the gods”).

⁶⁰ Cf. the discussion of Juno in the poem to *Fasti* 6 below.

having asserted her rights”).⁶¹ Here at *Fast.* 4.90 Ovid fuses two legal principles together, that of *vindicatio* and that of *manus iniectio*, even though, as Ovid himself admits, Venus’ etymological connection to the month of April is quite tenuous (4.85-9).

We also see *vindicat* used of Jupiter’s claim over the Vinalia on April 23rd: *redduntur merito debita vina Iovi. / dicta dies hinc est Vinalia; Iuppiter illa / vindicat, et festis gaudet inesse suis*. (“The wine owed to a deserving Jupiter was bestowed. Thence the day is called the Vinalia; Jupiter lays claim to it, and enjoys taking part in his festivities” *Fast.* 4.898-900).⁶² Thus Ovid uses the term several times to refer to deities who assert their rights over particular aspects of the calendar.⁶³ Returning then to the passage above, it is significant that *cura Iunonis* rather than just *Iuno* lays claim to the Kalends. In the examples above it was a deity who served as the subject of *vindicat*, not an abstract noun. If we decide to read *cura Iunonis* as a subjective rather than an objective genitive, focus is shifted away from the epigraphical calendar, where her place on the Kalends is secure, and onto Ovid’s own poetic calendar, where Juno’s position both on the Kalends and throughout the calendar more broadly is potentially jeopardized. This is especially the case for the month of June, in the proem of which Juno issues a lengthy speech, laying claim to the month’s etymology in a very aggressive manner (6.21-64). In addition, on the Kalends of

⁶¹ Fantham (1998) 108 takes note of the legal language and the irony of juxtaposing “‘motherly’ Venus and the aggressive legal act of reclaiming stolen goods by seizure.” Booth (1991) 120-21 in discussing Ovid’s deployment of similar language at *Amores* 2.5.30 (*iniciam dominas in mea iura manus*, “I shall lay claim over my mistress in accordance with my rights”) offers the following assessment: “Scholars of Roman law have detected in Ovid’s *iniciam...manus* an echo of a formula used by a plaintiff in *manus iniectio*, an archaic legal enactment *apud praetorem* associated with the ancient process of *vindicatio*, by which one man might reclaim his rightful property from another.” See also the discussion of E.J. Kenney (1969) “Ovid and the Law” 253-59.

⁶² Fantham (1998) 263 again takes note of the legal flavor of *vindicat*.

⁶³ As Juno will go on to do in the proem of *Fast.* 6.

June, Janus, a god who appears in competition with Juno on the Kalends of January, will once again overshadow Juno in the story of how he transformed the nymph Cranaë into Carna, goddess of the hinge. In such a way, Ovid subtly embeds both mythological and religious threads into his seemingly simple declaration of Juno's affiliation with the Kalends. On the one hand, she is claiming worship of the Kalends as a religious figure who receives a sacrifice on that day of month. On the other hand, Juno's mythological persona peeks through and 1.55 serves the additional function of foreshadowing Juno's aggressive behavior throughout the poem and the mythologically-inspired claims she will make regarding her place in the calendar.

Another feature of line 1.55 worth exploring is the presence of the adjective *Ausonias* that modifies *Kalendas*. Here, it is not the mythological derivation of the word that draws attention,⁶⁴ but its expansiveness.⁶⁵ As is generally the case for Ovid, *Ausonias* here serves as a synonym for *Italicas*,⁶⁶ and we must remember that throughout Italy many towns employed their own local epigraphical calendars.⁶⁷ It is a testament to the pervasive nature of Juno's worship on the Kalends outside of Rome that Ovid chooses to modify *Kalendas* with *Ausonias* rather than

⁶⁴ From Auson, legendary son of Odysseus and Circe/Calypso (see Green [2004a] 55).

⁶⁵ Geographically Ausonia is defined by Verrius Flaccus as central Italy south of the Apennines (Paul. *Fest.* 16.23ff.). While Skutsch (1985) 180 mentions "*Ausonia*, *Oenoetria*, and *Italia* were originally only parts of the peninsula," it becomes clear from the towns outside of Rome cited by Juno in the proem of book 6 (see below) that Ovid intends for *Ausonia* to be read beyond the scope of Rome alone.

⁶⁶ See Myers (2009) 55 who comments as follows on Ovid's use of *Ausoniae* at *Met.* 14.7: "Ovid follows Virgil in using *Ausonius/Ausonia* for Italy and the Italians in general."

⁶⁷ See Pasco-Pranger (2006) 4-6 for her helpful discussion about balance between the variation and "the shared discursive form" of the several extant Augustan and Tiberian epigraphical calendars. Cf. Green (2006) 7: "analysis of the calendars clearly suggests that there was no uniform, officially-recognised model on which different calendars were based: discrepancies and differences of opinion abound."

great debt to Verrius Flaccus' *Fasti Praenestini*, both in terms of organization and content.⁷⁰

With the imperative *inspice*, Juno twice directs Ovid—and by extension the reader—to look at the physical *fasti* which exist outside of Rome. Notice also that two different adjectives are used to indicate Juno's connection to the month of June within these epigraphical calendars. First, Juno asserts that Aricia, Laurentum, and Lanuvium all have a *mensis Iunonius* (61). Then, in a seemingly separate category, both Tibur and Praeneste display *Iunonale...tempus* (63).⁷¹ These two groups do in fact represent two different geographical areas. While Aricia, Laurentum, and Lanuvium are all to the south of Rome, Tibur and Praeneste are clustered fairly close to one another east of Rome. It may be, then, that these two groups of towns had their own localized way of attributing the month of June to Juno. Lanuvium, in particular, which Juno qualifies with the adjective *meum*, is noteworthy as being home to the cult of Juno Sospita, an aspect of her worship that emphasizes her martial side and is thus well-suited to the month of June,⁷² which marked the peak of the campaigning season.⁷³ The reference to the *Ausonias...Kalendas* (1.55), therefore, has implications that go beyond alerting the reader to Juno's worship on the Kalends.

⁷⁰ See Wallace-Hadrill (1987) 225-27 and Wheeler (1999) 46-47 who expands on Wallace-Hadrill. See also Fantham (2002) 23, especially n. 2 for additional bibliographical information. For arguments on the chronology of Verrius Flaccus' publication of the *Fasti Praenestini* in relation to Ovid's composition of the *Fasti* see Wright (1917) 30 n. 83 and more recently Herbert-Brown (1994) 26.

⁷¹ Littlewood (2006) 21 points out, *Iunonale*, like *Iunonicolas* of 6.49, is an Ovidian coinage. By making *Iunonale...tempus* the object of *leges*, Ovid invites the reader to "read" Juno's name both here in the text as well as in the epigraphical *fasti* of Tibur and Praeneste.

⁷² *New Pauly, Antiquity* vol. 6 1108-09.

⁷³ Littlewood (2006) lxxv.

It broadens the scope of Ovid's poetic project and anticipates Juno's appeal on behalf of external epigraphical calendars that already pay homage to her namesake month.⁷⁴

It is a contention of this chapter that Ovid's acknowledgement of Juno's special connection to the Kalends at 1.55 underpins her presentation elsewhere in the *Fasti*. This might appear to conflict with Ovid's concluding remarks about the laws of various days: *haec mihi dicta semel, totis haerentia fastis, / ne seriem rerum scindere cogar, erunt* (61-62). The issue is twofold. First, what exactly does *haec* refer to? Barchiesi and Green understand *haec* to encompass the entirety of the preceding passage, including the distinction between days that are *comitalis*, *fastus*, and *nefastus* (1.47-52), the existence of the nundinal cycle (1.54), the delineation of the month into Kalends, Nones, and Ides (1.55-56), and finally the explication that each day after the Kalends, Nones, and Ides is a "black day" (1.57-60).⁷⁵ Wheeler, on the other hand, shows that even black days, the final item on the list, are revisited at later points in the poem.⁷⁶ Thus, if the *dies atri*, which are almost certainly included in the term *haec*, have a place elsewhere in the poem, then surely the other previously mentioned items, including Juno's special worship on the Kalends, are not precluded from being mentioned at some later point. And, as I aim to show throughout this chapter, Ovid does engage considerably with Juno and her worship on the Kalends beyond these introductory remarks.

⁷⁴ Wheeler (1999) 45 draws a parallel between "the well-read Muse of the Hellenistic poets" and Juno, who is "'well-read' in calendrical matters."

⁷⁵ Barchiesi (1997a) 104 and Green (2004a) 57.

⁷⁶ Wheeler (1999) 46 who cites astronomical/meteorological notices, explicit mentions of disastrous losses in battle, the *aetion* for constellation of Ariadne's crown, the postponement of the discussion of the Floralia from April to May, and Ovid's own concerns for his daughter's wedding date as evidence of Ovid NOT ignoring these *dies atri*.

This brings us to the second and more relevant issue: what is meant by *ne seriem rerum scindere cogar*? Barchiesi again weighs in: “Right from the beginning Ovid carefully avoids breaking up his poetic narrative with too many dates.”⁷⁷ Green has a slightly different reading: “Given the solemnity of the phrase, it here refers to the orderly procession of festivals in the calendar, rather than to Ovid’s own continuous poetic narrative.”⁷⁸ Pasco-Pranger’s interpretation comes closest to my own. She believes that Ovid’s concern “is expressed not as one of repetition, but as one of *continuity*, of not wishing to break the *series rerum*.”⁷⁹ As such, Ovid has no problem returning to any of the aforementioned *variorum iura dierum*, so long as doing so does not interrupt his poetic continuity.⁸⁰ We have already mentioned how he integrates numerous *dies atri* into his calendar without specifically calling them that.⁸¹ Similarly, throughout the poem he addresses Juno and Jupiter’s association with the Kalends and Ides respectively without repeating the formulaic nature of the days’ significance. The employment of *variatio* throughout his continuous poem allows him to incorporate lengthy mythological and aetiological narratives alongside—or even in lieu of—dry and routine calendrical information. By alerting the reader to the existence of these calendrical markers and asking that they be acknowledged throughout the duration of the poem (*totis haerentia fastis* 1.61), Ovid does not simply dismiss them. Quite the opposite. He conditions his reader to expect them in some capacity other than the simple way they are typically displayed on the epigraphical calendars. As

⁷⁷ Barchiesi (1997a) 104.

⁷⁸ Green (2004) 57-58.

⁷⁹ Pasco-Pranger (2006) 119.

⁸⁰ Hardie (1991) 55-56 likens Ovid’s statement here to his pledge at *Met.* 1.4 to sing of a *perpetuum carmen*, acknowledging, however, that the fragmented nature of the calendar with its inherent lack of transitions requires some poetic finessing on Ovid’s part.

⁸¹ See n. 76 above.

we shall see, Juno's worship on the Kalends ripples out far beyond the confines of its mention here in the poem's preface.

Discussions in this chapter focus on key events involving Juno which occur on or around the Kalends. I have chosen to examine the Kalends of January and June in this chapter, first because they both involve competition between Juno and Janus, who are alike in as many ways as they are different. Ovid exploits both their similarities and their differences and frames his poem around this incongruity. Second, they show Juno in two completely different lights. On the Kalends of January, she aids Titus Tatius and the Sabines in their attempted invasion of Rome, while in the proem to June, she embraces her Roman identity and pleads her case to be fully integrated into Roman society. I also address her brief appearance on the Kalends of March, where Romulus' wife Hersilia convinces the Romans and the Sabines to reach an amnesty after gathering in the temple of Juno Lucina, which is retroactively founded on that very day.⁸² I have saved discussions concerning Juno on the Kalends of February and her absence on the Kalends of May, both of which involve the presence of Jupiter, for a later chapter that examines Juno and Jupiter as pair. As for the Kalends of April, Juno is entirely absent. In fact, Ovid goes through great lengths to avoid having Venus and Juno encounter one another in the *Fasti*. In a departure from the Vergilian universe, in which the two are treated as adversaries, with Venus representing the interests of the Trojans/Romans and Juno defending the native italic peoples, in the world of Ovid's *Fasti* they are both integral parts of the Roman calendar, even sharing in the ancestry of the imperial family.⁸³ Although the Juno that Ovid puts forth sometimes bears Roman cult

⁸² See Degraffi (1963) 418, who records the entry from the *Fasti Antiates Maiores*.

⁸³ Juno is on several occasions in the *Fasti* identified as the mother of Mars and hence the grandmother of Romulus, making her a closer divine ancestor to the Julian gens than Venus, mother of Aeneas (Cf. 2.251; 5.258-60; 6.53-54).

epithets and self-identifies as a Roman deity, she nevertheless oscillates between her bitter Hellenic persona and her endearing Roman persona, giving the reader the sense that she is constantly in motion. This seemingly polarizing dynamic is something that I aim to explore by examining closely her appearances on the Kalends of January, March, and June.

II. Juno and Janus on the Kalends: Engagement with Ennius and Vergil

Our first encounter with Juno as a character in the *Fasti* fittingly takes place on the Kalends of January. Janus, responding to Ovid's question about the reason for his temple's location between the Forum Romanum and the Forum Iulium, begins his story with the treachery of Tarpeia (1.260-2) and then tells of the attack led by Titus Tatius and the Sabines against Rome.⁸⁴

et iam contigerat portam, Saturnia cuius 265
dempserat oppositas invidiosa seras;
 cum tanto veritus committere numine pugnam,
 ipse meae movi callidus artis opus,
 oraque, qua pollens ope sum, fontana reclusi,
 sumque repentinas eiacularus aquas. 270
 ante tamen madidis subieci sulphura venis,
 clauderet ut Tatio fervidus umor iter.

And now [Tatius] had reached the gate, whose closed bars hateful/jealous Saturnia had removed; having feared to vie in battle with so powerful a divinity, I cleverly contrived a device of my own art, and with the power over which I have control, I unlocked the mouths of the fountains, and I released sudden jets of water. But first I threw sulfur into the wet channels of water so that the boiling water might block Tatius' path.

(*Fast.* 1.265-72)

⁸⁴ Neither of these stories exists in Livy, nor are they told before Ovid. Bömer on *Fast.* 1.263ff. suggests that Verrius Flaccus is the common source for Ovid and subsequent treatments of this story (cf. Myers [2009] 195).

The first couplet of Janus' story is in direct dialogue with the scene in *Aen.* 7 where Juno throws open the gates of the anachronistic temple of Janus in a declaration of war between the Latins and the Trojans:⁸⁵

centum aerei claudunt vectes aeternaue ferri
robora, nec custos absistit limine Ianus.... 610

hoc et tum Aeneadis indicere bella Latinus
more iubebatur tristisque recludere portas.
abstinuit tactu pater aversusque refugit
foeda ministeria, et caecis se condidit umbris.
tum regina deum caelo delapsa morantis 620
impulit ipsa manu portas, et cardine verso
Belli ferratos rumpit Saturnia postis.
ardet inexcita Ausonia atque immobilis ante;

One-hundred brazen bolts and the eternal strength of iron close (the temple), and Janus, its guardian, never leaves its threshold...In this manner then as well Latinus was bidden to proclaim war on the followers of Aeneas and to unlock the grim gates. The father refused to lay his hands upon it and disinclined withdrew from the foul duty, and hid himself in the blind shadows. Then the queen of the gods glided down from the sky and on her own struck against the reluctant gates with her hand, and having turned the hinges Saturnia burst open the iron door-posts of the temple of War. Ausonia, which before had been undisturbed and placid, now blazes. (*Aen.* 7.609-23)

Ovid also alludes via a 'window reference'⁸⁶ to Ennius's *Annales* through Vergil's appropriation of the following Ennian lines: *postquam Discordia taetra / Belli ferratos postes portasque*

⁸⁵ Hardie (1991) has observed that many parts of "the Janus episode" respond to issues developed in the *Aeneid*, remarking, "The analogy with the *Aeneid* is not gratuitous, for taken together the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* represent Ovid's typically indirect answer to the challenge of Virgil's epic" (47).

⁸⁶ This term coined by Richard Thomas in his 1986 article "Vergil's Georgics and the Art of Reference" is used to indicate a type of intertextuality where one text looks back at another text

refregit (“after foul Discord burst open the iron door-posts and gates of War” *Ann.* 225-26 Sk.).⁸⁷

Here, Ennius charges *Discordia* with the task of throwing open what is almost certainly the gates of the temple of Janus.⁸⁸ Vergil exchanges *Discordia* for *Saturnia* and separates the action of *postes* and *portas*, opting to have Saturnian Juno first strike against the gates (*impulit...portas*) and then burst open the door-posts (*rumpit...postis*). Ovid follows Vergil in separating the two, albeit using alternative diction. Instead of having Juno strike against the gates, Ovid has Titus Tatius arrive at a singular gate (*contigerat portam*), perhaps to denote a narrower route of passage. The delayed mention of Juno helps build suspense and enables Janus to direct his focus against Tatius, whose path he will ultimately block (*clauderet ut Tatio*). Ovid also innovates by removing the Ennian and Vergilian *postes* from his account. Instead of door-posts being flung open, Ovid has bars being removed (*dempserat...seras*). This is perhaps because the act here is not merely symbolic, as it was in the *Aeneid* and likely also in the *Annales*. In the latter two, the act of throwing open the gates serves as a general declaration of war, whereas in Ovid there is an actual contingent of warriors attempting to pass through the gates in order initiate war. Such an action requires a certain amount of stealth and the removal of bars rather than a large-scale bursting open of the doors is more appropriate. Quite significant also is that Vergil and Ovid both follow Ennius in placing the subject of the action in the same *sedes* of the line. Ennius’ *Discordia*, Vergil’s *Saturnia*, and Ovid’s *Saturnia* are all placed immediately before the concluding spondee of their respective lines. In fact, Ovid follows Ennius more closely in this respect by starting with the subject and then devoting the subsequent line to the subject’s actions.

only by way of an additional intermediate text (see Whitton [2019] 134-35 for a more in-depth explanation of this phenomenon).

⁸⁷ See Skutsch (1985) 401-05.

⁸⁸ For a summary of the argument see Skutsch (1985) 402-03 and Goldschmidt (2013) 137-38.

Further, like Ennius, Ovid also elects to attach an epithet to his subject. In Vergil *Saturnia* stands alone, whereas Ovid describes *Saturnia* with the epithet *invidiosa*, just as Ennius describes *Discordia* as *taetra*. All of these elements make it clear that Ovid is aware of both the Vergilian and Ennian versions of these lines and incorporates aspects of them into his own version. The result is Ovid's extension of the Ennian and Vergilian Juno, who initially chose sides against the Romans and Trojans. Here in the *Fasti*, our first glimpse of Juno is not the Roman deity honored on the Kalends, but rather an adversarial Juno resembling the principal antagonist of the *Annales* and the *Aeneid*.

Although the specific circumstances surrounding the aforementioned lines of Ennius have been lost to us, we can nevertheless with great probability interpret them as the events signaling the beginning of war between the Romans and the Carthaginians,⁸⁹ much as the Vergilian passage signals the beginning of the war between the Trojans and the Latins. Considerations of both beginnings and of war are paramount to properly understanding our *Fasti* passage, which takes place at the beginning of the year and involves Juno, a goddess closely associated with war,⁹⁰ and Janus, another god of beginnings, who a few lines prior confessed, *nil mihi cum bello: pacem postesque tuebar* ("I have nothing to do with war: I was protecting both peace and doorways" 1.253). Indeed, it is Janus here who relates the story, a clear departure from Vergil and likely Ennius as well, where the work's narrator serves as the speaker. It is also in Janus' best interests to avoid using the term *Belli* as a descriptive word for the gates, present in both Vergil and Ennius; for, as we saw above, Janus has already confessed that he has nothing to do with war, preferring to see himself as the guardian of peace. Therein lies the principal difference between the context of these three passages. While Ennius and Vergil use these lines to indicate

⁸⁹ The date of the opening of the gates is either 235 B.C. or 241 B.C. (see Skutsch [1985] 402).

⁹⁰ See Graf's tripartite classification of Juno's worship in n. 44 above.

the beginning of a sustained period of war, Ovid's Janus appropriates them for precisely the opposite purpose: to indicate that such a war will not happen on his watch. Such an achievement plays out on two different fronts. On the one hand, by engaging directly with Tatius and the Sabines, Janus cleverly avoids a battle with the more powerful Juno. On other hand, he successfully prevents the outbreak of a full-scale battle between the Sabines and the Romans, resulting in the symbolic re-closing of the gate that had just been opened.

One might ask then, what role does Juno play in the *Fasti* passage? We must remember that the narrative is entirely controlled by Janus, who is addressing Ovid's question about the precise location of his temple. In *Aen.* 7 Juno's actions are described in two separate stages. First, she strikes against the gates that are described as *morantis*, which itself encapsulates a range of possibilities, from the doors being old and rusty to their being personified and depicted as deliberately unwilling to open. Horsfall puts great emphasis on *morantis*, commenting, "but in the presence of a deity, they should, for all their hundred brazen bars, fly open."⁹¹ In a separate action, Juno then succeeds in bursting open the gates, just as Discord had done in the Ennian version. In the *Fasti*, however, she does not proceed past stage one. Her actions are restricted merely to the removal of the bars, which themselves are called *oppositas* (266), indicating that they are shut tight,⁹² a nod to Vergil's *morantis portas* (620-21). In the *Aeneid* Janus is mentioned, but only as the guardian of the temple (*custos...Ianus* 610). Nowhere in the *Aeneid* is Janus ever given a voice, nor is he associated with the Roman calendar. Rather, his role in the

⁹¹ Horsfall (2000) 401 who also compares the effect to that of *cunctantem* and the golden bough (*Aen.* 6.211). Cf. also Williams (1977) 289 who quotes Heather White's statement in *Doors and Stars in Theocritus, Idyll XXIV* that "every Hellenistic reader knew that doors unfailingly and automatically opened whenever a god (or goddess) was near them."

⁹² For this definition of *oppositus* see *TLL* 9.2.771.15ff. where the closest parallel is Tib. 1.8.76: *quaecumque opposita est ianua dura sera*. Cf. also Ov. *Ep.* 17.8 *oppositas fores*.

Aeneid is strictly geographical and the mention of his name is synonymous with the Janiculum hill. There, it is King Latinus, not Janus, who, though bidden, refuses not only to open the gates (*recludere portas* 617), but even to touch them (*abstinuit tactu* 618), thereby mounting a staunch yet ultimately ineffective resistance to the impending declaration of war. In the *Fasti* Janus admits that he is afraid to compete directly with Juno, a more powerful goddess (266), but nevertheless takes evasive action in order to mount a defense against the invading enemy.⁹³ He proceeds to activate sulfuric springs, directing the spouts of scalding water at the enemy forces, thereby succeeding in staving off the attack. The verb Janus uses to describe the discharge of the water is none other than *reclusi* (269), the very same verb used by Vergil to denote Latinus' obligation to "unlock the grim gates" (*tristisque recludere portas* 617). Janus' 'unlocking' of the springs should be viewed as a direct response to the 'opening' attempted by Juno just above (*dempserat...seras* 266). In such a way, Janus matches the actions of Juno by appropriating Vergil's term and turning it back against Juno. The gates that Latinus was tasked with unlocking (*recludere*) in the *Aeneid* are, in the world of the *Fasti*, defended by a different sort of unlocking (*reclusi*) by Janus. The two passages also have opposite trajectories. In the *Aeneid*, the gates are initially firmly closed (*claudunt* 609), do not open as a result of the reluctance of Latinus (619-20), and then are violently opened by Juno (620-22). In the *Fasti*, the gates are initially opened

⁹³ Bömer (1986) 234 traces this phenomenon, especially apparent at *Met.* 14.783-85, back to Callimachus' *Hymn to Athena*, where the laws of Chronos are laid out as follows: Κρόνιοι δ' ὧδε λέγοντι νόμοι: ὅς κε τιν' ἀθανάτων, ὅκα μὴ θεὸς αὐτὸς ἔλῃται, ἀθήρησι, μισθῷ τοῦτον ἰδεῖν μεγάλῳ ("But the laws of Chronos speak thus: whoever shall catch sight of any of the immortals, when the very deity does not want it so, beholds such a deity with a heavy price" 101-02). Merli (2000) 193 interprets Janus' admission as one of practicality, emphasizing his cleverness: "L'ammissione di inferiorità nei confronti di Giunone del v. 267 non implica un senso di inadeguatezza, ma una valutazione del proprio ruolo e delle proprie capacità."

partially by Juno (265-66), which prompts Janus to retaliate with an opening of his own (269), which in turn results in closing the path for a threatening Tatius (*clauderet* 272), followed by the assumed rebarring of the doors (274).

The contexts of the Vergilian and Ennian passages also differ greatly from that of the *Fasti* passage. In the former two, the temple's gates are thrown open as an indication of war and not as a means for one party to gain access to the other's city. Both culminate in the symbolic declaration of war, followed—at least in the *Aeneid*—by the panic that sweeps through Ausonia, which is immediately roused from its former state of stupor (7.623). No battle follows, but rather the mustering of Italian troops in a lengthy catalogue. The *Fasti*, however, depicts Juno aiding the Sabines for the purpose of allowing them access to the inner city of Rome. The ancient historical value inherent in opening the gates of the temple of Janus, namely a formal declaration of war, here becomes secondary to using the actual gate itself as an entry point into the city. Yet, in the aftermath of his victory, when explaining to Ovid why it is that his temple is open during times of war and closed during times of peace, Janus says: *ut populo reditus pateant ad bella profecto, / tota patet dempta ianua nostra sera* (“So that avenues of return lie open to the people who have set off to war, my doorway lies completely open with the bars removed” 1.279-80). Notice that Janus' positive usage of *dempta...sera* here is balanced against the similarly phrased hostile actions of Juno above, *dempserat...seras* (266). Janus thus acknowledges the presence of warfare, but frames the issue in such a way as to emphasize his peaceful contributions by making sure that those at war make it safely home.

Our *Fasti* passage engages in a long-standing epic tradition by acknowledging Juno as a former enemy of Rome. In his article, “The Reconciliations of Juno,” Denis Feeney discusses the degree to which Juno's wrath is appeased after the conciliatory episode of *Aeneid* 12, where she vows to put aside her hatred for the Trojans and allow them to mix with the Latins and form a

new race (*Aen.* 12.819-28). For Ennius in his *Annales* had chosen to depict Juno as an ally of the Carthaginians and an enemy of Rome during the Second Punic War—surely a nod to an actual historical and religious tradition.⁹⁴ Servius, commenting on *Aen.* 1.281-82,⁹⁵ in which Jupiter tells Venus that Juno will eventually endorse Rome, addresses the Ennian reconciliation: *quia bello Punico secundo, ut ait Ennius, placata Iuno coepit favere Romanis* (“because in the Second Punic War, as Ennius stated, a placated Juno began to favor the Romans”).⁹⁶ W.R. Johnson, whose argument Feeney builds upon, emphasizes the ambiguity inherent in Juno’s Vergilian reconciliation, particularly with regard to the narrator’s final remarks on the matter: *mentem...retorsit* (“she changed her mind” *Aen.* 12.841), for which he offers the alternative translation, “she turned her mind away from his words.”⁹⁷ Thus Johnson is open to the possibility of Juno verbally accepting Jupiter’s offer, while mentally rejecting it. After all, Juno’s hatred of Troy accounts for only part of her dislike of the future Roman race, who are destined to destroy her beloved Carthage. Feeney follows Horsfall in referring to both a ‘mythological’ and a ‘historical’ motive for Juno’s hatred of Aeneas and his followers.⁹⁸ From a historical standpoint,

⁹⁴ Similar to how Silius Italicus begins his epic poem *Punica* with the premise that the Second Punic War arose as a result of Juno’s hatred of Rome (*Sil.* 1.26-55).

⁹⁵ *Consilia in melius referet, mecumque fovebit / Romanos rerum dominos gentemque togatam* (“[Juno] will change her mind for the better, and together with me she will cherish the Romans, masters of the world and the toga-wearing race”).

⁹⁶ See Skutsch (1984) 465-66 for his placement of Servius’ comments on Ennian themes at *Aen.* 1.281 and *Aen.* 12.841.

⁹⁷ Johnson (1976) 127 who goes so far as to say “[Juno] possibly never became fully reconciled to Rome at any time.” Feeney (1991) 149 and Tarrant (2012) 291 are a bit more flexible on the matter, referring to the pact between Jupiter and Juno as a “temporary accommodation.”

⁹⁸ Feeney (1984) 183.

she is the primary patron of Carthage,⁹⁹ a feature central to Ennius' *Annales* and acknowledged several times throughout the *Aeneid*.¹⁰⁰ On the other hand, she represents the Homeric Hera, who still holds a grudge against the Trojans for a variety of offences.¹⁰¹ Even after the reconciliation episode between Juno and Jupiter in *Aeneid* 12 (12.791-842), we must grapple with the fact that only one of these two Junonian dimensions is appeased. While the Juno that embodies the Homeric Hera can now take solace in knowing that another Troy will not arise, the Juno that represents the Carthaginian interests receives no such relief.¹⁰² Feeney explains this as "a question of emphases."¹⁰³ He goes on to say, "The divine reconciliation is qualified to the extent that it reflects only so much of the Roman endeavor as has been accomplished so far: it leaves open what historically remains open."¹⁰⁴ Feeney even postulates that *Annales* 1 involved a qualified reconciliation episode parallel to that of *Aen.* 12, suggesting that Juno there approves of the apotheosis of Romulus in return for the very thing she seeks in *Aen.* 12, namely the final destruction of Troy.¹⁰⁵ Thus in the case of both *Aen.* 12 and Feeney's version of *Annales* 1, Juno

⁹⁹ Feeney 1984 (183) and (1994) 131 sees her as a stand-in for the Carthaginian Tanit when viewed as the patron deity of Carthage.

¹⁰⁰ Most prominently in the proem (*Aen.* 1.12-23) and throughout all of book 4, which culminates in Dido's curse (*Aen.* 621-29).

¹⁰¹ These offenses are personal in nature and include the judgement of Paris and Jupiter's lust for the Trojan prince Ganymede (*Aen.* 1.26-28). Cf. Feeney (1984) 183.

¹⁰² Tarrant (2012) 290-91 stresses the limitations of the amnesty, remarking "Nothing is said about the future situations in which she [Juno] might be an adversary of Rome (e.g. in the wars with Carthage), and we must infer that the present agreement leaves her free to act as she wishes in those circumstances."

¹⁰³ Feeney (1984) 184.

¹⁰⁴ Feeney (1984) 184.

¹⁰⁵ Feeney (1984) 187-89.

is still destined to take the side of Carthage against Rome, relinquishing her ‘mythological’ motivation while retaining her ‘historical’ one.

I would argue that Ovid is offering the reader a glimpse of something similar in the episode of Juno aiding the Sabines. The matter is here also a question of emphases. Is Ovid, like Ennius and Vergil, emphasizing Juno’s continued hostility towards Rome from a historical perspective,¹⁰⁶ or does he have another agenda in mind? Since the chronology of the Sabine attack, which can be dated to the Romulean era, lies well before the Second Punic War and what may be considered, at least according to Ennius, Juno’s final endorsement of Rome, we can perhaps see Ovid embracing the historical tradition of a Juno who has not yet aligned herself with the Roman cause.¹⁰⁷ Ogilvie, in his discussion of Livy’s treatment of the Roman ritual of *evocatio* at 5.21, wherein the Etruscan Juno of Veii is ritually transferred to Rome, offers the following comment: “It is a curious fact that in three of the four cases [of *evocatio*] the tutelary deity was known at Rome as Juno (Regina, Curitis, Caelestis).”¹⁰⁸ The implication here is that various forms of the goddess Juno attached to conquered nations are especially prone to *evocatio*. This further demonstrates that non-Roman equivalents of Juno are historically reluctant to transfer their allegiance to Rome and only do so after a formal ritual has taken place.

Robert Palmer speaks of Juno as the quintessential Italian protective goddess, owing in large part to the many aspects of her worship, and remarks that it was likely a common practice

¹⁰⁶ Assuming that her mythological motive for hatred against the Trojans at large has been satisfied by the events of *Aen.* 12 (cf. Feeney [1984] 183 n. 26).

¹⁰⁷ Thus offering a Sabine equivalent of Ennius’ Carthaginian Juno.

¹⁰⁸ Ogilvie (1965) 674. For the three documented instances of *evocatio* involving Juno (Falerii, Veii, and Carthage) see Macr. *Sat.* 3.9. For a more detailed account of the ‘most historical’ of the *evocationes*, namely that of Juno Regina of Veii by Camillus in 396 B.C. see Livy 5.22.4-7. For pushback on the validity of the evidence regarding *evocationes* of Juno at Falerii and Carthage see Gustaffson (1999) 56-60.

for Romans to relocate the conquered enemy's version of Juno to Rome.¹⁰⁹ Perhaps, therefore, we are meant to view this moment of Juno's aggression against Rome on behalf of the Sabines as foreshadowing yet another example of *evocatio*.¹¹⁰ Indeed, there may already be a connection between Titus Tatius, who hailed from the Sabine town of Cures,¹¹¹ and Juno Curitis,¹¹² who is traditionally associated with Etruscan town of Falerii.¹¹³ This would speak to Juno's historical motivation as a protectress of Sabine interests in the guise of Juno Curitis. Interestingly, Livy's account glosses over Juno's role in aiding the Sabines, proceeding directly from the treachery of Tarpeia to the taking of the Capitoline hill by the Sabine contingent, without providing any

¹⁰⁹ Palmer (1974) 38.

¹¹⁰ For other undocumented examples of *evocatio* see Plin. *NH* 28.18. Johnson (1976) 123 refers to the meeting between Jupiter and Juno in *Aen.* 12 as "shaped as an *evocatio*."

¹¹¹ Ovid himself alludes to this at *Met.* 14.778 when he calls the contingent of Sabines *sati Curibus* ("men born from Cures") and again at *Fast.* 2.135 (*Tatius parvique Cures*). Kötze (1991) 149 connects the former to Juno Curitis, referring to it as "eine verborgene religionsgeschichtliche Dimension." Heinze (1919) 36 n. 2 drawing in particular upon the mention of *sati Curibus* at *Met.* 14.788, also sees an allusion to Juno Curitis. Prop. 4.9.71...74 may also allude to Juno Curitis and her connection with Tatius and the Sabines: *sic sanctum Tatiae composuere Cures. / Sancte pater salve, cui iam favet aspera Iuno* ("Thus the Sabine Cures established him [Hercules] as sacred in his temple. Hail, sacred father, to whom bitter Juno now shows favor"). Note the inclusion of *Tatiae* for Titus Tatius and especially the paired line endings of *Cures* and *Iuno*. See also Stephanus Byzant. s.v. Κυρίς.

¹¹² Dion. Hal. *RA* 2.50.3 tasks Titus Tatius with the role of having established the cult of Juno Curitis in Rome. Bömer (1986) 233 doubts this considering Varro does not mention it: "Varro dagegen erwähnt in einer Nachricht ling. V 74 über die von T. Tatius eingeführten Kult Iuno nicht, und der müßte es eigentlich wissen."

¹¹³ Basanoff (1947) 52, Bruun (1972) 114. Ovid discusses at length the festival of Juno at Falerii in *Am.* 3.13 and in the *Fasti* Juno herself refers to the people of Falerii as *Iunicolae Falisci* (6.49).

intermediate repulsion of the Sabines or temporary victory for the Romans.¹¹⁴ As it happens, like the *Aeneid* and the *Annales*, the *Fasti* also features a reconciliation episode involving Juno. For the events depicted by Janus here at *Fasti* 1 seem to be in dialogue with the episode told on the Kalends of March, where Juno is credited with helping to bring about the amnesty between the Romans and the Sabines. This is partly owing to the fact that Mars, a god much more sympathetic to Juno's case,¹¹⁵ serves as the narrator for that episode. An alternative version of the events will also be alluded to by Juno in the proem of book 6 where she argues that the month of June owes its name to her. These connections will be discussed at length below.

III. Mytho-historical Implications of Juno as *Saturnia*

Let us turn now to the specific words used by Ovid/Janus to describe Juno in this passage. In *Aeneid* 7 Vergil had introduced Juno by calling her "queen of the gods" (*regina deum* 7.620) and then follows that up with the epithet *Saturnia* (7.622). In our passage Juno is identified exclusively by that very same epithet (*Saturnia* 1.265). The reference to Juno as a daughter of Saturn has a long tradition, going as far back as Homer, who refers to Hera as a daughter of Kronos: "Ἥρῃ πρέσβῃ θεᾷ θυγάτηρ μεγάλῳ Κρόνῳ" ("Hera, the honored goddess, daughter of great Kronos" *Il.* 5.721). Skutsch suggests that *Saturnia* is likely an Ennian coinage, serving "as a metrically convenient tag, or...to hint that after her original hostility she would eventually become the *dea sospes* of the *Saturnia terra*."¹¹⁶ More broadly, the term *Saturnia*

¹¹⁴ Liv. 1.11-12. This however, may result from Livy's general skepticism regarding divinely inspired events, as Anthony Corbeill helpfully suggested to me.

¹¹⁵ For within the *Fasti*, Mars is presented as the son of Juno. A whole episode is devoted to the matter (cf. 5.229-60) and both Juno and Mars independently emphasize their close relationship (Mars at 3.251-52 and Juno at 6.53-54).

¹¹⁶ Skutsch (1985) 205. For Ennius at least twice refers to Juno as *Saturnia* (Skutsch: *Ann.* 53 and 445).

constitutes a common way for Roman poets, especially those engaged in the writing of ‘high poetry,’ to refer to Juno.¹¹⁷ Indeed, it occurs 16 times in the *Aeneid*, 4 times in the *Fasti* (1.265, 2.191, 5.235, 6.507) and 13 times in the *Metamorphoses*.¹¹⁸ Servius Danielis comments on its first appearance in the *Aeneid* at 1.23: *Saturnia autem nomen quasi ad crudelitatem aptum posuit; Vergilius enim ubique Iovi vel Iunoni Saturni nomen adiungit, causas eis crudelitatis adnectit* (“Vergil, moreover, adapted the name Saturnia especially suited to her cruelty; for whenever Vergil joins the name of Saturn to Jove or Juno, he attaches to them reasons for their cruelty”).¹¹⁹ MacKay, however, has endeavored to provide some clarification on Servius’ narrow definition of the epithet, noting that Vergil refers to Juno as *Saturnia* only four times in the first six books, yet a whopping twelve times in the last six books.¹²⁰ He provides the following comment: “It can hardly be accidental that the name *Saturnia* is applied to Juno chiefly in the part of the poem where her chief activity is the direct defence of the old order, the native traditions, the indigenous element of the *Saturnia tellus*.” Patricia Johnston takes this a step further and views Juno’s role in the *Aeneid* in part as a protective Italic deity, whose hostility is commensurate with the harm capable of being inflicted upon Latium by the Trojans.¹²¹ The *Fasti*, of course, cannot be divided so neatly, but of the four instances in which Juno is referred

¹¹⁷ Cf. Green (2004) 125.

¹¹⁸ For all 16 appearances in the *Aeneid* see Anderson (1958) 520 n. 4.

¹¹⁹ Cf. also Servius on *Aen.* 4.92: *ubi nocituram Iunonem poeta vult ostendere Saturniam dicit* (“When the poet wishes to show Juno’s intent to do harm, he calls her *Saturnia*”).

¹²⁰ MacKay (1956) 60. Applying a similar treatment to its appearances in Ovid’s *Met.*, Bömer has observed that the epithet occurs primarily in the earlier books of the poem (11x in books 1-5 vs. only 2x in books 6-15) and mostly in relation to Greek myths (cf. Myers [2009] 198).

¹²¹ Johnston (2002) 123-30.

to as *Saturnia*, three involve acts of anger and aggression.¹²² Significantly, however, Ovid's use of the term *Saturnia* to describe Juno in the passage under discussion follows closely after Janus' own exposition of the ancient realm of Saturn:¹²³

hac ego Saturnum memini tellure receptum
 (caelitibus regnis a Iove pulsus erat).
 inde diu genti mansit Saturnia nomen;
 dicta quoque est Latium terra latente deo.
 at bona posteritas puppem formavit in aere,
 hospitis adventum testificata dei.

I remember when Saturn was received in this land (he had been thrust from the kingdom of the sky by Jove). Thence for a long time the name "Saturnian" remained for the people; the land was also called "Latium" from the god who hides. But noble posterity stamped a ship on a bronze coin, having sworn witness to the arrival of the foreign god. (*Fast.* 1.235-40)

The proximity of this passage to Ovid's first use of *Saturnia* in the *Fasti* lends weight to MacKay's correction of Servius that the name *Saturnia* ought to principally evoke the golden age of Saturn in early Italy, and with it, feelings of hostility towards those who might wish to threaten or subvert that former period of glory.¹²⁴ Hugh Parker in his assessment of Saturn's role in the *Fasti* emphasizes that he is wholly rooted in the mythological world and "is not associated

¹²² The exception is 5.235, where Flora calls Juno *Saturnia*, which may be an attempt at flattery, serving as an acknowledgment of Juno's prestigious lineage. It may also serve to embody Juno's desperate frame of mind, as she seeks a way to give birth without the assistance of a male.

¹²³ A feature observed by Littlewood (2006) 16 who remarks on its similarity to the triple repetition of *Saturnum...Saturni...Saturnia* at 6.29-31.

¹²⁴ Vergil describes Saturn's reign in similar terms at *Aen.* 8.319-23, but Juno as *Saturnia* is nowhere to be found. Amerasinghe (1953) 65 sees a reference to the golden age in the mention of *ferratos...postes* at *Aen.* 7.22, remarking, "The mention of 'iron gates' would remind any reader of Virgil that Saturn stood for the golden age. That age of peace and goodwill is surely being contrasted here with the iron age of corruption and war."

with any Roman religious activity.”¹²⁵ By stripping Saturn of any religious associations, Ovid invites the reader to interpret Saturnian Juno in light of the two main mythological dimensions of Saturn: the golden age he brought with him to Latium and the violence he exhibits upon swallowing his children.¹²⁶ As Parker notes, the *Fasti* is unique among Augustan poems in its account of the latter story, which Ovid tells in book 4 (197-214).¹²⁷ Janus, however, is more concerned with Saturn’s association with the former and paints him in an altogether positive light, which in turn enhances the dichotomy of a Saturnian Juno who exhibits such blatant violence against the Roman state.¹²⁸

One can, moreover, view Janus’ recollection of the Saturnian golden age as coloring the reader’s understanding of Juno as *Saturnia* at *Fast.* 1.265. For one, Janus’ story begins with *memini* (235), indicating that he personally witnessed the arrival of Saturn and the golden age that ensued.¹²⁹ Janus goes on to describe the tranquil bliss associated with Saturn’s rule and emphasizes the presence of justice (*iustitiam* 1.249), all of which are traditional elements of that time period.¹³⁰ Yet, the choice of describing Juno, who is in the midst of a hostile act, as *Saturnia* problematizes the idyllic description of the Saturnian era. The epithet does not inherently activate any specific association, but its proximity to Janus’ positive reflections on the age of Saturn does raise certain questions. One possible explanation is that we are meant to see in this narrative a reenactment/reflection of the circumstances that led to Saturn’s exile in the first place. As

¹²⁵ Parker (1997) 19-20.

¹²⁶ Newman and Newman (2015) 197-98 view the *Aeneid*’s Juno as inheriting these opposing Saturnian characteristics.

¹²⁷ Parker (1997) 20.

¹²⁸ This fits with Evander’s close characterization of the two in the *Aeneid*, where they are paired in consecutive lines (see *Aen.* 8.357-58).

¹²⁹ Green (2004) 115 sees *memini* as validating Janus’ authority.

¹³⁰ Cf. Ryberg (1958).

Saturnia, Juno fulfills the role of Saturn, while Janus acts as a stand-in for Jupiter. Instead of the thunderbolt of Jove, which could also be described as bolts of fire, Janus employs jets of hot water (*fervidus umor* 272). Recall that Juno is here representing the interests of the Sabines, a tribe that is much older than the Romans and believed to be indigenous to the area. The description of Saturn's expulsion from the heavens by Jove (*a Iove pulsus erat* 236) is echoed by Janus' account of the Sabine rejection (*pulsis...Sabinis* 273).¹³¹ It may, therefore, represent a drastically reduced version of the epic battle par-excellence that took place between the Titans and the Olympian gods. As such, it may be read as having the comedic undertones of a mock-epic, especially considering the irony of the peaceful Janus defeating the bellicose Juno.

A more compelling reading, however, would interpret the actions of Juno and Janus as a civil war of sorts. After all, Janus and Saturn were at one time co-rulers of Latium and Juno is endowed with a title that evokes her association with the native Italic tribes, among which are the Sabines.¹³² While Janus has transferred his allegiance entirely to the Roman cause, Juno still nurses a preference for the more indigenous Italic tribes that manifests itself in the form of violence against the new and potentially destructive city of Rome. This passage thus expresses a mythologically-inspired deviation of interests that will experience a readjustment on the Kalends of March, when Titus Tatius and Romulus become co-rulers and Juno is cited as a major factor in their reconciliation (*Fast.* 3.205-52).

Now that we have examined the various implications of referring to Juno here as *Saturnia*, we must turn our attention to the epithet used to describe her, namely *invidiosa* (266).

¹³¹ This phrase recurs again at *Fast.* 6.393 (*hoste repulso*), this time in reference to the Roman repulsion of the Gauls from the Capitoline hill. All three of these phrases gloss over the actual battle that took place and skip right to the moment of victory (cf. Merli [2000] 194).

¹³² For Janus and Saturn as co-rulers of ancient Latium see *Aen.* 8.357-8.

Although there exists a less well-attested reading of *insidiosa* in place of *invidiosa* in the transmission of a few manuscripts, the vast majority of modern editors print the latter, the only exception being the text of Merkel.¹³³ The *OLD* does not cite our current passage, but does provide two possibilities for translating *invidiosa* in this context: either “arousing hatred, unpopular, odious, invidious”¹³⁴ or “jealous, envious.”¹³⁵ Only the latter usage is ever applied to a deity, with Propertius referring to Venus as an *invidiosa dea* when other clearly inferior deities attempt to compete with her beauty (Prop. 2.28.10). Like Propertius, our passage also involves the aspect of competition between a superior and inferior deity, as acknowledged by Janus himself (*tanto...numine* 267). Keegan calls the entire phrase *Saturnia invidiosa* “prejudicial,” attributing its presence here primarily to the male narrator Janus, who removes Juno’s agency and focuses instead on his own actions as gatekeeper.¹³⁶ This is especially true in light of the female gate-keeper, Tarpeia, whose failure to perform her duties is noted by Janus just above (*levis custos* 261).¹³⁷ That is not to say the *OLD*’s former and far more prevalent definition of “arousing hatred” is entirely absent from its usage here, which may be interpreted to reflect hatred on two different levels. As we have seen, an allusion to Juno’s cruelty is already

¹³³ The app. crit. of AWC cites the reading *invidiosa* in the primary manuscripts A and M, as well as in the majority of *codices vulgares* (ω), while the reading *insidiosa* appears in manuscript U and is also attested later in the *Fasti* at 6.508, where it is also used to describe Juno in the form of Saturnia. Cf. *TLL* 7.2.206.55 and Green (2004) 125. This epithet for Juno even escapes the notice of J. B. Carter’s extensive *Epitheta Deorum*.

¹³⁴ *OLD* s.v. 1.

¹³⁵ *OLD* s.v. 3.

¹³⁶ Keegan (2002) 132-33. King (2006) 96-97 takes that idea a step further and views this scene as sexually charged with Juno deliberately replacing Titus Tatius and the Sabines such that the penetrator becomes the penetrated. In this way the emitting of Janus’ hot springs takes on a phallic quality.

¹³⁷ See Barchiesi (1991) 15.

embedded into the presence of her title *Saturnia*. What then does *invidiosa* add to her description? One solution is that it plays into the dynamic of Ovid presenting a multivalent Juno who is at once hostile to the Romans, yet also eager for the recognition that accompanies the Roman deity who is worshipped on the Kalends. Such an interpretation would mean that she is *invidiosa* or “hateful” primarily towards Janus rather than the Romans or any other target. After all, he is the one who technically ascribes the adjective to her. Although Janus takes great pains to portray himself as the savior of Rome, launching a defensive attack against an anti-Roman Juno, from a different perspective one could see Juno as engaging in hostilities with Janus over control of the Kalends. On the one hand, we have an anti-Roman Juno who is doing something familiar by attempting to open the gates of Janus and engage in hostilities against the Romans. On the other hand, we have a glimpse of Juno of the Roman calendar, who is fighting on the Kalends of January against an adversary who also shares that day. Later in book 6, we see the term *invidiosus* recur from the mouth of Juno herself, albeit in a different sense: *hic honor in nobis invidiosus erit?* (“Will this honor be begrudged to us?” 6.36).¹³⁸ There Juno is engaged in fighting off another rival, Maia, who served as one of the three contenders for May’s etymology. Janus himself lurks right around the corner on the Kalends of June and overshadows the day on which the temple of Juno Moneta was dedicated.¹³⁹ Regardless of how noble Janus’ motives truly are, the battle between these two calendrical deities on the very first Kalends seems deliberate and establishes a theme of competition that will extend throughout the entire poem. We should also consider that Macrobius connects the epithet *Iunonius* to Janus as well as to Juno: *a qua etiam Ianum Iunonium cognominatum diximus, quod illi deo omnis ingressus, huic*

¹³⁸ *TLL* 7.2.207.10 categorizes this example of *invidiosus* as “*quae maligne negantur, non ceduntur alicui.*”

¹³⁹ This episode will be discussed below.

deae cuncti Kalendarum dies videntur adscripti (“From her [Juno] we called Janus by the name *Iunonius*, because all entry-ways are ascribed to his dominion, while all Kalends are ascribed to hers” Macr. 1.15.19). Thus the ancients acknowledged the overlap between Juno and Janus, not only in terms of domain, but also in terms of epithets.

To sum up then, in our passage the epithet *Saturnia* along with her description as *invidiosa* has multiple resonances. By referring to Juno as *Saturnia*, Ovid activates an association with Ennius and, by extension, with Vergil, highlighting her cruelty, particularly with regard to the preservation of indigenous Italic tribes. This is especially evident, given the close proximity between Juno’s appearance as *Saturnia* and Janus’ reminiscence of the golden age, which coincided with Saturn’s exile from heaven and his arrival in Latium. At the same time, the adjective *invidiosa* reinforces the hostility exhibited by the Ennian and Vergilian Juno, while also adding an additional layer to Juno’s motivation—competition with the god Janus on the Kalends of January. As such, she serves as an enemy of the fledgling Romans who have disrupted peaceful society in Latium by absconding with the wives of the Sabine men. Let us now turn to the comparable narrative of the Sabine invasion in *Met.* 14.

IV. Juno and the Sabines in the *Met.*: Intertextuality and Generic Play

The *Fasti* does not present us with Ovid’s only account of the attempted invasion by Titus Tatius and the Sabines. A similar version is told in greater detail in Book 14 of the *Met.*:

unam tamen ipsa reclusit
nec strepitum verso Saturnia cardine fecit;
sola Venus portae cecidisse repagula sensit
et clausura fuit, nisi quod rescindere numquam
dis licet acta deum. Iano loca iuncta tenebant
naides Ausoniae gelido rorantia fonte:
has rogat auxilium, nec nymphae iusta petentem
sustinuere deam venasque et flumina fontis
elicuere sui; nondum tamen invia Iani

ora patentis erant, neque iter praecluserat unda:
 lurida subponunt fecundo sulphura fonti
 incenduntque cavas fumante bitumine venas.

However, Saturnia herself unlocked one of the gates nor did she make any noise when she turned the hinge; Venus alone sensed that the bars of the gate had fallen and would have closed it, were it not for the fact that it is never permitted for gods to reverse the deeds of gods. The Ausonian Naiads were holding a spot joined to Janus that was wet with chilly spring water: Venus asks them for help, nor did the nymphs hold out against the goddess who was seeking just things and they released the veins and channels of their spring; however, the mouth of the opening of Janus was not yet impassable nor had the water blocked off their course: the Naiads place yellow sulfur beneath the abundant spring and they scorch the hollow veins with burning pitch. (*Met.* 14.781-92)

The purpose of comparing these two passages, beyond merely showing how they simultaneously converge with and deviate from one another, is to flesh out the many nuances and subtleties embedded into Ovid's poetic enterprise. Yes, one represents an epic and the other an elegiac rendering of a similar narrative, but they also play off one another and establish deep-rooted threads within the larger context of each individual work. We immediately notice that once again Saturnian Juno is responsible for unlocking the gate(s) and aiding the Sabines in their attempted attack. Here Juno's actions are associated with stealth, as opposed to the far more epic gesture depicted in *Aen.* 7, where she thrusts open the gates with much fanfare (*Aen.* 7.621-22).¹⁴⁰ In the *Fasti* that aspect of stealth is transferred to the Sabines themselves who are called *tacitos* (1.262) as they make their way into Rome. While no explicit evidence of noise or silence is indicated in the *Fasti* when Juno removes the gate's bars (*dempserat...seras* 266), in the *Met.* we are told that

¹⁴⁰ Barchiesi (1991) 15-16 makes note of the dichotomy between the epic noise of Discordia's and Juno's actions in Ennius and Vergil and the elegiac silence of Juno's actions in the *Fasti*, but refrains from drawing a parallel between the silence evoked in the comparable lines of the *Fasti* and *Met.* passages.

no noise was made, even as the hinges of the gate were being turned (*nec strepitum verso ...cardine* 782).¹⁴¹ Interestingly, Vergil had employed precisely the same expression in *Aen.* 7 (*cardine verso* 7.621) to convey the opposite, more appropriate response, namely that much noise accompanied the opening of the gates.¹⁴² In both Ovidian cases Juno's implicit and explicit silence may foreshadow her failure to actually penetrate the gates. For despite her attempts to aid the Sabines unnoticed, in both cases her actions are met with immediate recognition—by Venus in the *Met.* and by Janus in the *Fasti*. I do not think that this is intended to be comic, but instead serves to emphasize the vigilance of the pro-Roman deities and perhaps the diminishing power of the non-Roman Juno.¹⁴³

The two Ovidian passages are certainly in dialogue with one another. Although the *Met.* initially glosses over any mention of bars, we next see that Venus is aware that the bars have been removed (*portae cecidisse repagula* 783), prompting her to take action in a similar way to Janus in the *Fasti*. Yet, whereas Janus crafts a method of attacking Juno through indirect means, Venus enlists the help of a third party, the Naiads, who acknowledge the validity of Venus' request (*iusta petentem* 787). The fact that Venus recuses herself from engaging directly in battle with Juno further separates the events at hand from those of the *Aeneid*, where the two goddesses were perpetually at odds with one another. Although the Vergilian Juno bursts open the gates of war on her own accord, she does so in a larger sense in direct defiance of Venus who wishes for

¹⁴¹ Howell (1968) 135 draws attention to the vociferous sounds ancient Roman doors made when opened—apparently detectable even today! Such an observation reinforces the futility of Juno's actions.

¹⁴² See Myers (2009) 197-98.

¹⁴³ That is, in the era of the *Aeneid* she could thrust open the gates of war with authority, but now that Rome actually exists, her attempts at doing them harm are limited to stealth, and even then, are unsuccessful.

the Trojans and Latins to integrate seamlessly. In the *Fasti*, however, Janus takes the initiative, simultaneously cementing himself as the newfound champion of Roman interests as well as Juno's new rival,¹⁴⁴ thereby supplanting the role held by Venus in the epic treatment of the episode.¹⁴⁵ This establishes a dynamic wherein the Roman, peaceful Janus defeats the foreign, hostile Juno. Yet, it is a victory that does not prevent Juno from attempting to assert her authority elsewhere in the *Fasti*.¹⁴⁶

The *Met.* passage begins with a series of *re-* words (*reclisit*, *repagula*, *rescindere*), perhaps hinting at the various levels of resistance—the door itself, the bars, and then a divine adversary—culminating in the repulsion of Juno and the Sabines.¹⁴⁷ Note how the verb indicating Juno's opening of the gates here, *reclisit* (781), is also used by Janus to describe how he burst open the springs at *Fast.* 1.269 (*fontana reclusi*).¹⁴⁸ This adds another layer to the aforementioned Vergilian parallel where Latinus refuses to unlock (*recludere* 8.617) the gates of the temple of Janus. By employing the same word for the actions of both opposing characters in these two congruent episodes, Ovid makes it appear as if Janus is matching Juno's actions word-

¹⁴⁴ Merli (2000) 195 focuses on the equality of the “rivalità fra Venere e Giunone,” seen in the *Met.*, as opposed to the “il motivo dell’astuzia vittoriosa” on the part of Janus embedded with the *Fasti* narrative, but does not mention calendrical considerations.

¹⁴⁵ Keegan (2002) 133 speaks of Janus as having “elevated masculine cunning to the status of superordinate godhead.”

¹⁴⁶ Especially in her speech at 6.21-64, where she argues that Juno owes its name to her.

¹⁴⁷ This use of *re-*words may also emphasize the recurrence of this episode in the *Fasti*, namely that these events all happen ‘again’ there.

¹⁴⁸ Both *reclisit* (*Met.* 14.781) and *reclusi* (*Fast.* 1.269) are also in the same *sedes* as the final word of their respective lines.

for-word, or vice-versa, depending on how one interprets the intertextuality.¹⁴⁹ The word play, however, does not end there. Ovid also uses *reclusa* to describe the opening of the city gates by the traitor Tarpeia at *Met.* 14.776: *arcisque via Tarpeia reclusa* (“the path to the citadel was unlocked by Tarpeia”). The pairing of *Tarpeia reclusa* (776) and *ipsa reclusit* (781) at their respective line ends emphasizes the comparison that is intended to be drawn between the human and the divine female traitor.¹⁵⁰ Yet, while Tarpeia’s treacherous actions are followed immediately by her punishment (*poena* 14.777), no such information is given regarding the aftermath of Juno’s defeat.¹⁵¹ At the same time, the intertextual use of *recludere* is meant to underscore the oppositional relationship between Juno and Janus. Although they both take the same action, Juno initiates hostilities against the Romans, while Janus is compelled to respond and does just enough to repel Rome’s enemy. These differences also play out on a larger scale within the *Fasti*, with the month of January being particularly devoted to memorials associated with peace,¹⁵² while Juno’s month of June marks the middle of the campaigning season and commemorates a number of military anniversaries.¹⁵³

One of the most conspicuous differences between the two Ovidian episodes is the exchange of Janus for Venus—or vice-versa—as defender of the gates. Although King explains

¹⁴⁹ Ovid himself subsequently uses the same verb in the *Fasti* when asking Janus about why his temple is opened during times of war: *at cur pace lates, motisque recluderis armis?* (“And why do you hide during peace, and unlock yourself when war is initiated?” *Fast.* 1.277).

¹⁵⁰ “Traitor” is, of course, a strong word to describe Juno, since part of her appearance here exists in a world in which she has not yet endorsed Rome (see discussion above).

¹⁵¹ Although gods cannot be punished, the reader is often privy to the emotional reaction of a deity following a defeat. We see this in other episodes of the *Fasti* involving Juno, particularly in the Callisto narrative (2.177-92).

¹⁵² Such as the restoration of the Republic (587-616), the temple of Concordia (637-50), prayers to the peaceful deities Ceres and Tellus (657-704), and the Ara Pacis (709-22).

¹⁵³ Littlewood (2006) lv-lviii.

Venus' presence in the *Met.* by pointing out the proximity between the temple of Janus Geminus and the shrine of Venus Cloacina,¹⁵⁴ we must also acknowledge that the pairing of Venus and Juno is more suited for an epic contest.¹⁵⁵ In discussing the role of Venus in post-Vergilian epic, Barchiesi remarks that she "carries on her Aeneadic role of family-oriented protection, but in a vacuum—gone are the forces of Juno, Apollo, and especially Jupiter."¹⁵⁶ While Barchiesi is right in stating that Venus' anger is a more significant force than Juno's in *Met.* 14,¹⁵⁷ as we see here, Juno's wrath still lingers. Her resistance, however, has been greatly diminished, and although Venus claims that she is not allowed to compete directly with another Olympian deity, it is ironic that the Naiads, as lesser deities, should have such great success against Juno. This aspect of a lesser deity, or group of deities, competing with a greater one is also reflected in the *Fasti*'s contest between Juno and Janus. While Janus certainly holds a higher place in the divine hierarchy than the Naiads of the *Met.*, he is by no means on par with Juno.

Juno's strong personality and her penchant for cruelty and violence make her especially suitable for the weighty genre of epic. Although these qualities are certainly imported into Ovid's *Fasti*, they are often given an elegiac flavor, as is the case with many of the characters and narratives of this generically fluid poem.¹⁵⁸ This cross-generic play will become even more apparent when we examine her role in facilitating the amnesty struck between the Sabines and the Romans on the Kalends of March and again during her lengthy speech in the proem of *Fasti*

¹⁵⁴ King (2006) 97.

¹⁵⁵ Kötzle (1991) 149 who remarks, "Juno is zwar auch die epische Gegnerin der Venus."

¹⁵⁶ Barchiesi (1999) 119.

¹⁵⁷ Barchiesi (1999) 119. Cf. *Met.* 14.494-95.

¹⁵⁸ Mars and Minerva, two principally martial deities, are depicted having discarded part of their martial identity, Mars his helmet (3.172), although he is initially asked to lay aside his shield, spear and his helmet (3.1-2), and Minerva her spear (6.655-56). This "disarming" is characteristic of their elegiac treatment within the *Fasti*.

6. Here, however, a few things can be said about genre in relation to Juno's appearance in the Sabine episodes. It has already been noted that the *Met.* episode engages more closely with the *Aeneid*, both through direct verbal parallels as well as by drawing attention to the competition between Juno and Venus; and although a peace is ultimately struck between the Sabines and the Romans, much emphasis is placed on violence and death: *et strata est tellus Romana Sabinis / corporibus strata estque suis, generique cruorem / sanguine cum soceri permiscuit inpius ensis* ("And the Roman ground was strewn with the bodies of Sabines and of their own people, and the impious sword mixed the gore of son-in-law with the blood of father-in-law" 14.800-02). All of this results in a very epic treatment of the episode.¹⁵⁹ In the *Fasti*, however, Barchiesi has detected generic play with the elegiac replacement of *armillae* (261) for *arma* that serve as the 'reward' that Tarpeia reaps from helping the Sabines.¹⁶⁰ In addition, her role as *custos* is described as *levis* (261), a word which has a long history of being elegiacally charged.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁹ Barchiesi (1991) 16 highlights the "massacre of Romans and Sabines" in the *Met.* passage as opposed to the peaceful elegiac outcome of the *Fasti* passage.

¹⁶⁰ Barchiesi (1997a) 21 who remarks, "*armillae* behaves almost as if it were a diminutive of the word *arma*, canceling it out or reducing it to the dimensions of elegy."

¹⁶¹ Cf. Prop. 2.9.36. On the topos of Augustan poets using the terms *levis* (also *mollis* and *tenuis*) as a demarcation of the slender non-epic poetry modelled after Callimachus' use of λεπτός see Keith (1994) 28 n. 4, Clauss (1995) 237-55, and Houghton (2007) 3-5. The description of Tarpeia as a *levis custos* also sets up a nice parallel with Janus, who is the guardian of the gates par excellence.

Heinze brings Macrobius' account to bear,¹⁶² remarking on what he calls the 'war-like' quality of Janus set in contrast with the peace-oriented Janus of Ovid's *Fasti*.¹⁶³ While it is true that both the *Met.* version and Macrobius' version devote attention to the death and destruction resulting from the hot springs, Juno is absent from Macrobius. Heinze offers no real distinction between the Junos of Ovid's two narratives, but does remark on Ovid's need to emphasize the 'Verwandlung' in the *Met.* episode. He does, however, make the observation that in the proem to *Fasti* 6 Juno brings up the devotion lavished upon her by Titus Tatius and the Sabines, thereby alluding to her role she played in this earlier episode.¹⁶⁴ Although such a connection certainly furthers the didactic force of the poem by highlighting Juno's awareness of the outside world and of the historical breadth of her worship, it does not shed any real light on the issue of genre. We have already addressed the descriptive adjective *invidiosa* (*Fast.* 1.266) as a supplement to the themes expressed in the title *Saturnia*, but now it is fitting to say something about its generic force. Ovid employs the adjective *invidiosa* at *Am.* 1.8.55, where it modifies the abstract noun *rapina*.¹⁶⁵ There, McKeown comments that "*invidiosus* is common in many types of prose, but generally rare in poetry."¹⁶⁶ Earlier in his commentary when assessing the broader force of *-osus*

¹⁶² Macr. *Sat.* 1.9.18: *fertur ex aede Iani per hanc portam magnam vim torrentium undis scatentibus erupisse multasque perduellium catervas aut exustas ferventi aut devoratas rapida voragine deperisse* ("It is said that from the temple of Janus a great force of scalding water burst through the gate and that many throngs of enemy forces perished either scalded by the boiling water or swallowed up by the swift whirlpool").

¹⁶³ Heinze (1919) 35 n. 1 where he says: "ist Janus ein kriegerischer Gott, der den Römern zur Hilfe kommt." Cf. also Merli (2000) 196 who sees Janus as "[una] figura...exemplare: sia all'interno della vicenda bellica...sia come informante elegiaco."

¹⁶⁴ Heinze (1919) 36 n. 2. The couplet mentioned by Heinze (*Fast.* 6.49-50) will be discussed in the section below on Juno's speech.

¹⁶⁵ Ov. *Am.* 1.8.55: *certior e multis nec tam invidiosa rapina est*.

¹⁶⁶ McKeown (1989) 231.

adjectives, McKeown states, “The nuance of such formations ranges from the colloquial to the highly poetic.”¹⁶⁷

Peter Knox had undertaken an examination of the frequency and purpose of adjectives bearing the suffix *-osus*, observing that they are rarely found in poetry before the Neoterics, become especially common in post-Vergilian epic, and are, surprisingly, rather uncommon in Roman love elegy.¹⁶⁸ He adds, however, that the one instance of elegy that does have a preponderance of *-osus* adjectives is “the Fourth Book [of Propertius], where the poet is experimenting with objective narrative in elegiac verse.”¹⁶⁹ This fourth book of Propertius with its address to the Babylonian astrologer Horos as the Roman Callimachus (4.64) and its devotion to Roman *aetia* has long been acknowledged as a key influence on Ovid’s *Fasti*, which experiments with a similar type of generic play.¹⁷⁰ Quite fittingly, the *Fasti* has a comparable multitude of *-osus* adjectives, with 54 of them spread out rather evenly across the six books.¹⁷¹ While it is impossible to connect the abundance of *-osus* adjectives in Ovid’s *Fasti* directly to those found in the heavily aetiological verses of Propertius Book 4 and to assign to them a

¹⁶⁷ McKeown (1989) 18.

¹⁶⁸ Knox (1986).

¹⁶⁹ Knox (1986) 97. Knox counts 16 *-osus* adjectives in Prop. 4.

¹⁷⁰ See Green (2004) 29-30.

¹⁷¹ Kenney (2002) 37 in describing Ovid’s poetic language, acknowledges that five syllable *-iosus* adjectives “are peculiarly well suited for fitting into the pentameter,” which is where we find our example at *Fast.* 1.266. I have observed the following *-osus* adjectives in Ovid’s *Fasti*: *rugosa*, *furiosa* (twice), *invidiosa* (three times), *herbosa*, *generosa* (5 times), *luxuriosa*, *harenosi*, *formosa* (9 times), *lacrimosa*, *annosa* (twice), *litigiosus* (twice), *studioso* (twice), *umbrosa*, *ingeniosa*, *lpidosus* (twice), *perosus*, *viniosior*, *umbrosa*, *ingeniosus*, *damnosis*, *nemorosi*, *ventosis*, *fumosis* (twice), *limoso*, *animosa*, *officiosa*, *exosa*, *ambitiosa*, *iocosis*, *aquosae*, *nodosas*, *luxuriosa*, *insidiosa*, *iocosa*. There are 7 in book 1, 9 in book 2, 9 in book 3, 12 in book 4, 11 in book 5, and 6 in book 6.

specific force or tone, it does seem clear that these two specific types of poetic output favor the employment of *-osus* adjectives, perhaps as a way of enhancing the dichotomy between the elevated diction embedded into the didactic genre and the often colloquial manner in which those aetiological stories are dispersed.¹⁷² Indeed, the deployment of *invidiosa* here at 1.266 comes at a critical juncture. The narrative has already been primed by the elegiac markers embedded within the Tarpeia couplet.¹⁷³ When the reader arrives at Juno's couplet, he/she is met by *Saturnia*, *invidiosa*, and the vestiges of a thrice-recurring epic motif (that of Juno and the opening of Janus' gates).¹⁷⁴ The reader is thus conditioned to expect a blend of elegy and epic, which is precisely what Ovid presents. Janus, who Barchiesi describes as "a kind of pacifistic and sub/anti-epic narrator,"¹⁷⁵ celebrates a bloodless victory. And while he acknowledges Juno's superiority with an admission of her greater divinity (*tanto...numine* 1.267), we hear no more about her power or any form of resistance against Janus' maneuvers.¹⁷⁶ For the moment, the clever Janus with his truncated self-aggrandizing description of his repulsion of the enemy wins out over the weighty, yet eerily silent Juno.

¹⁷² For *-iosus* adjectives being rooted in *sermo plebeius* see Knox (1986) 97-98 and Kenney (2002) 38.

¹⁷³ This story is also told in Prop. 4.4, where Propertius plays up the amatory context by portraying Tarpeia as desiring to wed Titus Tatius. Here in the *Fasti* the elegiac motif is expressed not by an amatory context but rather through the presence of *levis* and *armillis* noted above.

¹⁷⁴ In Ennius' *Annales*, Vergil's *Aeneid*, and Ovid's *Met*.

¹⁷⁵ Barchiesi (1991) 16.

¹⁷⁶ It is important to keep in mind Keegan's comment about the gendered nature of this passage, which is told from the perspective of the male champion (see n. 136 above).

V. A Review of the Evidence of Juno on the Kalends of January

Since this story of the repulsion of the Sabines by divine intervention is clearly malleable, with Venus featuring in one account and absent in another, we must ask the question of why Juno appears in both passages as a Roman antagonist.¹⁷⁷ The clearest answer is that Ovid is building on the models that Ennius and Vergil had established. Earlier in *Met.* 14 Ovid offers up his own reconciliation episode akin to that of *Aen.* 12, wherein Juno is once again appeased, this time in response to the deification of Aeneas: *adsensere dei, nec coniunx regia vultus / inmotos tenuit placatoque adnuit ore* (“The gods agreed, nor did the royal wife display an unchangeable expression, but nodded assent from her placated face” *Met.* 14.592-93).¹⁷⁸ The fact that an apparently appeased Juno will within a couple hundred lines display hostility towards Aeneas’ descendants in our Sabine passage may look back to Ennius and his multiple reconciliations of Juno. Recall that Feeney had argued on behalf of a reconciliation scene in *Annales* 1 involving Juno and the deification of Romulus.¹⁷⁹ Juno’s thrusting open of the gates of Janus in *Aen.* 7 also establishes the precedent for the recurrence of that same motif in a different time and setting. Thus, for both passages, the literary models of Ennius and Vergil are certainly on Ovid’s mind.

In the *Met.* Juno’s actions in relation to aiding the Sabines follow the work’s temporal structure and thus come near the end of the poem during the rule of Romulus. In the *Fasti*, however, the episode appears on the Kalends of the very first month from the mouth of Janus

¹⁷⁷ Since she does not occur at all in Macrobius’ account of the event, it is a deliberate choice by Ovid to feature her in both of his versions.

¹⁷⁸ Note the shared language with *Aen.* 12.841: *adnuit his Iuno et mentem laetata retorsit*. Both Ovid and Vergil use *adnuit*, Ovid’s *vultus / inmotos tenuit* can be seen as the equivalent of Vergil’s *mentem...retorsit*, and Ovid’s *placato...ore* can be viewed as a reworking of Vergil’s *laetata*.

¹⁷⁹ Feeney (1984) 187.

himself, the work's first divine interlocutor, who sets the tone for the remainder of the poem.¹⁸⁰

By using Janus as the mouthpiece and having him describe Juno as Rome's enemy on the day that is also sacred to her, Ovid plays with Juno's mytho-historical enmity and her role as an honored deity in Roman religious practices. Although Juno is described as the aggressor, with Janus merely stepping in and repelling her, their calendrical interests are also at play. It makes sense then that Juno and Janus are in a way competing for primary worship on the Kalends of January.¹⁸¹ This short narrative allows the competition to play out within the calendar itself. Janus is symbolic of peace, having professed earlier to Ovid that he has nothing do with war (*nil mihi cum bello* 1.253), while Juno here acts as a surrogate for war itself. Janus' success against Juno and his stalwart allegiance towards Roman interests cement his supremacy over the Kalends of his own month. Yet, although Janus and Juno may represent the opposing themes of war and peace, they are supposed to function as cooperative deities with regard to Roman cult practices, with Janus facilitating the transition into the new month and Juno securing its ongoing prosperity.¹⁸² Thus by allowing Janus to narrate the story of Juno's attempt at throwing open his own gates, Ovid establishes a more personal rivalry between these two deities than he presents in the *Met.* This blend of myth, history, religion, and literary allusion leads to a very complicated introduction to the goddess Juno who is as integral to the Roman calendar as she is to Ovid's poetic enterprise. As we are about to see, however, when Ovid refers to her using a more

¹⁸⁰ Newlands (1995) 6-7.

¹⁸¹ Ovid even refers to Kalends of January as Janus' own (*tuis...Kalendis* 1.175). Littlewood (2006) lvii says "In *Fasti* their respective patronage of January and June forms the outer frame of the first half of Ovid's calendar poem, so that the two deities appear to stand in diametric opposition as the instigators of Peace and War."

¹⁸² Dumézil (1966) 295; Littlewood (2006) lviii also points out that both Janus and Juno facilitated the adjustment of Roman youths as they entered a new stage in life: Janus for young men as they transitioned into active citizens; and Juno for young women as they became wives.

religiously-inspired epithet, he activates a different dimension of her worship that serves to temper or eradicate the traditionally omnipresent association that she has with anger and malice from a mythological perspective.

VI. The Kalends of March: Forging a new Junonian Identity

We turn now to Juno's appearance on the Kalends of March. Once again, it is another deity who incorporates Juno into his response to Ovid's inquiry. Just as Janus served as the primary interlocutor for his month of January, Mars fulfills that role in March. The passage acts as a direct continuation of the events related by Janus in *Fasti* 1, with the continued fighting between the Romans and the Sabines. Mars speaks as follows:

intumuere Cures et quos dolor attigit idem:
tum primum generis intulit arma socer.
iamque fere raptae matrum quoque nomen habebant,
tractaque erant longa bella propinqua mora:
conveniunt nuptae dictam Iunonis in aedem...

The men of Cures became inflamed with rage, as did those whom the same pain touched: at that time father-in-law first waged war upon his sons-in-law. And now generally those women who had been raped were also having the name of mother, and the war of kin had been protracted over a long span of time: the wives gather at the appointed temple of Juno.¹⁸³ (Fast. 3.201-05)

The passage begins with the rage of the Sabine men described using a few choice words:

intumuere Cures. Heyworth remarks that Ovid's use of a *tumesco* compound, with its natural indication of swollenness, "is a marker of epic, generally apt as the narrative turns to war."¹⁸⁴ In

¹⁸³ Heyworth (2019) 123 is right to translate *dictam* as "appointed" (citing *OLD* s.v. 10b) rather than "named," thereby putting the focus on Juno's association with marriage that will be highlighted later by Mars.

¹⁸⁴ Heyworth (2019) 122.

fact, Ovid employs the verb *intumesco* thrice in the *Fasti* and once in the *Met.* to refer to the swelling of anger.¹⁸⁵ Two of those examples are of Juno's rage (*Fast.* 6.487 and *Met.* 2.508). In addition, we have already seen Juno aiding the Sabines at the gate, so a recurrence of that same role here would not be unexpected. No less interesting is Ovid's use of *Cures* as a way of referring to the Sabines. In the previous book on the Quirinalia, Ovid offers the reader several possible etymologies concerning Romulus' title Quirinus (*Fast.* 2.477-80).¹⁸⁶ The first connects his name to *curis*, the ancient Sabine word for spear (2.477), the second to the designation of Roman citizens as *Quirites* (2.479), and the third to the Sabine town of *Cures* (2.480). However, since *Quirites* itself likely derives from *Cures*, all of the aforementioned derivations pay homage to the Sabines.¹⁸⁷ Thus we cannot treat *Cures* here as merely the citizens of Rome. The focus is on the anger of the Sabine men who have lost their daughters and who, under Titus Tatius, had launched the attack against the gates of Janus with the assistance of Juno, as documented on the Kalends of January (1.260-73).

We have already discussed the similar use of the term *Cures* at *Met.* 14.778 (*sati Curibus*) where it precedes the mention of Juno by a mere four lines.¹⁸⁸ As the subject of a verb that is used elsewhere of Juno, *Cures* at *Fast.* 3.201 can be seen as activating an association with Juno Curitis, an epithet of Juno that underscores her martial side as well as her allegiance to

¹⁸⁵ *TLL* 7.2.100.5 (*fere i. q. irasci*).

¹⁸⁶ Robinson (2011) 304 adds that Ovid here "presents a greater number of etymologies [for Quirinus] than any one surviving source."

¹⁸⁷ See Maltby (1991) 517 s.v. *Quirites*. Robinson (2011) 305-06 makes the following comment on deriving *Quirites* from *Cures*: "This was the commonly accepted reason in antiquity why the Romans were called Quirites." See also de Vaan (2008) 509-510 who attests to the uncertain etymological origins of the words, concluding that "it may also be a loanword."

¹⁸⁸ See n. 111 above.

tribes outside of Rome proper.¹⁸⁹ The festival whose action Mars is relating, however, is the *Matronalia*, a feast in honor of mothers, marked in the *Fasti Praenestini* by a dedication on the Esquiline hill of a temple to Juno Lucina.¹⁹⁰ The transition occurs almost instantaneously. The raped women (*raptae*) have become mothers (*matrum*), and what place is more fitting for them to congregate than the temple of Juno (*Iunonis in aedem*),¹⁹¹ goddess of mothers.¹⁹² Notice that when Mars mentions Juno's temple, he employs the same form of her name introduced by Ovid when he was explaining the sanctity of her Kalends (*Iunonis* 1.55). She is no longer *Saturnia* or even *Curitis*.¹⁹³ Attention has been shifted from her martial to her maternal *numen*.

Mars goes on to officially ring in the celebration: *inde ~diem quae prima~ meas celebrare Kalendas / Oebaliae matres non leve munus habent* ("Hence the Sabine mothers

¹⁸⁹ Mart. Cap. *Nupt.* 2.149 describes Juno Curitis' as follows: *Curitim debent memorare bellantes* ("those waging war ought to call upon Juno Curitis"). Servius, although he ignores the possible relationship of Juno Curitis with *Cures*, nevertheless acknowledges its martial overtones: Remigius in *Martianum* 1.182: *Servius Curitim dicit vocari Iunonem a Curru, quia bellantes curribus utuntur* ("Servius says that Juno Curitis is derived from 'Chariot' because those engaged in war employ chariots.") See also n. 4 above.

¹⁹⁰ Degrassi (1963) 418: *Iun[o]ni Lucinae Exquiliis, / quod eo die aedis ei d[edica]ta est per matronas, / quam voverat Albin[i] filia vel uxor, si puerum / [parientem]que ipsa[m] fovisset*. For the temple's location on the Esquiline hill cf. Varro *Ling.* 5.49. Notice that there is no mention of Mars' participation in the *Matronalia*, an observation made by Kötzle (1991) 93: "Es ist für den 1. März weder ein Mars-Fest bezeugt, noch eine Beteiligung der Frauen an ihm."

¹⁹¹ Heyworth (2019) 123 comments that the reader would prefer to connect the temple mentioned here with that of Juno Lucina on the Esquiline, which Mars will discuss below (245-48), even though Ovid leaves the issue open.

¹⁹² Heyworth (2019) 123 draws attention to the juxtaposition of *raptae* and *matronae*, drawing attention to "their very different tones." Indeed, the two words are separated by the line's caesura, giving them an even greater emphasis. Two lines below they are called *nuptae*, which speaks to the fact that they have embraced their role as wives and mothers.

¹⁹³ Also due to the likelihood that this is the temple of Juno Lucina (see n. 192 above).

possess the prestigious honor of celebrating my Kalends” *Fast.* 3.229-30). Although the beginning of line 229 is corrupt, the rest of the couplet is clear. Mars calls the Kalends of March his own, which, while true, does not explain his involvement in the Matronalia.¹⁹⁴ The ones whom Mars directs to celebrate the day are called *Oebaliae matres*, a phrase used to identify the Sabine origins of the women, while also indicating their Romanization.¹⁹⁵ The only other place in the entire *Fasti* where Ovid uses the adjective *Oebalius* as a descriptive word for “Sabine” is right before the battle at Janus’ gates in book 1, where weapons are described as belonging to Oebalian Tatius (*Oebalii...arma Tati* 1.260). In the very next line, it is implied that Tarpeia is the recipient of Tatius’ *arma* in lieu of the *armillae* that she actually sought. Those familiar with this episode in Livy will recall that Tatius’ *arma* are more specifically classified as *scuta*:

eo scuta illi pro aureis donis congesta (“therefore their shields were heaped upon her instead of the golden gifts” Liv. 1.11.8).¹⁹⁶ Now let us consider the context of Mars’ use of *Oebaliae matres* at 3.230. In the preceding lines, Mars talks of shields, but in a way that inverts the violent role they play in the Tarpeia episode. In this instance the focus is on the positive use of the shield, as a way of conveying the sons and grandsons of the respective fighting parties, culminating in the line: *hic scuti dulcior usus erat* (“This was a sweeter use for the shield” 3.228). Thus when Heyworth mentions that *Oebalii* here is intended to serve as a reference to the

¹⁹⁴ Mention of *Feriae Marti* is made by the *Fasti Praenestini* on the entry for March 1st, but is absent in the *Fasti Antiates* (see Degraffi (1963) 417-18).

¹⁹⁵ See Heyworth (2019) 127.

¹⁹⁶ Once Livy has established that the cause of Tarpeia’s death is indeed *scuta*, he reverts back to the more generic *arma* (Liv. 1.11.9).

custom of Spartan mothers demanding that their sons return either with their shields or on them, we have yet another more textually relevant dichotomy.¹⁹⁷

The parallels between the current episode and the Janus episode continue. Whereas Janus feared to challenge Juno, a more powerful adversary, to a direct fight (*cum tanto veritus committere numine pugnam* 1.267), here the Sabine women take bold action against a superior force: *committi strictis mucronibus ausae* (“they dared to commit themselves against drawn swords” 3.231);¹⁹⁸ both parties achieve victory through water: Janus by his sulfuric springs (*madidis...sulpura venis* 1.271), and the Sabine women through their tears (*lacrimis...suis* 3.232); and finally, both parties put an end to hostilities in a peaceful manner: Janus by using scalding water to block Tatius and the Sabines (*clauderet ut Tatio fervidus umor iter* 1.272), and the Sabine women by effectively ending the war by inserting themselves between the two foes (*finierant...Martia bella* 3.231). The achievements of Janus in book 1 have thus been shifted to the Sabine women here in book 3. The gender reversal is all the more palpable, given that Mars, the antithesis of elegy,¹⁹⁹ is recounting the story and in essence his own demise.²⁰⁰ The focus is then shifted away from Mars and onto the establishment of a temple to Juno, who elsewhere in the poem is shown to be the mother of Mars and thus a pivotal force in the foundation of

¹⁹⁷ The shield motif may also play into the later episode on the Kalends of March where Mars discusses the origin of the *ancile* shield and the Salian priests (3.349-92).

¹⁹⁸ For the reflexive sense of *committi* see Heyworth (2019) 127.

¹⁹⁹ Indeed, Ovid first asks Mars, *cum sis officiis, Gradive, virilibus aptus, / dic mihi matronae cur tua festa colant* (“Since, Mars, you are suited to the duties of men, tell me why matrons celebrate your festival” 3.169-70).

²⁰⁰ Heyworth (2019) 127 draws attention both to “the speaker’s subjugation” and the fact that it is “appropriately placed in a pentameter.”

Rome.²⁰¹ Although Mars connects Juno to the events of the Matronalia with the overly simplistic statement, *mater amat nuptas* (“my mother loves brides” 3.251), one can detect an echo of the very specific group of Sabine *nuptae* mentioned above, who had gathered in Juno’s temple to protest the war (3.205). Juno, who had supported the Sabine men in their failed attack against the fledgling Romans in book 1, is depicted now in concert with the Sabine women who succeed at putting an end to the war.

The Juno we see here is an entirely Roman deity and bears the epithet *Lucina* in response to her role in facilitating birth. Let us look further at how Mars integrates Juno into the discussion:

illic a nuribus Iunoni templa Latinis
 hac sunt, si memini, publica facta die.
 quid moror et variis onero tua pectora causis?
 eminet ante oculos quod petis ecce tuos. 250
 mater amat nuptas: matris²⁰² me turba frequentat.
 haec nos praecipue tam pia causa decet.

There [on the Esquiline hill], if I recall, a public temple to Juno was dedicated on this day by the Latin daughters-in-law. Why do I delay and burden your hearts with different causes? Behold! That which you seek stands before your eyes. My mother loves brides: my mother’s crowd celebrates me. This so pious a cause is especially fitting for us.

(*Fast.* 3.247-52)

²⁰¹ The Flora episode told in book 5 (183-378) includes an extended dialogue between Flora and Juno that results in the parthenogenetic birth of Mars from Juno.

²⁰² There is an alternative reading of *matrum* for *matris* preferred by Bömer (1957) 158 who views the line as a direct response to 3.170 (*dic mihi matronae cur tua festa colant*), but ultimately Mars connects himself to the festival not through the *matronae* but rather through his own *mater*. Thus the reading of *matris* should stand.

Mars here calls attention to the temple of Juno that lay on the Esquiline hill, although historically this temple's construction is connected with a certain Albinus, dating to around 375 B.C, well after the conflict with the Sabines.²⁰³ His uncertainty as to the exact date of the temple's dedication, as expressed by *si memini* (248), contrasts with Janus' legitimate claim of remembering Saturn's arrival (*memini* at 1.235). Mars' inability to recollect the precise nature of the temple's founding is especially surprising, given that in the prior book (2.487) he was able to remind Jupiter of a promise that was made to him regarding the apotheosis of Romulus from Ennius *Annales*.²⁰⁴ This uncertainty may allow him to make the temple appear older than it actually was and to connect it more acutely to the story of the Sabine women. Mars achieves this in several ways. First, he leads off by saying that it was founded by *nuribus*, which again connects the reader back to the *nuptae* of 3.205 and specifically to Hersilia, the wife of Romulus, who is called *nurus* at 3.206. Only later in the line do we get the adjective *Latinis*, which does not immediately disqualify them from being Sabine, since the whole point of Mars' story is that the Sabine women are intent on mixing the two races. Second, Mars' statement that the temple was founded "on this day" (*hac...die*) can be taken in two different ways. In the traditional sense, Mars is indicating that the temple was constructed on the 1st of March, which the epigraphical evidence supports.²⁰⁵ Why then does he express a level of uncertainty? Merli has argued that the

²⁰³ Degrassi (1963) 418 suggests that the Albinus mentioned in the *Fasti Praenestini* is the same one mentioned by Livy at 5.40.9. Degrassi also tells us that the date of 375 B.C. comes from Pliny the Elder (*HN* 16.235).

²⁰⁴ Mars does this even more explicitly at *Met.* 14.813 where he uses the word *memoro*: *nam memoro memorique animo pia verba notavi* (see Miller [1993] 163).

²⁰⁵ See n. 190 above.

si memini ought to be applied rather to the meeting that was alleged to have taken place in the temple of Juno by the Sabine daughters-in-law at 3.205.²⁰⁶

But why would Mars delay such a parenthetical and place it alongside a correct assertion?

Perhaps Mars intends for the reader to construe *hac die* not merely as the Kalends of March, but specifically the day on which Sabine *nuptae* brokered an amnesty between the Roman and Sabine men. In which case, he is right in questioning the validity of his claim, which is contrary to historical accuracy. Such a reading is supported further by Mars' inclusion of the word *publica* (3.248) to describe the temple. Its presence must contribute some additional meaning, as all temples are in their own right "public" and nowhere else in the *Fasti* does Ovid describe a temple using this adjective. One can see in Mars' use of *publica* an attempt to elevate the celebratory occasion surrounding the temple's foundation and emphasize the fact that it was a shared space. This once again directs the reader back to the intermingling of the Sabine and Roman men at the behest of the aforementioned *nuptae*. Thus, although this temple is undoubtedly that of Juno Lucina dedicated on the Esquiline hill on March 1st in 375 B.C.,²⁰⁷ Mars, aware that he is making a questionable claim, hints that its origin may go as far back as the culmination of the Roman-Sabine war. In doing so, he once again connects Juno to the achievement of mixing the Sabines and the Romans.²⁰⁸

This air of hesitancy or inconsistency expressed by *si memini* is picked up again in the following couplet where Mars dismisses alternative *causae* and prefers simply to point at the temple itself as proof of his version of the story. Mars has not only compressed the date of and

²⁰⁶ Merli (2000) 110-113.

²⁰⁷ If Pliny the Elder's date is to be trusted.

²⁰⁸ This can be viewed as an extension of Juno's requirement that the Trojans mix with the Latins at *Aen.* 12.836-40. By helping to facilitate the mixing of the Sabines and the Romans, Juno succeeds in further diluting the Trojan bloodline.

the events surrounding the temple of Juno on the Esquiline, but he has also connected it to two opposing attributes of Juno. By twice citing Juno as his own mother (*mater...matris* 251), Mars inextricably entwines the disparate dimensions of her divinity that are associated with motherhood and war: she is a mother, but the mother of the god of war.²⁰⁹ This is apparently a sufficient reason for Mars to associate himself with the festival and is the *causa* (252) he prefers. Although he initially claims sole worship on the day (*me* 251), in the next line he acknowledges that the day is in fact jointly shared by mother and son (*nos* 252).²¹⁰ His involvement in the entire episode, apart from serving as the narrator,²¹¹ is limited to his role as the son of Juno and the inclusion of *praecipue* (252) calls attention to the dual martial/maternal origins of the temple.

Once Mars concludes his entry for the Matronalia festival, Ovid the narrator steps in and solidifies Juno's affiliation with the day by offering a prayer to Juno Lucina:

ferte deae flores: gaudet florentibus herbis
 haec dea; de tenero cingite flore caput:
 dicite 'tu nobis lucem, Lucina, dedisti'; 255
 dicite 'tu voto parturientis ades.'
 siqua tamen gravida est, resoluta crine precetur
 ut solvat partus molliter illa suos.

Bring flowers for the goddess: this goddess enjoys flourishing plants; gird your head with the tender flower: say 'Lucina, you have given light to us'; say 'be present for the prayer

²⁰⁹ Heyworth (2019) 131 points to the ambiguity of the word *mater*, which combines those who are would-be mothers (i.e. the Sabine *nuptae*) with the *matronae* for whom the festival actually exists.

²¹⁰ I take *nos* as an actual plural, denoting both Mars and Juno, rather than as a poetic plural. It is intended, I believe, to expand upon the *me* of 251 (see also Heyworth [2019] 131).

²¹¹ See Pasco-Pranger (2000) 287 who views Mars' explanations as continually pushing him toward the periphery, until he gets closest to the truth and "has lost all centrality in his own explanations."

of the one who is in labor.’ However, if anyone is laden with child, with hair loosened let her pray that Juno deliver her offspring gently. (Fast. 3.253-58)

The focus on flowers is immediate and deliberate, for Ovid directs worshippers to bring flowers (*flores*) because the goddess takes pleasure in flourishing plants (*florentibus herbis*), and finally bids them to cover their heads with tender flowers (*tenero...flore*). Although the presence of flowers follows neatly after his description of the onset of Spring (235-42) and may be viewed as a standard part of any ritual celebration, Ovid has an additional reason for featuring them so prominently here.²¹² In book 5 Ovid tasks Flora with explaining the rites of the Floralia (5.5.183-374), amongst which is the story of how she assisted Juno in the birth of Mars. Fittingly, it is a flower (*flos* 5.252) offered to Juno by Flora that enables her to become pregnant with the Roman god of War: *tangitur, et tacto concipit illa sinu. / iamque gravis Thracen et laeva Propontidos intrat, / fitque potens voti, Marsque creatus erat* (“[The flower] is touched, and having touched it she [Juno] conceives in her womb. And now pregnant she enters Thrace and west Propontis, and she fulfills her wish, and Mars was born” 5.256-58). These lines also emphasize the immediacy of Juno’s pregnancy (*tangitur...tacto concipit*) and the fulfillment of her wish (*potens voti*), the latter of which harkens back to Ovid’s prayer at the end of the Matronalia. For there, Juno Lucina is called upon to successfully deliver the child (*tu voto parturientis ades* 256) and is prayed to by pregnant women (*siqua tamen gravida...precetur* 257) in anticipation of giving birth. Note also that the line numbers for these two episodes in books 3 and 5 are nearly identical, further emphasizing their close connection. In a way then Juno Lucina can be viewed

²¹² Although flowers are also present at Fast. 4.133 and 6.312, the focus here is on Juno Lucina’s role in facilitating child-birth, which is a direct connection to the Flora episode. Add to this the fact that a few lines earlier Mars had twice called Juno his mother (3.251).

as completing the very process that Flora had begun for her, initiating a symbiotic relationship that ultimately results in the birth of the god who is the symbol for war and destruction.²¹³

Once again, we must acknowledge Ovid's clever generic play. Notice that the flowers that are to be placed upon the dedicant's head are called "tender" (*tenero* 244) and that Juno's role is to ensure that the birth occurs "gently" (*molliter*). Both of these words signal the elegiac context of the prayer itself and Juno's role within it.²¹⁴ Given the context, *gravida* (257) is thus an interesting word choice for a pregnant woman, as the root of the word is, of course, *gravis*,²¹⁵ meaning "heavy," a word also used as an indicator of the epic genre.²¹⁶ To further complicate matters, *gravida* bears a striking resemblance to a prominent epithet of Mars, *Gradivus*,²¹⁷ which is the term Ovid employs when he first addresses the god at the beginning of the entry (*Gravide* 3.169).²¹⁸ I view this as a further indication of the elegiacization of Juno's martial dimension. Although child-birth and motherhood are not particularly suited to elegy, they emphasize a de-

²¹³ Kötzle (1991) 94 contrasts the benevolent association of Juno's epithet *Lucina* here with Alcmena's description of the difficulty and pain involved in the birth of Hercules, brought about by the jealousy of Juno Lucina (*Met.* 9.281-313), there referred to as *Iunoni...iniquae* (296).

²¹⁴ See n. 161 above for the generic marking of *levis*, *mollis*, and *tenuis* (similar enough to *tener* to warrant inclusion). Cf. also Heyworth (2019) 132.

²¹⁵ Maltby (1991) 264 s.v. *gravidus*.

²¹⁶ Kötzle (1991) 90 sees both Mars' speech here and Juno's speech in book 6 (6.20ff.) as "episch stilisiert," making the additional observation that such epic language tends to emerge "wenn Ovid einer Szene augusteisches bzw. nationalrömisches Gepräge geben will."

²¹⁷ Servius on *Aen.* 3.35 offers several explanations for the etymology of *Gradivus*, one of which links the word to *gravis*: *aut gravem deum* (or [because he is] a serious god"). Cf. Maltby (1991) 262 s.v. *Gradivus*.

²¹⁸ Kötzle (1991) 89 connects Mars epithet *Gradivus* to the Flora's account of Mars' "Blumengeburt" in book 5. Heyworth (2019) 132 acknowledges the possibility of this connection, noting, "[this] possible echo of *Gravide* (169) would sum up the passage's movement from war to childbirth."

escalation of the martial attributes associated with other dimensions of Juno. Further, the pregnant women are subsequently bidden to loosen their hair (*resoluto crine*) so that Juno may in turn loosen their offspring (*solvat partus*).²¹⁹ The act of ancient women loosening their hair also evokes the image of women in mourning,²²⁰ recalling aspects of war and loss, the very domain of the god Mars. Thus the simple act of women loosening their hair in preparation for childbirth simultaneously touches upon the positive influence of Juno Lucina and the potentially negative influence of bellicose Mars.

The entirety of the Matronalia episode as told by Mars is a combination of war and peace as well as death and birth, dichotomies established by the very appearance of the god who takes off his helmet, yet retains possession of his spear (3.171-72). At the beginning of book 3, Mars' elegiac persona coincides with his rape of Rhea Silvia (3.9-22), an action rooted in violence, but which is followed by the positive prophecy foretelling the birth of Romulus and Remus. Yet, when he appears as an interlocutor, he forsakes his martial tendencies in favor of peace: *nunc primum studiis pacis deus utilis armis / advocor, et gressus in nova castra fero* ("Now I, a god proficient in weapons, for the first time am called to the pursuit of peace, and I carry my steps into a new camp" 3.173-74). Mars is forced to behave elegiacally and in order to fulfill that role

²¹⁹ Fantham (2002) 31 takes *illa* as referring to the mother rather than the goddess, no doubt putting emphasis on *suos*. However, note the parallel prayer at 2.451-52 where the goddess is certainly the subject of the action: *parce, precor, gravidis, facilis Lucina, puellis, / maturumque utero molliter aufer onus* ("I pray, good-natured Lucina, go easy on pregnant girls and remove their ripe burden from their womb"). See also "solvo" *OLD* s.v. 2b which cites *Lucina* as the implied subject of *illa* in this very line.

²²⁰ An extremely common topos. Corbeill (2004) 83 remarks, "The practice of unbinding the hair in grief is particularly characteristic of women in Roman society." His accompanying footnote (n. 66) includes useful references to both textual and visual examples of "women with hair unbound in mourning." In addition, Corbeill provides evidence that childbirth and mourning are in fact not mutually exclusive, but overlap considerably. Cf. also Prop. 2.15.46.

he relies principally on his relationship with Juno and her affiliation with childbirth via her cult title Lucina. Even childbirth, however, has martial connotations according to Mars: *tempora iure colunt Latiae fecunda parentes, / quarum militiam votaue partus habet* (“Latin mothers rightly cherish the fertile period, mothers whose childbirth involves soldiery and prayers” 3.243-44).²²¹ Dolansky views *militia* here as a reference to “the vital service married women provided for the family, which ultimately benefitted the state.”²²² While that may be so, we must acknowledge the charged status of the word *militia*, which Ovid famously appropriated in his earlier love poetry in the form of *militia amoris*, an expression that encapsulates the idea of someone who wages war on behalf of the god Cupid for the sake of love.²²³ At 3.244 *militiam* concludes the first half of the pentameter, while *votaue* begins the second half, emphasizing that the birthing of a child contains a martial component that is distinct from, yet also complementary to the need for religious prayer. We know that prayer and war were by no means mutually exclusive,²²⁴ but one does not generally pair the two together when talking about child birth.²²⁵ Mars, however, is predisposed toward using martial language, as evidenced by his observation that shields have abandoned their typical function and instead serve as a method of carrying around grandchildren: *scutoque nepotem / fert avus: hic scuti dulcior usus erat* (“Grandfather hoists his grandson upon

²²¹ Kötzle (1991) 93 connects *militiam* with the etymology of the Esquiline hill from *excubias* (2.245), another military word.

²²² Dolansky (2011) 199.

²²³ A topos among all of the writers of Roman love elegy (see Murgatroyd [1975]), but developed most acutely by Ovid (cf. especially *Ars.* 2.233-36).

²²⁴ One such prominent example is that of the *supplicatio*, which was organized by the *quindecimviri* in order to avert extreme dangers, among them the threat of war (“*Supplicatio*,” in *Brill’s New Pauly*).

²²⁵ Heyworth (2019) 130 provides only two examples, one from Euripides *Medea* (248-51), and the other from Ovid *Ep.* 11.48 from the perspective of Canace.

his shield: this was a sweeter use for a shield” 3.227-28). The same is true for his description of childbirth involving *militia*, which also represents a *dulcior usus* than the typical usage of the word. At the same time, the force of *militiam* here, alongside *vota*, paves the way for the introduction of Juno’s rites just below. It signals her past association with war and her newly established religious role.

As Fantham points out with regard to the events related on the Kalends of March, “The women’s infertility cannot be reconciled with their legendary role as intercessors.”²²⁶ As she also observes, Hersilia and the Sabine daughters-in-law make their stand in Juno’s temple only to have Mars use their actions as a springboard for explaining the subsequent construction of that very same temple. Historical accuracy is clearly not Ovid’s principal intention. Instead, he seeks to use Mars as his mouth-piece, much in the same way he used Janus at the beginning of January. In the latter scenario, Ovid plays with epic traditions, religious connections, and genre expectations by having peaceful Janus clash with hostile Juno. Here on the Kalends of March, Ovid presents an inversion of that encounter: a paradoxically peaceful Mars embraces his connection not to martial Juno, but to Juno Lucina, whose prayer closes out the day’s entry. The connection between the Roman-Sabine treaty and the celebration of the Matronalia is tenuous at best, but Juno lies at the heart of both events. When the narrative begins, we can detect an allusion to the same hostile Juno that supported Titus Tatius and the Sabines against Janus and the Romans back in book 1, but that dimension of her character soon gives way to her identity as Juno Lucina, mother of Mars, and the true cause (*tam pia causa* 3.252) for the day’s festivities.

²²⁶ Fantham (2002) 30.

VII. Calendrical Competition: The proem of June

Nowhere in the *Fasti* is Juno more prominent than in the proem to book 6, where she argues vociferously, yet unsuccessfully that the month of June owes its name to her. It is here in her lengthy speech that all dimensions of her divinity coalesce.²²⁷ In the episodes previously discussed, Juno's connection with the Kalends was blended with her mythological and religious identities. In the episode on the Kalends of January, Ovid draws primarily upon her epic, war-like disposition vis-à-vis her epithet Saturnia, while on the Kalends of March, Ovid portrays her principally as a religious figure, associated with women and child-birth in the guise of Juno Lucina.²²⁸ Now that we have arrived at the sixth and final (extant) book, Juno's calendrical affiliations take center stage and her mythological and religious personae are employed as a way of reinforcing her connection to both Ovid's poetic calendar and the many epigraphical calendars.

By having Juno compete with Juventas and Concordia, Ovid establishes a clear parallel with the proem of book 5 where three Muses, Polyhymnia, Urania, and Calliope, debate over the etymology of the month of May. But we must also acknowledge how different the two proems really are from one another. In the proem to book 5 none of the Muses are arguing on behalf of themselves and there is no principal deity who could have served as the mouthpiece for the

²²⁷ Her speech is 43 lines long (6.21-64) compared to the adjacent speeches of Juventas, 21 lines (6.67-88), and Concordia who has but a single line of direct speech (6.96). Blank-Sangmeister (1983) 336 comments on the length of Juno's speech as follows: "die Göttermutter gemäß ihrem Rang die erste Stelle im Rededuell erhält und mit 43, 5 V. (= Versen) am längsten sprechen darf."

²²⁸ Juno's mythological connection to Mars enables him to connect himself with her religious celebration.

month in the way Janus had for January and Mars for March.²²⁹ Thus Ovid makes the conscious choice to frame his June proem around a similar contest, rather than endowing the goddess Juno with the authority he had given to the many previous divine interlocutors—Janus and Mars in particular. The question of why he chose to do this, although certainly an interesting one, is unlikely to yield any fruit. Instead, we must concentrate on how his choice shapes the way in which readers interpret his text. I aim to examine this question principally from his treatment of Juno, who, as we have seen, has an inextricable connection to the Roman calendar and is presented as having several different polarizing personae.

Much has been written about the proem to book 6. J. F. Miller was one of the first to acknowledge Ovid's incorporation of "the programmatic and aetiological themes of Callimachus' encounter with the Muses (in the *Aetia*)," and has shown that the Hesiodic *Dichterweihe* ought to be viewed through a Callimachean lens.²³⁰ More recently, Mazurek has followed Barchiesi's treatment of the Muses in May and argued that the goddesses in the proem of book 6 are also debating about poetic genre.²³¹ Harries prefers to view the situation from a somewhat comical perspective, focusing on the aspect of *iudicium* and referring to Ovid's "judicial impotence."²³² Newlands takes this view a step further and addresses the issue from the perspective of power and freedom of speech: "The narrator's tentativeness is directly tied to a

²²⁹ Maia as the mother of the Olympian god Mercury is hardly a significant enough deity. Harries (1989) 172 acknowledges "the obvious cases of January and Mars" in terms of their etymology.

²³⁰ Miller (1991) 35-40. In addition, Pasco-Pranger (2006) 89 suggests that mention of the Hesiodic Muses, despite Ovid's rejection of their presence, may imply the blending of truth and fiction in the subsequent discussion among the goddesses.

²³¹ Mazurek (2010) 128. Barchiesi (1991) 14 had argued that the three Muses each represent a specific literary genre: Polyhymnia to hymn, Urania to Roman didactic poetry, and Calliope to epic/narrative poetry (see also Newlands [1995] 76).

²³² Harries (1989) 173.

recognition that freedom of expression and choice is not always prudently enjoyed when powerful competing interests control access to art and to knowledge.”²³³ She sees Ovid’s refusal to commit to any one etymology as a product of the buildup of political tensions that has been progressively mounting throughout the course of the work.²³⁴ At the same time, she attributes his indecisiveness to the fragmented nature of the true historical landscape, asserting, “The many voices of his elegiac poem produce fragments of competing meanings about the past.”²³⁵ For Loehr, Ovid’s multiple *causae* reflect the prismatic nature of truth and ought to be viewed as a deliberate and essential aspect of his poetic program. In her view, the very essence of competition, coupled with Ovid’s refusal to select a winner, act as an endorsement of the complexity of the month’s aetiology.²³⁶ Thus we have a wide range of interpretations that cover issues such as Ovid’s programmatic agenda, his debt to literary predecessors, his generic experimentation, his acknowledgement of the contemporary political climate, and his need to offer an all-inclusive set of aetiologies that accounts for both the past and the present. None of these scholars, however, have examined Juno’s speech in relation to her presence elsewhere in the *Fasti*. I aim to show that Juno deliberately engages not only with her mythological past and her religious present, but also with her status as a part of Ovid’s poetic calendar.

²³³ Newlands (1995) 79.

²³⁴ Newlands (1995) 78-80 who views Ovid’s over reliance on informants in the later books of the work as “a sign of Ovid’s increased hesitation to assert his own voice” (79-80).

²³⁵ Newlands (1995) 80.

²³⁶ Loehr (1996) 304 who comments “der Leser von Anfang an für Ovids poetisches Experiment eine aitiologische Mehrfacherklärung in der Szenerie des Paris-Urteils der Konkurrenz-Situation par excellence, darzustellen, disponiert.” For Loehr, then, Ovid’s non-decision is the only “correct” decision. This is picked up by Pasco-Pranger (2000) 290, where she claims “[Ovid’s] antiquarian mode of discourse does not require a single answer, and indeed depends on a multiplicity of explanations to build a layered, multifaceted relationship with the past.”

In order to further emphasize how Ovid's treatment of the Muses in the proem of book 5 differs from that of the goddesses in book 6, it may help to examine the concluding lines of each, which at first glance appear quite similar. For in both cases, Ovid does not choose a winner. In the contest over May he declares:

quid faciam? turbae pars valet²³⁷ omnis idem.
gratia Pieridum nobis aequaliter adsit,
nullaque laudetur plusve minusve mihi.

What am I to do? All members of the group make an equally strong argument. May the good-will of the Piërides smile on me equally and may I praise none of them more or less. (*Fast.* 5.108-10)

According to Barchiesi, the primary reason Ovid abstains from selecting a winner is that he needs all three Muses for his poetic purposes: "For each Muse brings a different type of poetic discourse to bear on the argument, and each has a bent towards the tradition of a different literary genre."²³⁸ Harries views Ovid's non-decision as exacerbated by the fact that in *Met.* 5 (5.294ff.) Calliope's story wins the contest for the Muses against the rival Pierides.²³⁹ But Urania's claim of deriving May from *maiores* also has validity, as it is the very same etymology for the month that Ovid has given (1.41) and will give again (5.427 and 6.88). Thus Harries does not see Ovid embracing neutrality as much as he sees him "undermining his own role as judicial *vates*."²⁴⁰ He applies this same reasoning to the proem of book 6 where the judgment of Paris motif is even more explicit:

dicta triplex causa est. at vos ignoscite, divae:
res est arbitrio non dirimenda meo.

²³⁷ I prefer Shackleton Bailey's conjecture of *valet* to the *habet* found in the manuscripts.

²³⁸ Barchiesi (1991) 14.

²³⁹ Harries (1989) 172. The Muses however, are referred to as the Pierides at 5.109.

²⁴⁰ Harries (1989) 173.

ite pares a me. perierunt iudice formae
 Pergama: plus laedunt, quam iuvat una, duae.

A triple cause was argued. But forgive me, goddesses: the issue must not be settled by my judgement. Depart from me as equals. Troy perished as a result of the judge of beauty: two goddesses harm more than one helps. (*Fast.* 6.97-100)

Although Ovid abstains from judgement again in the contest over June, he qualifies his non-decision with the apologetic statement, *at vos ignoscite, divae* (6.97). It soon becomes apparent that the stakes in this contest are too high for his taste, as he demurely reminds them of the catastrophe that followed the judgment of Paris (6.99-100). This reference is especially suggestive, as it alludes to the former loss of one of the three goddesses currently contending for the month of June, thereby singling out Juno amongst the trio. Indeed, Ovid frames the entire contest around references to the judgment of Paris, itself a matter of great bitterness for Juno who was passed over in favor of Venus.²⁴¹

We can make a few other meaningful observations about how the concluding parts of both proems are in dialogue with, yet opposed to one another. Let us compare, for example, the way in which Ovid dismisses the two sets of deities. In the case of the Muses, Ovid employs a volitive subjunctive, *adsit* (5.109),²⁴² and puts the emphasis on what the Muses can do for his poetic persona, *nobis*. This is followed by his pledge to praise each of them equally: *nullaque laudetur plusve minusve mihi*. Conversely, Ovid seeks nothing from the three goddesses, merely

²⁴¹ A feature also observed by many of the scholars who address this episode: Blank-Sangmeister (1983) 333, Harries (1989) 172ff., and Mazurek (2010) 130. Littlewood (2005) 34 adds “Ovid’s use of the motif of the Judgment of Paris is, to some extent, initiated by the need to focus on Juno’s wounded vanity in order to ‘elegize’ his unavoidable combination of Virgil’s Juno and Juno Seispes Mater Regina of Lanuvium.”

²⁴² Typical in prayer formulae (cf. Hickson [1993] 67-69).

dismissing them: *ite pares a me* (6.99). The use here of a command as opposed to a prayer demonstrates that Ovid wants to distance himself from this decision rather than embrace his impartiality. Ovid's hesitancy, not of choosing wrongly, but of choosing at all, is apparent when he concludes his non-decision by saying, "two goddesses harm more than one goddess helps" (*plus laedunt, quam iuvat una, duae* 6.100). When examining this final line in comparison to that of the contest of the Muses, we can see that Ovid is playing with his use of *laudetur plus* in the latter and *plus laedunt* in the former. He inverts his optimistic coda of praise (*laudetur*) for the Muses into the potential for harm (*laedunt*) at the hands of the goddesses, creating a chiasmus of nearly identical-sounding words in virtually the same *sedes*. Further, in both of these pentameters the first half maintains the same metrical structure (ˉ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘), culminating in the spondaic emphasis of *laudetur* and *laedunt* respectively. Lastly, the use of the passive voice with *laudetur* with *mihi* puts Ovid firmly in the driver's seat as the agent of the action. He will make sure that the Muses are taken care of and in return he expects them to favor his poetic enterprise.²⁴³ He collects on this bargain at the end of book six when he calls upon the Muses to put the final touch on his work (6.797-812). Clio then sings of the temple of Hercules and the Muses and the rest of the Muses harmoniously concur (*doctae adsensere sorores* 6.811).²⁴⁴ On the other hand, the active voice used in *laedunt* has the opposite effect. There, the goddesses are the ones who have complete power and Ovid himself is powerless to prevent their wrath. Let us now turn specifically to Juno, who attempts to convince Ovid of her importance as a religious figure both outside of and within the realm of Ovid's poem.

²⁴³ The resolution of the Muses, will, of course, be one of the culminating images of the extant poem (6.811).

²⁴⁴ The Pierides even mention that Juno (called Hercules' "step-mother" [*noverca*]) reluctantly permitted Hercules to attach his name to this temple alongside the Muses (6.800).

Ovid sets the scene for the divine epiphany in a wooded grove that is devoid of any sound, save the rushing of water (6.9-10).²⁴⁵ Newlands compares this idyllic setting to that of *Amores* 3.1 where Tragedy temporarily gives way to Elegy, interpreting the parallel language as an indication that this debate between the goddesses will also fail to arrive at a firm resolution.²⁴⁶ Juno appears to Ovid in much the same way Janus does in book 1, where he served as Ovid's first interlocutor. There, Ovid, equipped with his antiquarian writing tablets, was pondering the origins of Janus, when the god himself miraculously appears to him (1.93-96). Ovid's initial reaction is one of fear: *extimui sensique metu riguisse capillos, / et gelidum subito frigore pectus erat*. ("I became afraid and I felt my hairs stand up straight out of fear, and my chest became cold with a sudden chill" 1.97-98). Likewise, at the beginning of book 6 Ovid is pondering not the origins of a particular deity, but rather that of the month, when he suddenly catches sight of not one, but multiple goddesses:

hic ego quaerebam coepti quae mensis origo
 esset, et in cura nominis huius eram.
 ecce deas vidi, non quas praeceptor arandi
 viderat, Ascræas cum sequeretur oves;
 nec quas Priamides in aquosae vallibus Idae 15
 contulit: ex illis sed tamen una fuit,
 ex illis fuit una, sui germana mariti;
 haec erat, agnovi, quae stat in arce Iovis.
 horrueram tacitoque animum pallore fatebar;
 tum dea, quos fecit, sustulit ipsa metus. 20

Here I was seeking what the origin could be of the month I had begun, and I was concerned with its name. Behold I saw goddesses, not those whom the instructor of

²⁴⁵ For the remote wooded grove as place especially suited to poetic inspiration elsewhere in elegy see Prop. 3.1.1-2, and Ov. *Am.* 3.1-5. Both have in mind Callimachus' Dream in the *Aetia* (Fr. 2 Harder).

²⁴⁶ Newlands (1992) 46 and (1995) 77.

ploughing saw, as he trailed his sheep on Ascra; nor those whom the son of Priam compared in the valley of watery Ida: but there was nevertheless one from those [goddesses involved in the judgment of Paris], one from them, namely the sister of her own husband; it was she, I recognized, who stands on the citadel of Jove. I shuddered and I revealed myself with my silent pallor; then that very goddess removed the fear, which she had caused. (Fast. 6.11-20)

As a prelude to his epiphany, Ovid begins with a pair of negative exempla, but he is forced to backtrack when he realizes that he has misspoken. There is in fact one goddess who was involved in the judgment of Paris. The repetition of *ex illis una* is striking and can perhaps be viewed as Ovid's way of making amends for glossing over both Juno's presence and the pain she endured from losing the contest of Paris, a pain which she will reference later in her speech. The repetition also draws attention to the second half of the pentameter where Juno and her brother/husband are displayed as a singular entity (*sui germana mariti*). This in turn serves to anticipate one of Juno's primary arguments, namely that she is deserving of the month's name due to her relationship with Jupiter. Jupiter's name is again invoked when Ovid offers the further detail that the goddess in question is "the one who stands on the citadel of Jove."²⁴⁷ Since Jupiter himself never serves as an interlocutor for Ovid, Juno is arguably the most prestigious deity with whom he interacts. Therefore, although by now he should be used to deities appearing to him, Ovid reacts with dread at the sight of the regal queen of the gods.²⁴⁸ The description of Ovid's reaction is couched in terms very similar to the fear he experienced upon Janus' sudden arrival, the very first appearance of a divine interlocutor. The initial verb used to describe Ovid's fear at 1.97 is *extimui*. When Ovid first encounters Juno, he is speechless and only able to display his

²⁴⁷ Littlewood (2006) 12 believes Ovid's description is meant to indicate that "he recognizes Juno from a cult statue which he has seen in the Capitoline temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus."

²⁴⁸ Miller (1991) 40 describes her as "the goddess who comes via Rome's Capitol full of Virgilian magnificence."

fear through body language, first by shuddering (*horrueram* 19) and then by revealing the paleness of his skin (*pallore* 19). There is yet another related instance of Juno inspiring fear in the *Fasti*. On the Lupercalia, Ovid relates the story of how Roman men and women assembled on the Esquiline hill, where “there was a grove bearing its name from great Juno” (*Iunonis magnae nomine lucus erat* 2.435). Suddenly the trees begin to rustle and the voice of Juno, in the guise of Juno Lucina, informs them of how to ensure the fertility of their women (2.439-41). Their reaction is documented as follows: *obstipuit dubio territa turba sono* (“the crowd stood agape, terrified by the ambiguous omen” 2.436). Once again, Ovid uses an *-esco* verb (here *obstipesco*) to portray mortal fear as a result of the sudden appearance or voice of a divine figure.²⁴⁹ These inchoatives are especially suited to these examples, since in all three cases, the fear is immediately alleviated. Janus responds by telling Ovid to dismiss his fear (*metu posito* 1.101), while Ovid himself admits that Juno dispelled the very fear she had incited (*tum dea, quos fecit, sustulit ipsa metus* 6.20).²⁵⁰ Further, as Miller has observed, both Janus and Juno refer to Ovid’s role as a *vates*—Janus: *vates operose dierum* (“industrious poet of days” 1.101) and Juno: *o vates, Romani conditor anni* (“O poet, founder of the Roman year” 6.20).²⁵¹ As we can see, therefore, despite the many similarities between the proems of book 5 and 6, we must acknowledge the connections between books 1 and 6, which will become even more apparent with the resurgence of Janus on the Kalends of June. For now, it will suffice to say that the

²⁴⁹ Along with *extimui* (1.97) from *extimesco* and *horrueram* (6.19) from *horresco*.

²⁵⁰ The fear of the crowd upon hearing the oracular command of Juno Lucina is dispelled by the Etruscan priest who successfully interprets her command.

²⁵¹ Miller (1991) 41 sees in *conditor* a dual sense of “writer/singer” and “founder/originator.” Mars also addresses Ovid as *vates operose dierum* at 3.178. Of note also is the way in which Ovid repeats the sound *ani* when he says *Romani conditor anni*, drawing even greater attention to Ovid’s calendrical endeavor.

divine epiphanies of Janus and Juno are born out of similar circumstances;²⁵² they both elicit the same fearful reaction from Ovid, summarily alleviating that fear, and they both play to his vanity by referring to his privileged status not only as *vates*, but rather as a *vates* who is concerned specifically with the writing/refashioning of the Roman calendar.

VIII. Juno's Justifications for June

Several scholars have drawn attention to both the legal flavor of Juno's argument and its use of typical Roman oratorical techniques.²⁵³ Indeed, we see rhetorical flourish right from the beginning of Juno's speech, as she attempts to gain the good-will of the judge through flattery:²⁵⁴

namque ait 'o vates, Romani conditor anni,
ause per exiguos magna referre modos,
ius tibi fecisti numen caeleste videndi,
cum placuit numeris condere festa tuis:'

And she said, "O poet, founder/writer of the Roman year, you who dared to relate weighty things in a slender meter, you have forged for yourself the right to see celestial deities, when it pleased you to publish their festivals in your lines." (*Fast.* 6.21-24)

In addition to the already noted connections to Janus' initial appearance in book 1, this statement is a reformulation of Ovid's own words stated above: *fas mihi praecipue voltus vidisse deorum, / vel quia sum vates, vel quia sacra cano* ("It is especially right for me to gaze upon the faces of the gods, either because I am a poet or because I sing of sacred rites" 6.7-8). Juno begins her

²⁵² Bömer (1973) 338 citing 2.502 and 3.329 notes that the element of fear is a "Typologie der Epiphanie." He does not, however, draw a parallel with the epiphany of Janus.

²⁵³ Miller (1983) 189, Harries (1989) 173, Newlands (1995) 78, Littlewood (2006) 12, and Loehr (1996) 311, who calls her speech "selbstbewusst und rhetorisch ausgefeilt."

²⁵⁴ Loehr (1996) 310 and Littlewood (2006) 12-13 see this primarily as a *captatio benevolentiae*, a typical feature of Roman oratory; Miller (1991) 40-43 connects Juno's praise of Ovid's poetic endeavor to the proem of book 2 where Ovid confessed that he was taking the genre of elegy to new heights (*velis...maioribus* 2.3).

speech by touching upon the very two reasons Ovid himself claims he is in a unique position to carry on conversations with gods. First, she emphasizes Ovid's role as a *vates* by placing the word right before the caesura of the hexameter at 6.21, just as Ovid achieves the same effect by placing it right before the caesura of the pentameter at 6.8. Further, both parts of these respective lines are metrically equivalent in the form of a hemiepes (˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘).²⁵⁵ She then confirms Ovid's initial statement that he has indeed earned the privilege of conversation with the gods: *ius tibi fecisti numen caeleste videndi* (6.23). Note how the deliberate placement of *ius tibi* at the beginning of the hexameter corresponds directly with Ovid's *fas mihi* (6.7).²⁵⁶ It is interesting that she should substitute *ius* for Ovid's own *fas* in describing his special privilege.²⁵⁷ Ovid's *fas* contains more of a divine underpinning and is indicative of the work he is composing, namely *Fasti*. Juno's *ius*, on the other hand, is generally restricted to the human sphere, and involves laws among mortals.²⁵⁸ Although they appear to function as synonyms in this context, the irony should not be lost that Ovid the mortal employs the divine term, while Juno the immortal employs the mortal term.²⁵⁹ In both cases, however, the datives of reference (*mihi* and *tibi*) make it clear that Ovid has forged his own *ius* and that it is his poetic achievement and not a celestial gift that has enabled him to hold this privilege. One likely possibility for Juno's adoption of *ius* in lieu of *fas* is the association of the former with the Roman court system. As Harries is quick to

²⁵⁵ Even though 6.21 is a hexameter, the beginning of it is equivalent to the hemiepes of a line of pentameter.

²⁵⁶ Although as Prof. Anthony Corbeill has pointed out me, this placement of the unemphatic personal pronouns *mihi* and *tibi* in the second position is standard according to Wackernagel's Law.

²⁵⁷ Here closest to *OLD* s.v. 13: "Rights over others, authority, jurisdiction (conferred by law)."

²⁵⁸ Wolff (1951) 50.

²⁵⁹ *Ius* was used by the divine figure Boreas in book 5 to describe the precedent of rape he had set for his younger brother Zephyrus (5.203).

point out, both Juno and Juventas will present their arguments as if appearing before a Roman *iudex*.²⁶⁰ In fact, Juventas will use the same word to refer to her jurisdiction (*remque mei iuris* 6.71).

Juno then concludes her opening remarks by drawing attention to the second reason for Ovid's privileged status, namely the fact that he sings of sacred things (*sacra cano* 6.8): *cum placuit numeris condere festa tuis* (6.24). Here *condere* picks up on the earlier *conditor* (6.21), activating both the "compositional" aspect of Ovid's work as well as its "originality."²⁶¹ Just as the word *vates* was in the same position in the lines of both Ovid and Juno, so too does the position and meaning of Juno's *festa* (6.24) match that of Ovid's own *sacra* (6.8), both of which refer to Ovid's explication of religious themes. Although Ovid's lines occur first to the reader, it is Juno's lines that take temporal precedence, as Ovid is recalling events of the past.²⁶² Thus Ovid can be seen as appropriating Juno's own words for his poetic validation. The irony is that although Juno ultimately fails in her attempt to convince Ovid that June derives its name from her, she unwittingly succeeds in convincing him of his privileged status.

After these few words of blandishment, Juno exhibits a more familiar form of behavior. She proceeds to tell Ovid: *ne tamen ignores volgique errore traharis, / Iunius a nostro nomine nomen habet* ("Lest you are ignorant and misled by the error of the people, June derives its name from my name" 6.26).²⁶³ In this vein, Juno aims to combat the other possible etymologies of the

²⁶⁰ Harries (1989) stresses the legal nature of the entire poem.

²⁶¹ *Condo* OLD s.v. 14 "to compose, write (a poem or other literary work)" and s.v. 10 "to found, establish."

²⁶² Notice the present tense of *sum* and *cano* at 6.7-8 and the past tense of *quaerebam* and of all subsequent verbs after 6.11.

²⁶³ I would be remiss if that I did not point out the interesting feature observed by J. F. Miller and recorded by Littlewood (2006) 15 that the phrase *iunius a no(stro) no(mine) no(men)* (6.26) repeats the second syllable of *Iuno*, which gives the sense that Juno is literally emphasizing her

month of June.²⁶⁴ Frazer, who offers a survey of ancient opinions on the matter, is quick to point out that of the three possible derivations put forth in the *Fasti*, “the only one which has a shadow, or rather a high degree, of probability, is that from Juno.”²⁶⁵ Indeed, despite the competing tradition among ancient sources of deriving the name of June from *iunior*,²⁶⁶ it is hard to imagine that many Romans would have made the additional connection with Juventas.²⁶⁷ Yet, Juno’s blunt statement that she is without a doubt the deity responsible for the month of June is at odds

own name alongside her repeated use of the generic phrase for “my name.” Word-play abounds throughout Juno’s speech and is also detectable here with the balanced sound of the final syllables of *ignores...errore* (6.25), both of which are pejorative words meant to emphasize the gravity of Ovid’s mistake. Just below there is word-play with *nupsisse Iovi Iovis esse sororem* (6.27), intended to underscore Juno’s dual connection to Jupiter as both his wife and sister.

²⁶⁴ Kötze (1991) 150 even goes so far as to say of the three goddesses’ etymologies Ovid favors that of Juno.

²⁶⁵ Frazer (1929) 127, who goes on to acknowledge that according to Wissowa (1912) 181 the etymology of *Iuno* is linked to that of *iuvenis* and *iunior*. Michels (1967) 18 n. 24 comments “Junius probably comes from Juno, although perhaps from the Etruscan form of her name.” For a comprehensive list of ancient opinions on the matter see Degraffi (1963) 320-21 and Maltby (1991) 318 who divides the issue into five categories: a) *a iunioribus vel iuvenibus*, b) *a iunone*, c) *a ‘iuncto’*, d) *a Iunio Bruto*, and e) *a Iuventa dea*. Of these, a) and b) have about equal support. The majority of Maltby’s etymologies (a, b, and d) come from Macrobius (*Saturn.* 1.12.30) who connects the month to Juno through its alleged original name *Iunonius* and the fact that the temple of Juno Moneta was dedicated on the Kalends of that month. Both features, however, are found in Ovid’s *Fasti* (*Iunonius* at 6.59-63 and the temple of Juno Moneta at 6.183-84).

²⁶⁶ Frazer (1929) 127 points out that Varro, Festus, Fulvius Nobilior, Isidore, and Polemius Silvius, in addition to Ovid himself, as previously mentioned, give support to the derivation of June from *iunior*. Maltby (1991) 318 adds to this Plutarch, Censorius, Servius, Macrobius, and John Lydus.

²⁶⁷ Auson. 7.11.11 does make this connection, but he may have been influenced by Ovid’s inclusion of Juventas here in book 6. To my knowledge, no author prior to Ovid connects the month of June to the deity Juventas. Maltby (1991) 318 is no help here, citing only Agroecius’ *De Orthographia et Differentia Sermonis*, which refers back to Ovid’s *Fasti*.

with what Ovid has already told the reader at the very beginning of the month: *hic quoque mensis habet dubias in nomine causas* (“The derivation of this month’s name is also uncertain” 6.1). Juno, who had begun her argument by endorsing Ovid’s privileged status, now corrects the arbiter and shifts the praise away from him and onto herself. Her initial argument focuses on her familial primacy and prestige. She reiterates Ovid’s own observation at 6.17 (*sui germana mariti*) with the clever assertion that both aspects of her relationship with Jupiter are equally significant: *fratre magis dubito glorier anne viro* (“I am uncertain as to whether I take more pride in having him as a brother or as a husband” 6.27). The presence of *dubito* here matches that of *ignores* three lines prior, both in *sedes* and in sense. In both cases the semantically linked words occur immediately prior to the line’s caesura, giving them added emphasis. While Juno attempts to prevent Ovid from being ignorant of the month’s true etymology, she herself possesses a degree of uncertainty. Her doubt, however, centers not on any factual knowledge, but rather on which aspect of her relationship with Jupiter ought to be praised more. The use of *dubito* here also brings the reader back to the very beginning of the book where Ovid claimed that the month had *dubias...causas* (“uncertain origins” 6.1). By employing an etymological variant of that same word here, Juno attempts to draw Ovid’s uncertainty away from the month and onto the unrelated issue of her dual relationship with Jupiter. In either case, her pedigree is unquestionable. In order to make that point, she traces her lineage all the way back to her auspicious birth, which itself is given precedence over all of the other Olympians: *si genus aspicitur, Saturnum prima parentem / feci, Saturni sors ego prima fui* (“If you look at my lineage, I first made Saturn a parent, I was Saturn’s first fate-child” 6.29-30).²⁶⁸ Here, we may be

²⁶⁸ This is in accord with Hera’s statement in Homer’s *Iliad* (4.59) but at odds with the accounts of both Hesiod and the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite which cite Hestia as the first-born of the Olympians (*Theog.* 453, *HH. Aphr.* 22).

reminded of Janus' claim that he alone was responsible for repelling the Sabines and saving Rome,²⁶⁹ yet another example of the parallelism between the entries for the first day of the first month/book and the first day of the last month/book of the extant work.²⁷⁰

An even stronger parallel between the two episodes is Janus' threefold repetition of *Saturnum* (1.235), *Saturnia* (1.237), and *Saturnia* (1.265), which Juno herself adopts here in the form of *Saturnum...Saturni...Saturnia* (6.29-31).²⁷¹ For the mention of Saturn as a biographical marker prompts Juno to revisit another of Janus' claims, namely that the land currently occupied by Rome was formerly called *Saturnia* and that it exhibited features of the golden age:

a patre dicta meo quondam Saturnia Roma est:
haec illi a caelo proxima terra fuit.
si torus in pretio est, dicor matrona Tonantis,
iunctaque Tarpeio sunt mea templa Iovi.

Formerly Rome was called *Saturnia* from my father: to him this was the land closest from the sky. If the marriage bed is worth anything, I am called the matron of the Thunderer, and my temple is joined to Tarpeian Jove. (Fast. 6.31-34)

She speaks of Saturn and the Saturnian land with the same air of nostalgia as Janus had done back in book 1 (235-52). In fact, Juno's assertion that Rome was formerly known as *Saturnia* can and should be read as a refashioning Janus' explanation of Latium's etymology: *dicta quoque est Latium terra latente deo* ("the land was called *Latium* from the god who was hiding" 1.238). Yet, she collapses the golden age imagery by directly associating the much older Saturnian land with the newer construction of Rome (*dicta...Saturnia Roma est* 6.31). Janus, who shared the

²⁶⁹ *ipse meae movi...sum...reclusi...sumque...subieci* (1.268-70).

²⁷⁰ Recall that we had already seen both verbal and thematic echoes vis-à-vis Ovid's reaction of fear upon encountering both Janus and Juno.

²⁷¹ See Littlewood (2006) 16.

rule of ancient Saturnia together with Saturn, had already confessed that at that early time the site of Rome was entirely uncultivated: *hic, ubi nunc Roma est, incaedua silva virebat* (“Here, where Rome is now, an uncut forest was thriving” 1.243). We can perhaps attribute this temporal inconsistency to the fact that Juno is torn between two different worlds. On the one hand, she strives to connect herself to the Saturnian era, which is symbolic of simplicity, tradition, and peace. As we have seen, however, her epithet *Saturnia* embraces the more violent aspect of fighting to preserve that peace, rather than merely being a part of it.²⁷² Thus her Saturnian argument, which brings the reader back to the *Saturnia invidiosa* of 1.265-6, where she acted as an enemy of Rome, problematizes her alleged Roman patriotism. This, in turn, clashes with the other part of her familial argument, which focuses on her relationship with Jove.²⁷³ Indeed, the juxtaposition in consecutive lines of Saturn’s absence from the sky (*a caelo* 6.32) and Jupiter’s title “Thunderer” (*Tonantis* 6.33) evokes Janus’ earlier acknowledgement of Saturn’s forced removal from the heavens at the hands of Jove and his weapons (*caelitibus regnis a Iove pulsus erat* 1.236).²⁷⁴ The dichotomy between her peaceful/protective sphere and her bellicose

²⁷² Lieberg (1969) 929 detects a shift here from the Vergil’s use of *Saturnia* and views the reference as Juno’s new-found endorsement of the Roman cause: “Er [Ovid] weicht damit von Vergil ab, in dessen Aeneis eben dieser Kontrast gerade am Verhalten Iunos abzulesen ist, die besonders als Saturnia die Rechte Latiums gegen die zur Grundung Roms berufenen Trojaner des Aeneas verteidigt.”

²⁷³ Pasco-Pranger (2006) connects the reference to Saturn and *Saturnia tellus* specifically to the Capitoline hill, once called *mons Saturnius* (cf. Varro *Ling.* 5.42) and concludes, “Saturn, it would seem, has been supplanted by his son not just on the heavenly *arx*, but on the Roman one as well.” For an analysis of Juno’s treatment of Jupiter in relation to herself, see chapter 3.

²⁷⁴ The employment of *Tonantis* here may be a nod to the Homeric Hymn to Hera where she is described as ζηνός ἐριγδοῦποιο κασιγνήτην ἄλοχόν τε (“sister and wife of thundering Zeus” *HH.* Hera).

disposition is further accentuated by her description of herself as *matrona Tonantis* (6.33).²⁷⁵ Her argument hinges upon the sanctity of the marriage bed, as evidenced by *si torus in pretio est* (6.33), and, by extension, her role as a goddess of marriage. Yet, Jupiter is notoriously serially unfaithful and the phrase *matrona Tonantis* appears also at *Met.* 2.466 as a designation of Juno when she is plotting her revenge against Callisto for sleeping with Jupiter. It thus hints at her vengeful mythological side and detracts from the religious argument that she is attempting to make.²⁷⁶ In the very next line the mythological is again blurred with the religious when she asserts that her temple is joined to that of Tarpeian Jove (*Tarpeio...Iovi* 34).²⁷⁷ The phrase, beyond serving as a point of geographic reference, activates an association with Tarpeia, who, like Juno, provides aid to the Sabines earlier in book one (1.261-62).²⁷⁸ Further, the sandwiching of *mea templa* between *Tarpeio* and *Iovi* exacerbates the division between the historical and the religious, leaving the reader confused about the extent to which Juno truly has transferred her allegiance to Rome. The use of *iuncta* here also plays a significant role. Feeney sees Vergil as exploiting an etymological link to *iungere* when Juno offers to join Aeolus to the nymph

²⁷⁵ For *matrona Iuno* as a deity who exhibits temperate power cf. Hor. *C.* 3.4.59. Augustus' close association with the cult of Jupiter Tonans and the resulting implication that Juno represents Livia will be discussed in chapter 2.

²⁷⁶ That the focus of her argument is on religion/cult is further brought out by the fact that she mentions the proximity between her temple and that of Jupiter's. Littlewood (2006) 16 sees Ovid as deliberately grouping together cults centered on the Capitoline hill, further connecting Juno to Saturn and Jupiter.

²⁷⁷ Although the aid Juno provides to Titus Tatius and the Sabines technically falls within the realm of history, its aforementioned engagement with the opening of Janus' gates in *Aen.* 7 also endows it with a mythological flavor, especially considering the epithet *Saturnia* and Juno's penchant for violence.

²⁷⁸ Frazer (1929) 134 points out both that "Tarpeian" here equals "Capitoline" and that according to Varro *Ling.* 5.41 the Tarpeian hill received its name from Tarpeia's treachery.

Deiopeia in marriage in the first book of the *Aeneid*: *conubio iungam stabili* (1.73).²⁷⁹ So in addition to seeing a Juno who glories in the space she shares with Jove, perhaps we can detect another cult reference. Given her endorsement of the sanctity of the marriage-bed (*si torus in pretio est* 6.33) and her self-identification as the wife of Jupiter (*dicor matrona Tonantis* 6.33) in the previous line, it is reasonable to infer that by using the word *iuncta* (34), Juno is promoting the epithet *Iuga* or *Iugalis*, signaling her jurisdiction over marriages. The invocation of other cult titles before and after lend further weight to this possibility.²⁸⁰ The significance of her use of *iuncta* will become even more pronounced once Concordia enters the fray and argues that she deserves the month because it derives from *iunctis* (6.96).²⁸¹ Throughout her speech, Juno continues to weave in and out of the mythological, religious, and calendrical realms, directing the reader's attention to episodes earlier in the poem, to her broader treatment in other poetic works, and to her contemporary worship among other Italic peoples. The principal argument here is twofold. First, that Juno's speech deliberately revisits many of Janus's assertions in book 1 and reshapes them in order to provide Ovid with a fresh, new perspective on her relationship with Saturn and Saturnia that speaks to her intimate connection with Rome and *Romanitas*. Second, that Juno alludes to several distinct aspects of her worship and uses a broad array poetic, rhetorical, and metrical devices in order to convince Ovid that she is indeed a full-fledged Roman deity, responsible for giving the month its name.

The mention of her close connection to Jupiter prompts Juno, who has thus far uncharacteristically maintained a rather civil discourse, to adopt her more vengeful persona in

²⁷⁹ Feeney (1991) 133.

²⁸⁰ *Saturnia* at 6.29-31, *Regina* at 6.37, and *Lucina* at 6.39.

²⁸¹ See n. 265 above for the possible derivation of the Month *a* 'iuncto.'

the manner of the Homeric Hera.²⁸² This manifests itself in a rather typical way, namely with Juno attacking one of Jove's lovers. The subject of Juno's wrath here, and the one alluded to through the word *paelex* (6.35), is the goddess Maia, one of the three contenders for the etymology of May:

an potuit Maio paelex dare nomina mensi, 35
 hic honor in nobis invidiosus erit?
 cur igitur regina vocor princepsque dearum,
 aurea cur dextrae sceptrum dedere meae?

Or was my rival able to give her name to the month of May, while this same honor is begrudged to me? Why therefore am I called queen and chief of the goddesses, why have they given a golden scepter to my right hand? (*Fast.* 6.35-38)

Maia is, of course, Juno's rival in two different senses, both of which are acknowledged here. On the one hand, Juno refers to Maia as a *paelex*, since she coupled with Jupiter and produced the offspring Mercury. On the other hand, the more explicit rivalry being voiced here is that over the prestige of lending their respective names to the months of May and June. Yet, the implication that Maia has earned that right does not equate with Ovid's own statement on the matter. For, as we have seen, he has already hinted that the name of May derives from *maiores* (1.41), and, at the very least, he is unwilling to commit to any one interpretation (5.109-10). By endorsing Maia's claim to the month of May, Juno paradoxically validates Calliope's narrative of why Maia deserved that honor in the first place. This includes Calliope's assertion: *Maia suas forma superasse sorores / traditur et summo concubuisse Iovi* ("Maia is said to have surpassed the beauty of her sisters and to have lain with supreme Jove" 5.85-6). On one level, Juno uses Maia's

²⁸² Liebeg (1969) 930. Kötzle (1991) 152 couches this dynamic in terms of a Romanized version of the Greek Hera, commenting "Die griechische Hera hat ihren Wirkungsbereich also nach Rom verlegt."

inferior divine status as a launching board for her own claim to the month's naming rights. At the same, however, by acknowledging Jupiter's infidelity, Juno casts a palpable shadow around her previous glorification of the sanctity of their marriage.

Ovid also embeds earlier literary parallels into Juno's current predicament. The sheer disbelief expressed by her question, *hic honor in nobis invidiosus erit?* (6.36) evokes a similar query posited by Juno early in book 1 of the *Aeneid*: *Mene incepto desistere victam, / nec posse Italia Teucrorum avertere regem?* ("Am I, beaten, to desist from my undertaking, and I am not able to avert the king of the Trojans from Italy? *Aen.* 1.37-38). In both cases, Juno is incredulous that she as queen of the gods is prevented from defending her honor while other, arguably inferior, deities succeed in defending theirs. Indeed, Juno's disdain for Maia's ability to succeed where she herself faces obstacles is a refashioning of a similar argument from *Aeneid* 1. There, Juno follows her caustic question with a description of how a rival goddess, Pallas Minerva, handily took her revenge against Ajax son of Oileus.²⁸³ Although likely a coincidence, it is fitting that the line numbers of these two questions are virtually the same: *Fast.* 6.36 and *Aen.* 1.37-38. At the very least, Ovid invites the reader to recall Juno's struggles at the beginning of the *Aeneid*, a situation that will become even more apparent when she recapitulates nearly the precise list of grievances noted by Vergil in *Aeneid* 1. In addition, the lines that conclude her rant against Minerva in the *Aeneid* also match those that follow her criticism of Maia in the *Fasti*:

Ast ego, quae divum incedo regina, Iovisque
et soror et coniunx, una cum gente tot annos
bella gero! Et quisquam numen Iunonis adorat
praeterea, aut supplex aris imponet honorem?

²⁸³ The rivalry between Juno and Pallas Minerva stems from the judgement of Paris referenced by Vergil's Juno at *Aen.* 1.26-7. Recall that the entire contest here in the proem of *Fast.* 6 is fashioned in the manner of the judgment of Paris.

But I, who go forth as queen of the gods, and as the sister and wife of Jove, I wage a war with a single race for so many years! And hereafter does anyone worship the divinity of Juno, or will anyone make a sacrifice as a suppliant at her altars? (*Aen.* 1.46-49)

In both cases, she cites her cult title *Regina* and emphasizes her regal position within the Roman pantheon. Her assertion in the *Aeneid* that she is the sister and wife of Jove has already been noted in the *Fasti* (6.27) and she proceeds to call herself *princeps dearum*, a testament to her importance even without the force of Jupiter's name.²⁸⁴ The mention of the scepter in her right hand (6.38) further symbolizes her autonomous power, but it also evokes the image of her cult statue, which may be how Ovid had initially recognized her (6.18).²⁸⁵ The blending of myth and cult is also detectable in our *Aeneid* passage above, where Juno uses her mythological status and lineage as a platform to voice her concerns about the prevalence of worship at her altars.

In the *Fasti*, Juno will linger on her cult image for another couplet, calling attention to the more tranquil dimension of her worship in the form of Juno Lucina: *an facient mensem luces, Lucinaque ab illis / dicar, et a nullo nomina mense traham* ("Or will days comprise a month and I be called Lucina from those days, and yet not derive my name from any month?" 6.39-40). Recall that Juno Lucina had played a prominent role on the Kalends of March where she contributed to a peace treaty between the Romans and Sabines (3.201-34). Further, back in book

²⁸⁴ Juno mentions her relationship with Jupiter thrice in her speech (6.26, 6.33-34, and 6.52). The word *princeps* is no doubt marked with an Augustan flavor and may indicate a connection with the empress Livia who is often conflated with Juno. Additionally, Kötzle (1991) 153 n. 17 connects this back to other uses of the word in the *Fasti*, including references to Julius Caesar (3.697), to Augustus (2.142; 5.570), and, in particular, to Venus, who is called *generis princeps* ("founder of the race" 1.40). Imperial associations will be explored in the subsequent chapter.

²⁸⁵ See n. 247 above for Ovid's identification of Juno from her cult statue. For a surviving example of this statue type see the *Barberini Juno* in the Vatican Museum, which depicts Juno grasping a scepter in her right hand.

2 on the Lupercalia Ovid had already connected Juno's cult name *Lucina* to the word *lux*: *aut quia principium tu, dea, lucis habes* ("or because you, goddess, produce the beginning of light" 2.450).²⁸⁶ There, however, *lux* refers to the light of life in a newborn child, rather than serving as a synonym for *dies*, as it does here. Matthew Robinson in his commentary on *Fasti* 2 offers the interesting comment that Juno Lucina literally possesses the *principium lucis*, in that "her name contains the beginning of *lucis*."²⁸⁷ Thus, regardless of whether she considers the etymology of her name to derive from the "day" or "light" definition of *lux*,²⁸⁸ she employs her title Lucina as further proof that she deserves to give her name to a month, June in particular. There may also exist a connection between the phrase *princeps dearum* (6.37), mentioned above, and the *principium...lucis* of 2.450. Not only is Juno the chief female deity of the Olympian pantheon, but she also represents the origin of human life. She will pick up that thread again shortly when she reminds Ovid and the reader of her role in Mars' birth, which makes her the grandmother of Romulus and, by extension, the initial seed for the entire Roman enterprise. One last thing is worth observing here. Juno's highly sarcastic rhetorical question *a nullo nomina mense traham?* (6.40) ought to be read in light of her previous assertion: *Iunius a nostro nomine nomen habet* (26). What began as a polite correction of Ovid's potential ignorance has devolved into caustic disbelief at the thought of being denied what Juno considers rightfully hers. The previously mentioned emphasis on the *-no* of Juno's name returns in slightly different format with *nullo*

²⁸⁶ In Maltby (1991) 348, the majority of the ancient sources connect Lucina with *lux*, including Varro, Cicero, and Donatus. There is, however, the competing etymology connecting Lucina with *lucus* endorsed by Pliny the Elder and Paulus Festus. Both etymologies are mentioned by Ovid in the *Fasti* (2.449-50).

²⁸⁷ Robinson (2011) 285.

²⁸⁸ For *lux* as "a day" see *OLD* s.v. 4 where the entry is limited to Lucretius, Livy, Manilius, Martial, and Ovid. Our present example (*Fast.* 6.39) is not listed, but Ovid also uses *lux* as "day" at *Met.* 7.662.

nomina, this time showcasing her incredulity at the perceived likelihood of being passed over as the originator of the month.

We are able to detect a progression within Juno's speech. Her tone has gone from coaxing, to didactic, to insolent, and finally to inimical. The Juno that Ovid next presents to us is very much the Vergilian character, whose words clearly echo *Aeneid* 1 and 12:

tum me paeniteat posuisse fideliter iras
 in genus Electrae Dardaniumque domum.
 causa duplex irae: rapto Ganymede dolebam,
 forma quoque Idaeo iudice victa mea est.
 paeniteat quod non foveo Carthaginis arces, 45
 cum mea sint illo currus et arma loco:
 paeniteat Sparten Argosque measque Mycenae
 et veterem Latio subposuisse Samon:

Then I would regret having faithfully set aside my anger toward the race of Electra and the house of Dardanus. The cause of my anger was twofold: I was pained when Ganymede was snatched away, and also when my beauty was refuted by that arbiter of Ida. I would regret that I no longer cherish the citadels of Carthage, although my chariot and my arms lie there: I would regret having made Sparta and Argos and my Mycenae and ancient Samos subservient to Latium. (*Fast.* 6.41-48)

The *tum* that sets up this entire passage refers to the scenario in which Ovid does not endorse Juno's claim to have given her name to the month of June.²⁸⁹ Ironically, the reader is already aware that this imagined scenario is very much a reality for Ovid, who began the book with the admission that June, like May, has multiple possible aetiologies (6.1), and thus does not owe its name unequivocally to Juno. In light of this, her regrets are not merely hypothetical, but represent a sincere desire to undo all of the concessions she had previously made in the Vergilian

²⁸⁹ Littlewood (2006) 18 comments on Juno's thought-process: "If Ovid were disinclined to grant her the *titulus mensis*, then she would perhaps reconsider her policy of appeasement."

and Ennian universes. At the time of this discussion, which takes place in Ovid's own era, the events of the *Aeneid* are in the distant past, as is Juno's allegiance to the former city of Carthage. Her bitter and scathing tone, characteristic of her epic persona, is immediately apparent in the harsh *p* and *d* sounds that emanate from *paeniteat posuisse* (41) and *Dardaniumque domum* (42). By referring to the Trojans as "the race of Electra and the house of Dardanus" (*genus Electrae Dardaniumque domum* 42), she once again undermines the sanctity of her relationship with Jupiter, who slept with Electra and fathered Dardanus.²⁹⁰ Thus Electra, like Maia above (35), is another hated *paelex* for Juno. Her inclusion of *fideliter* (41) can be viewed as a recapitulation of *laetata* at *Aen.* 12.841, the very moment at which Juno pledges her devotion to the Roman cause: *adnu't his Iuno et mentem laetata retorsit* ("Juno agreed to these things and happily changed her mind"). In fact, *fideliter* may have even greater implications for her present argument. It not only connects the reader back to her initial Vergilian reconciliation, but it also emphasizes that she has fulfilled her end of the bargain and deserves adequate compensation for her efforts. Matthew Fox views this appropriation of Vergilian language as a parody of Vergil, commenting that "Ovid produces a remarkable trivialization of the view of Rome's history put forward in the *Aeneid*."²⁹¹ Yet, while these lines do engage both verbally and thematically with the *causae irarum* expressed by Juno in *Aeneid* 1,²⁹² they look beyond the scope of the *Aeneid* to a time when such concessions are unnecessary. The Trojan customs have long been put aside and the Latin name has lived on, just as Juno had requested in *Aen.* 12 before consenting to the integration of the

²⁹⁰ Venus spells this out in the proem to book 4: *Dardanon Electra nesciret Atlantide natum / scilicet, Electran concubuisse Iovi*? ("Was [Romulus] unaware that Dardanus had been born from Electra, daughter of Atlas, and that Electra had lay with Jove?" 6.31-32).

²⁹¹ Fox (1996) 189.

²⁹² Note especially *Fast.* 6.46: *cum mea sint illo currus et arma loco* and *Aen.* 1.16-17: *hic illius arma, / hic currus fuit*. For further parallels see Littlewood (2006) 19.

Trojans and Latins (*Aen.* 12.830-41). Indeed, she admits to having already subjected several prominent Greek cities to Latium (47-48),²⁹³ which removes her original hatred of Troy from consideration. These mythological and historical concerns no longer hold any weight. The *ira Iunonis* that once threatened the very existence of Rome in the *Aeneid* and cast doubt upon their ability to defeat the Carthaginians in the *Annales* is now reduced to something as insignificant as the naming rights of a month. These *causae*,²⁹⁴ which served as a legitimate basis for Juno's complaints in these earlier poetic works, have no real merit here.²⁹⁵ By alluding to them, Ovid embraces the tradition of Juno's mythological and historical reconciliations, while also pointing out the futility of an additional reconciliation at the present time. Juno's only valid argument hinges not upon events of the past, as in Vergil and Ennius, but rather on the current state of her worship amid the neighboring Italic cities.

Yet, this does not stop Juno from trying to present events of the past in an alternative light that would put her in a favorable position:

adde senem Tatium Iunonicolasque Faliscos,
 quos ego Romanis succubuisse tuli. 50
 sed neque paeniteat, nec gens mihi carior ulla est:
 hic colar, hic teneam cum Iove templa meo.

²⁹³ In the *Aeneid* Juno is said to have cherished Carthage above all other cities with even Samos held after (*quam Iuno...unam / posthabita coluisse Samo* 1.15-16). Here in the *Fasti* the order is inverted with Juno placing Samos beneath Rome: *et veterem Latio subposuisse Samon* (6.48).

²⁹⁴ That Juno's diction here so closely mimics her *causae irarum* in *Aen.* 1 endorses the view of Mazurek (2010), who sees Juno as the embodiment of epic poetry in contrast to the elegiac persona of Juventas.

²⁹⁵ Feeney (1991) 191ff. discusses the more practical reasons behind Juno's motives in Vergil and Ennius. He mentions that Troy and the Trojan name would have served to infect Rome and its people with its inherent association with "degeneracy and moral shabbiness" (192). He goes on to discuss the historical basis for Juno's worship in Carthage as Juno Lacinia (193).

Add old Tatius and the Juno-worshipping Faliscans, whom I permitted to submit to the Romans. But let me not regret it, for no race is dearer to me: Let me be worshipped here, and let me have my temple here along with my Jove. (*Fast.* 6.49-52)

When Juno brings Titus Tatius (*senem Tatium* 6.49) into the equation, she invites comparison with prior episodes involving the Sabine chief. She is no doubt referencing her role as Juno Lucina in the mediation of the war between Sabines and Romans, an event celebrated as part of the Matronalia on the Kalends of March (3.199-258). She may also be alluding to the role she played in supporting Titus Tatius and the Sabines in their failed attempt to sack the city (1. 265-66), emphasizing once again her willingness to abandon foreign allegiances in favor of a sole Roman allegiance. What is more, beyond merely acknowledging the part she played in bringing about a reconciliation between the two peoples, she claims sole responsibility for subjecting the Sabines to Roman control: *quos ego Romanis succubuisse tuli* (6.50). The expression *Romanis succubuisse* picks up on the similarly phrased *Latia subposuisse* two lines earlier in the same *sedes*. What could at first glance be viewed as a temporal shift from early Latium to later Rome breaks apart when one considers that the Sabines and the Faliscans were conquered by Rome long before the various Greek cities, which only fell to Rome following the destruction of Corinth and the end of the Achaean war in 146 B.C. Just below, Concordia also claims responsibility for adding Tatius and the Sabines to the Roman dominion, although she puts the emphasis on reconciliation rather than subjugation: *haec ubi narravit Tatium fortemque Quirinum / binaque cum populis regna coisse suis...* (“when she told of Tatius and brave Quirinus and how the two kingdoms had merged along with their tribes...” 6.93-94). Ovid thus presents us with two different versions of the same story, one told by the goddess who embodies

chaos and strife,²⁹⁶ the other by the goddess who is the actual personification of harmony. The inevitable result is disharmony and although Juno fails to secure the month's name for herself, the strife that ensues bears the mark of her very essence, in a way providing her with a quasi-victory.

The Sabines are only one of the two tribes that Juno claims she subjected to Rome's power. The other are the Faliscans (*Faliscos* 49), who threw in their lot with the Etruscans and were conquered by the Romans soon after Veii was taken in 396 B.C.²⁹⁷ She describes them as Juno-worshipping (*Iunonicolas*) even prior to their Roman subjugation. Ovid had previously discussed at length the Falerian festival of Juno in *Amores* 3.13, in which he opened by noting that his wife had been born in Falerii.²⁹⁸ There, he presents a detailed account of the festival's rites whose mythical origins he attributes to a certain Halaesus, a comrade of Agamemnon who had fled to Italy from Argos.²⁹⁹ Indeed, he even mentions the specifically Greek custom of maidens carrying ritual items (*sacra*) on their heads while clad in white robes.³⁰⁰ This is clearly something that was ongoing during Ovid's lifetime. Yet, in the *Fasti*, Juno passes over any specific details related to this festival of hers in favor of a simple statement asserting the subservient position of the Faliscans to the Romans. This can be viewed as an extension of her

²⁹⁶ Feeney (1984) 194, Feeney (1991) 150-51, and Coffee (2009) 73.

²⁹⁷ See Livy 5.1ff. for an account of the siege of Veii and the subsequent events that involve the voluntary capitulation of Falerii to Camillus following the actions of a treacherous schoolmaster. See n. 108 above for the possible instance of *evocatio* in relation to Juno's cult at Falerii. It is interesting that both episodes would involve the act of betrayal—Tarpeia betraying the Romans to Tatius and the Sabines, and the schoolmaster betraying the Falerians to Camillus and the Romans. In both cases, treachery is rewarded with punishment.

²⁹⁸ Ov. *Am.* 3.13.1

²⁹⁹ A reference to Halaesus' founding of Falerii is also made at *Fast.* 4.73-74.

³⁰⁰ Ov. *Am.* 3.13.27-28.

comment above that she had already subjected Argos to Latium (6.47-48). Thus while Falerii and the Faliscans may continue to embrace these Argive traditions and incorporate them into Juno's festival, they do so, according to Juno, only under Roman authority and with a Roman pretext.

Juno concludes this portion of her speech by expressing her desire for official incorporation into the Roman calendar with an inversion of the Vergilian reconciliation that took place in *Aeneid* 12.³⁰¹ Her request revolves solely around her place in Rome and all other factors are rendered moot. There are clear verbal echoes of the reconciliation episode of *Aeneid* 12 where Jupiter predicts the following in order to appease Juno: *nec gens ulla tuos aequae celebrabit honores* ("And no other race will celebrate your rites with equal vigor" *Aen.* 12.840).³⁰² In addition to the verbatim repetition of *nec gens...ulla* (51), Vergil's *aeque* is matched by Ovid's *carior* (51). Note also the change in speakers. In Vergil, it is Jupiter who is trying to set Juno's mind at ease by negotiating a bargain, whereas in Ovid Juno is making the claim for herself. The irony is that Juno's reluctance to approve of the integration of the Latins and the Trojans in the *Aeneid* and her reluctance to allow for the existence of Rome have been replaced in the *Fasti* by an ebullient desire to have a prime position within that very same city. The repetition of *hic...hic* at 6.52 is in dialogue with the previous situation as described in *Aeneid* 1: *hic illius arma, / hic currus fuit* ("here were the arms (of Juno), here was the chariot (of Juno)" *Aen.* 1.16-17). There, Vergil is describing Juno's allegiance to Carthage. Once again, Ovid takes us from the past into the present and emphasizes the gulf between Juno's earlier literary and mytho-historical disposition and her current one. The words *hic colar* (52) pick up

³⁰¹ *Aen.* 12.830-42.

³⁰² Littlewood (2006) 20 also makes this connection. Miller (1983) 190 n. 86 draws attention to the parallel language of Propertius' Vertumnus who says: *nec paenitet inter / proelia Volsinios deseruisse focos*. ("nor does it pain me to have abandoned the Volsinian hearths in battle." Prop. 4.2.3-5).

on the *Iunonicolasque Faliscos* (49) just above, again showing that the Faliscans worship Juno, but only under the Roman banner. Lastly, her statement *hic teneam cum Iove templa meo* (52) is a reformulation of the earlier *iuncta Tarpeio sunt mea templa Iovi* (34). The second *hic* of line 52 thus alludes not only to Rome, but also to the Capitoline hill where her temple stood adjacent to that of Jupiter Optimus Maximus,³⁰³ which also contained her cult statue along with the other members of the Capitoline triad.³⁰⁴

Although Juno makes much of her relationship with Jupiter throughout the course of her argument,³⁰⁵ her true connection to Rome is through her parentage of Mars. And it is to this that she now turns:

ipse mihi Mavors "commendo moenia" dixit
 "haec tibi: tu pollens urbe nepotis eris."
 dicta fides sequitur: centum celebramur in aris,
 nec levior quovis est mihi mensis honor.

Mars himself said to me, "I entrust these walls to you: you will be powerful in the city of your grandson." Faith follows his words: We are worshipped at a hundred altars, nor is my month a lesser honor to me in any way. (Fast. 6.53-56)

Unlike the *Aeneid*, the *Fasti* as a whole, places a much greater emphasis on the Romulean founding of Rome, choosing to downplay or even gloss over the events concerning Aeneas and the Trojans settling in Latium. One possible reason for this is Romulus' alleged role in

³⁰³ The temple of Juno Moneta also stood on the Capitoline hill where the church of Santa Maria in Aracoeli now stands. That temple was dedicated on June 1st and will be mentioned by Ovid on the Kalends of June (6.183-84).

³⁰⁴ For the presence of a cult statue to Juno in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus see Littlewood (2006) 12.

³⁰⁵ She does this thrice at 6.27-28 (*est...viro*), 6.33-34 (*si...Iovi*), and just above at 6.52 (*hic...meo*).

establishing the original Roman calendar (1.27-30). Another, it would seem, is to favor the immediate divine ancestry over the more ancient. Indeed, Mars is Ovid's second longest interlocutor after Janus and tethers himself irrevocably to his mother Juno. In this way, Mars and Juno are the primary founding deities of Rome, while Venus, who prominently held that role alone in the *Aeneid*, is pushed further into the past. When Venus is given a similar opportunity to express her connection to Rome and the Julian gens in the proem of book 4, she too plays up the connection of Romulus to the calendar, attributing her month's position as second of the year to Romulus' desire to honor his divine lineage first and foremost with the months of March for Mars and April for Venus (4.23-28). In order to make this connection she weaves her way through fifteen names before finally arriving at Romulus.³⁰⁶ Yet, despite Venus' admission that she is a distant ancestor of Romulus, she claims that Romulus identified both her and Mars as her *parentes*: *ille suos semper Venerem Martemque parentes / dixit, et emeruit vocis habere fidem* ("He (Romulus) always called Venus and Mars his progenitors and he deserved for his voice to have authority" 4.57-8). Venus clearly uses the word *parentes* loosely, since Mars is in fact Romulus' father, whereas she herself is a much more distant ancestor. The portion of Juno's speech cited above serves in a way to combat Venus' testimony and to place herself at the center of Rome's divine lineage, in essence reorienting the reader away from the Vergilian chronology.

It has been said already that Venus and Juno do not interact at all throughout the *Fasti* and that Ovid has taken pains to keep them apart.³⁰⁷ Joy Littlewood has interpreted Juno's actions here as intentionally trying to match those of Venus Genetrix by "adopting a new

³⁰⁶ Aeneas, Iulus, Postumus/Silvius, Latinus, Alba, Epytus, Capys, Calpetus, Tiberinus, Agrippa, Remulus, Aventinus, Proca, Numitor, Ilia, and finally Romulus (*Fast.* 4.36-55).

³⁰⁷ The two most prominent examples are Venus' absence on behalf of the Roman cause during the invasion of Titus Tatius and the Sabines (1. 265 ff.), despite her presence in the *Met.* version of the story, and Juno's complete absence on the Kalends of April.

‘Augustan’ matriarchal persona.”³⁰⁸ Even though Juno has offered a variety of arguments about her superiority and her entitlement, the one constant has been the promotion of her familial lineage. Thus far she has looked to her father, Saturn, and her husband/brother, Jupiter, but she has saved the most compelling evidence for last, namely her status as the grandmother of Romulus through her son Mars. The *mihi* of 6.52 at first appears to go closely with the juxtaposed *Mavors*, suggesting the meaning “my Mars,” before we see that it is in fact an indirect object with *dixit*, which yields the meaning “Mars told me.” Either way, lines 6.53-54 harken back to the episode in book 5 which describes Juno’s birthing of Mars through the assistance of Flora.³⁰⁹ Notice also Mars’ designation of Romulus as Juno’s *nepos* (54).³¹⁰ Feeney connects Juno’s power in Rome (*tu pollens urbe* 54) back to the ‘concilium deorum’ of *Annales* 1, where Juno likely negotiated with Mars over Romulus’ apotheosis.³¹¹ Here, however, it does not so much represent a reconciliation, but rather a mutual exchange of benefits, dependent upon the Flora episode and mimicking the sort of mutual dependency seen on the Kalends of March.³¹² Juno, who had been powerless after Jupiter’s parthenogenetic birth of Minerva (5.231-32), now becomes *pollens* (6.54) in a new dynamic way. Moreover, the use of *pollens* here may also evoke

³⁰⁸ Littlewood (2006) lxxxii.

³⁰⁹ Cf. ‘*habeto / tu quoque Romulea*’ *dixit* ‘*in urbe locum*’ (“You also have for yourself,” he said, “a place in the city of Romulus” 259-60). In fact, we can almost see the *quoque* of Mars’ statement to Flora as looking forward to his validation of Juno’s connection with Rome.

³¹⁰ This will recur at 6.64, the final line of Juno’s speech, where Juno herself stresses her familial connection to Romulus through Mars: *at nostri Roma nepotis erat* (“but Rome belonged to my grandson”).

³¹¹ Feeney (1984) 190 esp. n. 70. His statement, however, that “Mars ‘bribes’ Juno as Jupiter does (12.838-40)” seems out of place here, considering the effort Juno exerted in order for Mars to be born. It is better interpreted as a reward for services already rendered.

³¹² There, Mars plays up his own role on the Matronalia, which is really a festival dedicated to his mother Juno.

the efficaciousness of the drug that Flora gave to Juno, enabling her to have this power in the first place, thereby alluding to Juno as a fertility goddess.³¹³

The fulfillment of Mars' promise is a testament to his *fides* (55), a word steeped in Roman tradition. His *fides* also connects back to Juno's own claim that she had "faithfully put aside her anger" (*posuisse fideliter iras* 6.41) with regard to insults of the past. Notice how *fides* was also used by Venus when she speaks of Romulus' claim that Mars and Venus were his *parentes* (*emeruit vocis habere fidem* 4.58). By using *fides* here, Juno appropriates Venus' language and applies it to her own situation. The question posed in *Aeneid* 1 of who, if anyone, will pay respect to her altars (*Aen.* 1.49) is thus answered: "we are worshipped at one-hundred altars" (*centum celebramur in aris* 6.55). The first-person plural need not be treated as a poetic plural here, since Juno and Mars are clearly entwined.³¹⁴ Juno concludes this portion of her argument by asserting that having the month named after her is as important to her as her many altars (6.56). In this way she transitions from arguments based on family and myth to the pervasive worship of her cult in Ovid's own time, creating a link between her many physical temples throughout Italy and the epigraphical calendars that feature a month derived from her name. Ovid has taken us from the beginning of the *Aeneid* through the reconciliation of *Aeneid* 12, past the birth of Mars and the founding of Rome, all the way to the present where Juno does hold a considerable position within the Roman pantheon. The closing portion of Juno's speech will put aside considerations of myth and literary tradition and focus on her place within contemporary Roman and Italic calendars.

³¹³ *Pollens OLD* s.v. 1b. Note that Ovid also uses *pollens* to describe the power Janus exercises over fountains (1.269-70), which may have sexual undertones. Kötzle (1991) 139-40 also connects Juno's maternal relationship with Mars to her role as a fertility goddess.

³¹⁴ See n. 210 above for a similar situation on the Kalends of March.

The portion of Juno's speech left to discuss formed the initial basis for considering Juno's calendrical associations throughout the *Fasti* and for weighing them against other aspects of her domain. It is fitting, therefore, that her final words in the poem should so concretely endorse her connection to both textual and epigraphical *fasti*:

nec tamen hunc nobis tantummodo praestat honorem
 Roma: suburbani dant mihi munus idem.
 inspice quos habeat nemoralis Aricia fastos
 et populus Laurens Lanuviumque meum: 60
 est illic mensis Iunonius. inspice Tibur
 et Praenestinae moenia sacra deae,
 Iunonale leges tempus: nec Romulus illas
 condidit, at nostri Roma nepotis erat.

However, Rome does not alone bestow this honor upon me: towns nearby honor me with the same privilege. Look at the calendars which wooded Aricia has along with the people of Laurentum and my own Lanuvium: there is a month of Juno. Look at Tibur and the walls sacred to the Praenestine goddess, and you will read the time of Juno: and Romulus did not even found those cities, but Rome was the city of my grandson. (*Fast.* 6.57-64)

Juno's language when discussing the honor of having a month not just in Rome but elsewhere in Italy strongly resembles her statement just above that her month is no less of an honor to her than being worshipped at a hundred altars. Her *mihi mensis honor* of 6.56 is picked up by *mihi munus idem* in the same *sedes* at 6.58 with equivalent alliterative force. She thus anchors her argument initially to Rome, then expands to other *suburbani* that already recognize her month. Toward this end, *Roma* is deliberately enjambed in line 6.58 and juxtaposed with *suburbani*. In fact, a few such *suburbani* have already been mentioned by Juno, namely the Sabines (*senem Tatium*) and the Juno-worshipping Faliscans (*Iunonicolasque Faliscos*) at 6.49. By exchanging the word *honor* for *munus* Juno can also be seen as appropriating the language of Mars, who had formerly recognized the preferential status given to Sabine mothers on the Kalends of March as follows:

Oebaliae matres non leve munus habent (3.230). The *non leve* of 3.230 may also be alluded to by Juno's *nec levior* at 6.56. She also circles back to the word *moenia*, spoken by Mars at 6.53 in reference to the walls of Rome which are pledged to her. Juno employs the same word (*moenia* 62) just below in reference to the city of Praeneste where Ovid is instructed to "read the time of Juno" (*Iunonale leges tempus*). Here Ovid is no doubt referencing Verrius Flaccus' *Fasti Praenestini* and the inclusion of the word *leges* may be construed as directing the reader to read the extended commentary for which Flaccus was famous and to which Ovid's *Fasti* owed a great debt.³¹⁵ Juno's reuse of the word *moenia* (62), this time attached to the goddess Fortuna Primigenia of Praeneste, highlights both her expanded jurisdiction as well as the physical location of the epigraphical *fasti* bearing her name upon the city walls.

Another point of interest is how Juno weaves in and out of the first person singular and plural. She speaks of a collective 'we' with the verb *celebramur* (55) when referencing the worship that takes place at the many altars. She then switches to *mihi* (56) when describing the honor of having the month of June named after her, only to return once again to the first-person plural with *nobis* (57) when emphasizing that this honor transcends the boundaries of Rome itself. She then finishes with another *mihi* (58) when specifying that other cities indeed grant her that same honor. Part of this dynamic is surely to maintain the sharp alliteration of *mihi* alongside *mensis* (56) and *munus* (58) respectively, which began with *centum celebramur* (55), aptly placed immediately following the caesura. The *nobis* of 6.57 also lies immediately before the line's caesura, putting added emphasis on it. The two short syllables which make up the word *mihi* would not have had the same effect as the five consecutive long syllables that straddle the line's caesura (*hūnc nōbīs // tāntūm*), providing an added sense of *gravitas* to Juno's statement.

³¹⁵ See n. 70 above.

On another level, Juno consciously chooses to embed Mars into her argument since just above Mars had pledged the walls of Rome to her (*commendo moenia.../ haec tibi* 53-54). In the next line we are told that this pledge is fulfilled (*dicta fides sequitur* 55) and Juno then incorporates Mars into the verb *celebramur* (55), as if Juno and Mars are now a singular entity. Further, when Juno bids both Ovid and the reader to look at the *fasti* of Aricia (*inspice quos...Aricia fastos*), her diction is reminiscent of Ovid's own instructions for the reader to consider non-Roman *fasti* in relation to the month of March: *quod si forte vacas, peregrinos inspice fastos: mensis in his etiam nomine Martis erit* ("but if by chance you have the opportunity, examine non-Roman *fasti*: in these also will be a month from the name of Mars" 3.87-88).³¹⁶ He goes on to explain that March was not the first month in the *fasti* of all of the Italic cities, but Romulus gave it primary status in the *fasti* of Rome, owing to Mars' role as the "founder of the race" (*sanguinis auctori* 3.98).

While Juno leaves out any mention of June's exact position within the calendars of the Italic cities, she concludes her speech by underscoring the significance of Rome and by similarly calling attention to her contribution to the Roman blood-line (6.63-64). Her purpose is clear: any honors bestowed upon Mars by right ought to pass on to her as well. In the beginning, Romulus had taken it upon himself to pay tribute to Mars with this special honor and Ovid must now follow suit by affirming Juno's connection to June, to which she has both an etymological and a hereditary claim.³¹⁷ In order to draw attention to the latter, Juno latches on to Mars' designation of her as Romulus' grandmother (*nepotis* 54), making it the last word of consequence in her

³¹⁶ I owe this observation to Miller (1983) 189 n. 83.

³¹⁷ The hereditary claim vis-à-vis parentage of Mars is most conspicuously endorsed by Mars himself in his description of the Matronalia (3.247-52) and by Flora in her account of Mars' birth (5.229-260).

speech (*nepotis* 64). Just as Juno began by referring to Ovid as *Romani conditor anni* (“founder of the Roman year” 6.21), she likewise ends her speech by emphasizing Romulus’ role as the founder/builder of the Roman city with the parallel verb form *condidit* (6.64), enjambed for maximum effect. She thus treats Ovid, here the *iudex certaminis*, as the modern equivalent of Romulus, capable of applying his scholarly observations voiced in the proem to March to the situation here in June. Back in March, Ovid was unsure of his poetic ability, saying: *si licet occultos monitus audire deorum / vatibus, ut certe fama licere putat...* (“If it is permitted for poets to listen to the secret advice of the gods, as rumor surely believes that it is...” 3.167-68). But in the proem of June, he boasts full confidence in that very same poetic ability: *fas mihi praecipue voltus vidisse deorum, / vel quia sum vates, vel quia sacra cano* (“it is especially right for me to gaze upon the faces of the gods, either because I am a poet or because I sing of sacred rites” 6.7-8). The parallels between the Juno’s opening remarks and Ovid’s own validation of his poetic status have already been discussed. In essence, Juno is appropriating Ovid’s own language from earlier in the work and relying on his status as both a *vates* and a *conditor*.

There is another aspect of parallel language worth considering. The repetition of *inspice* (59 and 61) and its didactic force bring us back to Ovid’s first interlocutor, Janus, who began his account with a similar series of imperatives: *disce* (1.101), *percipe* (1.102), *aspice* (1.104), and *accipe* (1.115).³¹⁸ This parallel functions as a continuation of the considerable overlap in the *Fasti* between these two deities, who occupy opposite ends of the work and who represent the opposing interests of peace and war. Yet, as it has been noted, they both share a similar relationship with the Kalends and with the movement of one month to the next. Recall that Macrobius had written of *Iunonius* as a designation for Janus (Macr. 1.15.19). Isidore of Seville

³¹⁸ Miller (1983) 166 likens these didactic imperatives to Ovid’s own inquiries (see esp. n. 30).

takes this connection between Juno and Janus even further, noting the similarities between Janus' role as a gatekeeper and Juno's role as a facilitator of birth: *Iunonem dicunt quasi Ianonem, id est ianuam, pro purgatione Jibus feminarum, eo quod quasi portas matrum natis pandat, et nubentum maritis* ("They say Juno as if she were 'Janus,' that is 'doorway,' in response to the female menstrual cycle, on the grounds that she opens up the doors of mothers for their children, and of wives for their husbands" Isidore *Origines* 8.11.69).³¹⁹ I submit that when Juno claims that Aricia, Laurentium, and Lanuvium all display the *mensis Iunonius*, she is activating an association with Janus, her former revival, who functions as a complementary deity in Roman ritual practice. This reference takes us back to book 1 and the agon between Janus and Juno as mythological figures and foreshadows their joint appearance on the Kalends of June. By conflating her epithet with that of Janus, she also draws attention to her dual role as Roman gatekeeper and progenitor, thus adding force to her final argument that the month is owed to her because she initiated the Roman blood-line (6.64).³²⁰

IX. Juno and Juventas

The irony ought not be lost on the reader that Juno puts so much stock into her familial connections, her son Mars in particular, yet her daughter Juventas comes forth as her primary challenger. While Ovid identifies her as the wife of Hercules (*Herculis uxor* 6.65), Juventas

³¹⁹ For further connections between the cult epithets of Juno and Janus see Renard (1953) 15-16 who discusses in particular their shared roles in the rites of Tigillum Sororium on October 1st.

³²⁰ In such a way she usurps the role of Venus within the *Aeneid* where she functioned as the progenitor of the blood-line of the Romans through her parentage to Aeneas. This is alluded to in the *Fasti* as well when Venus is called *generis princeps* ("first of the race" 1.40). Juno's blood relationship to Romulus through Mars, however, can be viewed as overriding Venus' claim since it puts her temporally closer to the actual foundation of Rome.

herself immediately acknowledges that Juno is her mother and proceeds to tailor her own argument to Juno's previous claims:³²¹

‘non ego, si toto mater me cedere caelo
iusserit, invita matre morabor’ ait.

[Juventas] spoke, “If my mother ordered me to leave heaven as a whole, I would not delay against my mother’s will.” (*Fast.* 6.67-68)

The polyptotic repetition of *mater* in Juventas’ first two lines of dialogue is striking. Both forms of *mater* are both placed in the same *sedes* immediately following the caesura for maximum effect. In addition, the alliterative “m” sound of *mater me...matre morabor* evokes Juventas’ emphatic tone,³²² described in the previous line by Ovid: *et in voltu signa vigoris erant* (“and on her countenance were signs of vigor” 6.66).³²³ At the same time, Juventas’ opening lines emphasize submission and filial obedience above all else. The mention of her willingness to depart from the celestial realm calls to mind the forcible expulsion of Saturn, who was a key component of Juno’s argument (6.29-32). Her opening two words, *non ego*, emphasize a contrast with Juno’s egotistical arguments, which featured a slew of first-person pronouns, adjectives and verbs,³²⁴ and stress that she will not suffer the same fate as Saturn did. Juventas thus simultaneously pledges that her argument will not be based on personal superiority, nor will she instigate the sort of hostility that prompted Saturn, her own grandfather, to be exiled from heaven. Indeed, in the very next line she professes her unwillingness to fight over the name of

³²¹ A feature observed by Miller (1983) 191.

³²² For similar emphasis of the ‘m’ sound cf. *Aen.* 2.199-200: *maius miseris multoque...magis*.

³²³ Juventas’ alliterative “c” and “m” sounds can also be viewed as a response to Juno’s *centum celebramur...mihi mensis...mihi munus* above (6.55-58).

³²⁴ *ego* (30), *fui* (30), *meo* (31 and 51), *nobis* (36), *vocor* (37), *meae* (38), *dicar* (40), *me* (41), *mea* (44 and 46), *meas* (47), *mihi* (51) etc.

the month (6.69),³²⁵ preferring to apply a softer touch than the naturally brazen Juno (6.70-71). Towards this end, Mazurek has argued convincingly that Juventas here represents elegy vying against Juno as the embodiment of epic.³²⁶ Yet, despite Juventas' deferential and placable demeanor, as a cult figure she, along with Juno, is principally connected with war and strife, a dynamic which also contributes to the contentious nature of the episode.³²⁷ There are also the literary and mythological perspectives to consider. Juventas is traditionally associated with Hebe, daughter of Zeus and Hera. Following this tradition, in the *Aeneid* Juno cites *rapti Ganymedis honores* ("the privilege belonging to Ganymede who had been snatched away" *Aen.* 1.28) as one of her *causae irarum*. Ovid's Juno clearly has this Vergilian passage in mind when she says *rpto Ganymede dolebam* ("I was grieved when Ganymede was snatched away" 6.43). But what is missing from the Ovidian line? The *honores*! Ovid's Juno, perhaps anticipating that Juventas will make her own claim to the month, only cites Jupiter's abduction of Ganymede in relation to his adultery. She deliberately glosses over the aftermath of Ganymede's rape and abduction, namely that he received the *honor* of becoming Jupiter's official cub-bearer, usurping the position formerly held by Hebe/Juventas. For how can Juno use this as a reason for deriving the month of June from her name if the very one who incurred this insult directly makes the same claim? By referring repeatedly to Juno as her mother (*mater* 67, *matre* 68, *mater* 74) and by stressing that no other honor belongs to her (*unicus est...honor* 76), Juventas reminds the reader that Jupiter's involvement with Ganymede affected her as well.

³²⁵ It may be that Juventas' *de nomine temporis huius* (6.69) is a response to Juno's *Iunonale leges tempus* (6.63).

³²⁶ Mazurek (2010).

³²⁷ Littlewood (2006) 22-23 discusses Juventas' connection with the Roman *iuvenes*, who embodied Rome's military strength. See also Mazurek (2010) 137 who acknowledges Littlewood.

As was stated above, Juventas responds directly to the arguments of Juno, rather than just offering Ovid an independent account of why she deserves the month's name,³²⁸ as was the case with regard to the arguments of the three Muses in the proem of book 5. Another instance of this is Juventas' acknowledgment of the honors already bestowed upon her mother Juno. The mention of *aurea...Capitolia* (6.73) looks back to Juno's *aurea...sceptra* (6.38), while *cum Iove summa tenet* (6.74) echoes Juno's *teneam cum Iove templa meo* (6.52). The tactful admission that Juno rightfully possesses these honors (*ut debet* 6.74) gives way to Juventas' main argument that the name of month of June would constitute her one and only honor: *at decus omne mihi contingit origine mensis: / unicus est, de quo sollicitamur, honor* ("every facet of my splendor hinges upon the origin of the month: it is the sole honor that I care about" 6.75-76). Recall Juno's statement that the honor of having the month of June named after her was merely one of many (6.56-8). In one sense, Juno's multiple honors mimic the multiple *aetia* being presented in the contest, while Juventas' argument that it constitutes her sole honor acts as a plea for aetiological consolidation. Although Juventas does not address Ovid's poetic status, she does identify him as a Roman (*Romane* 6.77), as Juno had done (*Romani* 6.21). Accordingly, she attempts to follow Juno's example by promoting her contribution to Rome's success. Yet, she does so not on her own merit, but vicariously through the exploits of her husband, Hercules.³²⁹ So much so that her identity undergoes a visible shift from the daughter of Juno to the wife of Hercules, a figure

³²⁸ Much like the way in which Juno responds directly to Venus' arguments during the *concilium deorum* of *Aeneid* 10 (62-95).

³²⁹ To the point where her entire identity exists in the form of Hercules' wife: *Herculis uxori* (6.78) and *nomine magni / coniugis* (6.79-80). The fact that Juventas refers to Hercules as *magni* while Juno refrains from attaching any such adjective to Jupiter makes her plea appear almost comic. Cf. Littlewood (2006) 24 who refers to this exchange as "a domestic comedy in which Ovid seems to parody two female character types." *Magni* here surely has the double sense of "important" as well as "physically large."

notoriously despised by Juno.³³⁰ Whereas Juno's invocation of Jupiter is balanced by the mention of her own feats, Juventas anchors the bulk of her argument upon her husband's achievements. Family relationships continue to be of great significance. Juno had spoken strongly about her father Saturn, her brother/husband Jupiter, and, above all, her son Mars. Here, Juventas speaks of her husband's triumph over the monster Cacus, who himself is endowed with prominent parentage. That Vulcan is Cacus' father is made explicit by the mention of *dote paterna* (6.81), which explains the origin of Cacus' unique ability to breathe fire. Yet, this parental gift serves him poorly, a fact made clear by the phrase *male defensus* (6.81) and Cacus' subsequent death at the hands of Hercules. Perhaps one point of this brief story is that divine lineage does not necessarily equate with triumph.

Juno had concluded her speech by taking Ovid and the reader into the present era and by bidding them to look at the prevalence of her worship both in and around Rome. When Juventas finally makes the same temporal shift forward (*ad propiora vocor* 6.83), she goes no further than the time of Romulus.³³¹ We have already noted that Juno emphasizes Romulus as the founder/*conditor* of Rome and as her grandson (6.63-64). Juventas opts for a different path and instead tells of his division of the population: *populum digessit ab annis / Romulus* ("Romulus divided the people according to their years" 6.83-84). Her use of the phrase *ab annis* to mean "according to years" is atypical and is perhaps a response to Juno's description of Ovid as the

³³⁰ Juno's hatred for Hercules will play a role later in book 6 both on the Matralia (6.521-24) and again on the book's final entry in anticipation of Hercules' apotheosis (6.800).

³³¹ Mazurek (2010) 139 makes the ingenious comment that *propiora* can be taken in the dual sense of chronologically closer to the present time, while also thematically closer to her own aetiological argument.

Romani conditor anni (6.21).³³² In order to sway Ovid's vote, she informs him about another distinct way in which Ovid and Romulus overlap with Rome and Roman time. Just as Ovid is the literary *Romani conditor anni*, Romulus is responsible for having literally embedded Roman years (*anni*) into the names of two of the months: *mensesque nota secrevit eadem* ("he divided the months with the same mark" 6.87). Her intention is to show Ovid that her connection to Romulus and to Roman time has as much merit as that of Juno.

When Juventas finally puts forth her suggested etymology for June, we find it identical the one Ovid had presented at the very beginning of his poem (1.41): *Iunius est iuvenum: qui fuit ante, senum* ("June is from the young, while the month which came before is from the old" 6.88). Despite, or perhaps because of, her Herculean efforts, Juventas immediately incurs the wrath of her mother Juno: *et in litem studio certaminis issent, / atque ira pietas dissimulata foret* ("and with eagerness for strife they would have engaged in an argument and family piety would be covered over by wrath" 6.89-90"). The juxtaposition of *ira* and *pietas* is particularly striking. These are, of course, two of the primary themes of the *Aeneid*, with Juno representing the former and Aeneas the latter. Here *pietas* describes the familial relationship between Juno and Juventas, jeopardized by a yet another form of *ira* that eclipses the many angers already laid out by Juno (6.41-48). Despite Juventas' seemingly calm demeanor and her reluctance to fight on behalf of the month's name (*non luctor* 6.69), the *ira* here belongs as much to her as it does to Juno. In essence, Ovid plunges the reader right back into the world of the *Aeneid*. But instead of showing a Juno intent on Roman destruction, he has crafted a Juno who fights for recognition on behalf of her beloved Rome.

³³² Although the *OLD* 6b does cite a definition for *annus* as "(pl.) age (in years)," there are no examples with *ab* in the sense that we have here.

The presence of the contrary to fact subjunctives *issent* (89) and *foret* (90) leads the reader to believe that some sort of resolution is about to be offered. That idea is further solidified by the arrival of the goddess who is the very embodiment of harmony, namely Concordia. But rather than serving as a mediator between Juno and Juventas, Concordia thrusts herself into the fray and lays claim to the month's name as well. Although she comes bearing the mark of peace, alleging the month is named for the coalescing of the Romans and Sabines (6.93-96), her involvement in the contest undermines her principal role as "the divine spirit and chief concern of our placid leader" (*placidi numen opusque ducis* 6.92).³³³ Her argument is further flawed because it was Juno not Concordia who was mentioned by Mars in book 3 as the one responsible for bringing together the Sabines and the Romans.³³⁴ In fact, her assertion that the month derives its name from *his...iunctis* (96) represents the only entry in Maltby for *Iunius* under the heading *a 'iuncto.'*³³⁵ We have already discussed how the form *iunctis* may be more appropriate for Juno who employs the word *iuncta* at 6.34 in order to emphasize both the proximity of her temple to that of Jupiter and also her marriage to him. Thus Concordia, despite her Augustan underpinnings and despite her penchant for facilitating harmony, is actually the least qualified of the three candidates to give her name to the month of June. In another twist of irony, Ovid's subsequent indecision may in part result from the presence of the goddess of harmony. In a way, Ovid's decision to treat all three goddesses equally (*ite pares a me* 6.99) can be viewed from a didactic perspective. Following Concordia's inappropriate attempt to foster further discord rather

³³³ For *opus* as "chief concern" see *TLL* 9.2.841.55: *respicitur summa (sc. rei effectae)*. This usage is also found in Pseudo-Ovid's *Consolatio ad Liviam* 39: *Caesaris illud opus*.

³³⁴ Principally it was Romulus' wife *Hersilia* (referred to by Mars as *mea...nurus* 3.206), but the women gather in the temple of Juno (3.205) and the celebration of Juno Lucina appears linked to this event (3.247-48). See above discussion for more details.

³³⁵ See n. 265 above.

than harmony, Ovid himself comes across as the true embodiment of Concord by not favoring any party over the other. At the same time his mention of a *triplex causa* (97) activates an association with Juno's *causa duplex irae* (43) above. Although the principal meaning of *triplex causa* is the threefold debate that is being waged among the three goddesses, on another level we can interpret the *triplex causa* as anticipating Juno's failure to secure naming rights for June and thus adding a third *causa* to her *duplex causa irae*.

X. The Kalends of June: Janus and Juno again

After Ovid the arbiter reiterates to the goddesses and to the reader his initial decision to leave the etymology of June undecided, the poem transitions into the Kalends of June. Here, one might expect Ovid to offer Juno some redemption with a lengthy and laudatory account of the story behind the temple of Juno Moneta, which was dedicated on June 1st and recorded in multiple epigraphical *fasti*.³³⁶ Although he does mention this temple and its dedication at the hand of Camillus at the very end of the entry, Ovid opts to dedicate the day to the obscure minor deity Carna, goddess of the hinge: *prima dies tibi, Carna, datur* ("The first day [of June] belongs to you, Carna" 6.101). Carna, however, is not entirely devoid of connection to Juno; for Pettazzoni views her as a lunar goddess, who functions much in the same way as Juno Covella.³³⁷ In addition, the story of Cranaë's transformation into the goddess Carna involves the

³³⁶ Degraasi (1963) 463. The temple was originally dedicated in 345 B.C. by Camillus' son, Lucius Furius Camillus. It is recorded in the *Fasti Antiates Maiores* as [*Iunon(i)*] in [*Arce*] and in the *Fasti Venusini* as *Iunoni* / *Monet(ae)*.

³³⁷ Pettazzoni (1940) 163. See also Renard (1953) 18 who connects Juno to Carna also through the ritual activity carried out by newlyweds of rubbing the door jambs of their new house with wolf fat.

return of Janus, who has been absent since his grand departure in book 1 (1.282).³³⁸ Given Janus' ritual involvement with the transition of months, it seems only fitting that he should endow his acolyte Cranaë with a similar function. His presence here on the Kalends of June immediately following the contest of the goddesses again prompts the reader to consider him in light of Juno.

Janus and Juno do not encounter one another directly on the entry of June 1st, but the juxtaposition of the narrative of Janus' rape of Cranaë and the reference to the temple of Juno Moneta is telling. The two figures have swapped places, so to speak, from their roles in book 1, with Janus assuming the part of the aggressor in his pursuit of the nymph Cranaë, while the dedication of Juno's temple alludes to the protective role it played in staving off the Gallic invasion of 390 B.C. One can perhaps draw a parallel between this untold story of Juno indirectly saving Rome and Janus' indirect protection of Rome against the invading Sabines.³³⁹ Further, the mention of Marcus Manlius and his subsequent treachery evokes the actions of Tarpeia that immediately preceded the battle between Janus and Juno in book 1 (1.260-62).³⁴⁰ Manlius, who acts as the agent of Juno, since he is the one alerted by the sacred geese, takes action similar to that of Janus against the Sabines in book 1. He is said to have repelled Gallic weapons (*Gallica...reppulit arma* 6.185-6), while Janus repelled the Sabines (*pulsis...Sabinis*

³³⁸ Although Macrobius (1.12.31) mentions the celebration of Carna on the Kalends of June, he does not mention the figure of Janus. The story of Janus' rape of Cranaë seems to be unique to Ovid.

³³⁹ See chapter 3 for an in-depth analysis of Ovid's decision not to tell the action of Juno's sacred Geese and to move his discussion of the Gallic siege of Rome to the Vestalia under the action of Jupiter Pistor.

³⁴⁰ As does the mention of the location of the temple on the top of the citadel/Tarpeian hill: *arce...in summa* (6.183) which parallels the *ad summae...arcis iter* of 1.262. Vergil uses similar language in his mention of Manlius on the shield of Aeneas: *in summo custos Tarpeiae Manlius arcis* (*Aen.* 8.652). Note that Ovid uses *custos* to describe Tarpeia at 1.261, while Vergil here uses *custos* of Manlius.

1.273). The exemplum, however, is short-lived, as Manlius follows his heroic act with a treasonous one (*damnatus crimine regni* 6.189), and his name is forever tarnished. The passage under discussion ends with the following line: *hunc illi titulum longa senecta dabat* (“ever-mindful posterity bestowed upon him this title” 6.190). Juventas had referred to the naming rights of June as *titulum mensis* (6.77).³⁴¹ While Manlius ultimately bears the title of traitor, Juno is forced to relive her own failure by having her temple’s dedication juxtaposed to his cautionary tale.³⁴²

The passage addressing the circumstances of the founding of the temple of Juno Moneta has a very strong moral tone and Littlewood connects it to “Augustus’ demolition of the excessively opulent town-house of Vedius Pollio on the Esquiline.”³⁴³ As such, the mention of Juno Moneta transgresses the mere temporal or circumstantial nature of its construction and serves as an allegory for “Memory” or “Warning.” Indeed, Ovid introduces the temple with the verb *memorant* (“they bring to mind” 6.184), which speaks both to its didactic force as well its firm place within the Roman mindset. Compare this with Mars’ *si memini* (3.248) in relation to the dedication of the temple of Juno Lucina. His equivocation regarding the origin of the temple of Juno Lucina is replaced by the confidence of the collective memory of the Roman people who attest not only that the temple of Juno Moneta was founded on the Kalends of June, but also that it was based on a vow from Camillus (*ex voto... Camille, tuo* 6.184). The subsequent discussion of Manlius’ positive and negative actions forces the reader to attach a similarly polarizing view

³⁴¹ The mention of *arce in summa* may also look back to Juventas’ *cum Iove summa* (6.74).

³⁴² Again, Ovid here chooses to focus on the aftermath of Manlius’ deeds, rather than telling the story of how he actually saved the Capitoline.

³⁴³ Littlewood (2006) 62.

to the temple of Juno Moneta.³⁴⁴ In a way, then, this brief entry picks up on the theme reestablished in the story of Carina by bicipital Janus of simultaneously looking both forward and backward. It is fitting that we conclude this portion of the study with yet another connection between Janus and Juno. These two figures play such an important role within the Roman calendar that Ovid had to carve out a special place for them within his poetic calendar. And how better to do that than by juxtaposing them on the Kalends of their respective months at opposite ends of the work.

XI. Conclusions

As I hope I have shown, Ovid's integration of Juno into his poetic calendar makes use of a broad range of considerations—religious, historical, and textual. Throughout the poem, Ovid engages closely with the Juno of Vergil's *Aeneid*, Ennius' *Annales*, and, of course, his own *Metamorphoses*. He manipulates temporal components, allowing the calendar to unfold organically, despite chronological deficiencies among the various narratives. Yet, at the same time each reference to Juno is indelibly linked to her appearances elsewhere in the poem, often activating allusions to her other personae. Ovid cleverly replaces Juno's primary literary adversary Venus with the more calendrically-suited and peace-oriented Janus, allowing their battle to unfold on the Kalends of the months that most closely belong to them—January and June—and which are appropriately situated at opposite ends of the work. Juno's close affiliation with the Kalends affects the way in which those entries are read and creates a mini-narrative of sorts within the broader context of the work. Most interestingly, Ovid has found a way to explore

³⁴⁴ Pasco-Pranger (2006) 265 recognizes this dichotomy even in Livy's account, but draws attention to the commemorative force within the *Fasti*, remarking, "Ovid's emphasis on both Manlius' service and his *crimen regni* in the calendrical commemoration of the temple that erased all traces of his house plays out the odd unification of the memory of the hero and the villain built into the temple of Juno Moneta."

a wide variety of Junonian personae and weave them into a singular identity, best exhibited in Juno's long speech in the proem of June (*Fast.* 6.21-64). The result is a prismatic view of the most important female goddess in the Roman pantheon,³⁴⁵ whose mythological *ira* constantly clashes with the sanctity of her religious cult. Rather than attempting to disentangle these inextricable elements of Juno's divinity, Ovid embraces their polarity, showcasing them on the very days earmarked for Juno in a way that the epigraphical *fasti* never could. Next, we will examine the many and varied ways in which Ovid constructs his representation of Jupiter within the *Fasti*, the majority of which, as we shall see, taken on a distinctly Augustan resonance.

³⁴⁵ The concept of viewing the gods as prismatic figures is taken from Feeney (1991) 127, who speaks of "the ancient's ability to view a deity as a many-sided prism."

CHAPTER TWO: JUPITER AND AUGUSTUS IN OVID'S *FASTI*

J. F. Miller in his book *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets* has shown that in Augustan poetry Apollo ought to be viewed as a prismatic figure, often simultaneously evoking aspects of Augustan ideology while retaining his more traditional affiliation with music, healing, prophecy, archery, and poetry. Miller begins his in-depth study by tracking the development of the association between Apollo and Octavian (not yet Augustus), showing that many of the earlier representations are at odds with the post-Actian Apollo who serves as the anchor for much of Augustan propaganda, both in architecture as well as in literature.³⁴⁶ It is with this very approach in mind that I undertake my exploration of the relationship between Jupiter and Augustus in Ovid's *Fasti*, a work which, regardless of whether it ought to be considered a genuine piece of Augustan propaganda,³⁴⁷ no doubt exists within a world that acknowledges Augustus' connection with the divine. Just as Miller has shed new light upon the many—sometimes conflicting—faces of Apollo throughout Augustan literature, I aim to demonstrate that Ovid's characterization of Jupiter in the *Fasti* is quite fluid, to the point where the reader is faced with polarizing images of the same figure. This should come as no surprise, however, since the *Fasti* itself is a poem rooted in contradiction with its combination of epic and elegy and its inclusion of multiple aetiologies that sometimes complement, but more often come into conflict with one another.³⁴⁸ Yet, as we navigate through the vast network of festivals and constellations, we must constantly be wary of attaching political meaning to the mere presence of the chief figure of the

³⁴⁶ Miller (2009) esp. 4-10.

³⁴⁷ Herbert-Brown (1994) is adamant that Ovid wrote the *Fasti* to praise rather than undermine Augustus. See below for the various scholarly opinions on the matter.

³⁴⁸ See below for a survey of the ways in which scholars interpret the political nature of these conflicting aetiologies.

Roman pantheon, who would no doubt garner significant attention in any Roman work—especially one with religious overtones. Nevertheless, I will aim to show that Ovid has deftly imbued his characterization of Jupiter with an uncomfortable duality, all the while maintaining his ever-elusive “hermeneutic alibi.”³⁴⁹ How exactly Ovid develops the dynamic of associating Augustus with Jupiter and what sort of religio-political message he is attempting to convey (if any) will be the focus of this chapter.

I. Scholarly Views on Augustan Politics in the *Fasti*

Before we try to make sense of the manifold references to Jupiter throughout the *Fasti*, I will first provide a brief summary of the varying scholarly opinions concerning Ovid’s political agenda. Steven Green in his commentary on *Fasti* 1 lays out a succinct division between what he calls “three critically-opposed camps.”³⁵⁰ The first belongs to those who, according to Green, view Ovid as praising Augustan institutions in a way that is “both consistent and unproblematic.” To this camp Green assigns McKeown, Fantham, and Herbert-Brown. Generally speaking, such a grouping is accurate, but as is typically the case, if we dig a little deeper, the views of these three scholars are not all in complete alignment. McKeown, for example, takes a firm stance against the terms ‘Augustan’ and ‘anti-Augustan’ and opts to view the work as largely apolitical, referring to it as “inspired primarily by the literary tradition, and not conceived of as a eulogy of the emperor and his regime.”³⁵¹ Thus McKeown sees Ovid not so much as endorsing the Princeps, but rather incorporating imperial holidays, many of which had by the time of the poem’s composition become a fixture in the Roman calendar,³⁵² into his literary enterprise.

³⁴⁹ See introduction n. 24.

³⁵⁰ Green (2004a) 12 n. 21. He is clearly indebted to similar ‘camps’ outlined by Toohey (1996) 135-6.

³⁵¹ McKeown (1984) 177.

³⁵² At least in the *Fasti Praenestini* set up by Verrius Flaccus.

Fantham, however, sees Ovid as truly believing that the celebration of imperial holidays was well-suited to his literary endeavor.³⁵³ Thus for Fantham, there is added motivation for Ovid in his praise of Augustus. Lastly, Herbert-Brown is perhaps the staunchest advocate of an Ovid bent on praising Augustus often and fulsomely. She goes so far as to say the following regarding Ovid's incorporation of unofficial imperial holidays: "The reason for this is undoubtedly to be found in the poet's intention of eulogizing the Princeps more often than the number of official anniversaries in the calendar itself allowed."³⁵⁴ Thus within Green's first camp we already have three different gradations of how Ovid might have approached the treatment of Augustus and imperial holidays.

Green's second camp, which he admits is in direct opposition to the first, espouses the view that "Ovid speaks in a deliberately ambiguous manner, undercutting the optimistic Augustan programme and exposing fissures in its discourse."³⁵⁵ In this camp he places Barchiesi, Hinds, Newlands, and Boyle.³⁵⁶ Barchiesi in his groundbreaking book "The Poet and Prince" speaks of two different sets of tensions embedded in the work. The first, which he refers to as "syntagmatic tensions," relates to the poem's structure rather than its content. Barchiesi argues that Ovid sometimes deliberately shifts the true chronological order of festivals, thereby creating jarring juxtapositions that have a destabilizing effect.³⁵⁷ The second he calls "paradigmatic tensions," which address the issue of content and selection. Yes, Ovid is somewhat constrained

³⁵³ Fantham (1995) 49.

³⁵⁴ Herbert-Brown (1994) 33.

³⁵⁵ Green (2004a) 12 n. 21.

³⁵⁶ Green (2004a) 12 n. 21. Feeney (1992) who identifies in the *Fasti* the theme of enforced silence under an oppressive regime also belongs in this camp.

³⁵⁷ Barchiesi (1997a) 80 argues that "this kind of reading can easily produce an interpretation of the *Fasti* as a compromise that dissolves into discrete fragments: aetiology, comedy, praise of Augustus..."

by the use of the rigid structure of the Roman Calendar in framing his poem, but at the same time he is free to omit certain events and devote a great deal of space to others. Further, within particular entries Ovid often supplies multiple aetiologies, the choices and presentation of which are significant in as far as such explanations are filtered through an Ovidian lens. In this way, Ovid takes it upon himself to “rewrite” Rome and provide his own form of discourse on Augustan ideology. Still, Barchiesi is very careful to avoid traditional dichotomies such as “Augustan vs. anti-Augustan” or “loyalist vs. subversive,” which he deems obstructive to the overall understanding of the poem.³⁵⁸ Like Barchiesi, Hinds too endorses the view that Ovid exploits the double-edged nature of Augustan discourse for his own poetic agenda. After discussing at-length the political resonances of several episodes involving the use or disuse of *arma* in the *Fasti*, Hinds comments, “Ovid’s problematic version of history and of the calendar, with its subtle dissonances of generic and of moral configuration...should make us properly suspicious of ideological simplification.”³⁵⁹ Newlands prefers, however, to emphasize Ovid’s playfulness throughout the *Fasti*—as one can detect from her aptly titled book, “Playing with Time.” For Newlands, Ovid’s constant penchant for playfulness and frivolity serves as his way of mounting a challenge against “authorities, conventions, and presuppositions.”³⁶⁰ Yet, at the same time she does not wholly commit to any one interpretation, remarking that “The poem is neither a failed panegyric nor a failed critique of the imperial system. *The Fasti* is both serious and humorous, both panegyric and subversive.”³⁶¹ Boyle takes as his point of departure

³⁵⁸ Barchiesi (1997a) 5-8 who eschews strict political divisions in a manner similar to McKeown above.

³⁵⁹ Hinds (1992b) 149.

³⁶⁰ Newlands (1995) 8.

³⁶¹ Newlands (1995) 6. Although in earlier article Newlands takes a rather firm stance in support of the *Fasti* as a vehicle intended to undermine the Augustan regime: “The narrator’s heavy

Barchiesi's concept of Ovid's desire to (re)-write Rome, choosing to apply it primarily to the poem's many monuments. Boyle lays out Ovid's alleged agenda as follows: "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."³⁶² He goes on to say, "*Fasti* especially is a poem designed to expose this [Augustan] appropriation, the hypocrisies it reveals, the autocracy it signals, the impoverished *romanitas* it creates."³⁶³ We may add to this group Denis Feeney, whose influential article "*Si licet et fas est: Ovid's Fasti and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate*" discusses the extent to which Ovid incorporates into his poem the tendency of the Augustan regime to suppress free speech and force its ideology upon its constituents.³⁶⁴ Indeed, the poem's very title, *Fasti*, speaks to a dichotomy between what is lawful and unlawful.³⁶⁵ In opposition to the positive view of Herbert-Brown on Ovid's profuse inclusion of imperial holidays and celebrations, Feeney classifies such an addition to the traditional Republican calendar as "a planned and systematic act of intrusion."³⁶⁶ Thus, while members of this camp all acknowledge the possibility of Ovidian subversion, they are more

reliance on variant explanations and stories and his frequent refusal to choose among them...challenges the authoritarian view of Rome's history and its heroes promulgated by current Augustan propaganda" (Newlands [1992] 47). For further discussion of the compatible views of Newlands and Barchiesi against Herbert-Brown see Myers (1999) 198-200.

³⁶² Boyle (2003) 49.

³⁶³ Boyle (2003) 49.

³⁶⁴ Feeney (1992) who frames his discussion around the premise that "the question of what may be said, and when, and by whom, is one of the poem's key thematic preoccupations" (Feeney [1992] 6).

³⁶⁵ See Newlands (2002a) 200.

³⁶⁶ Feeney (1992) 5.

concerned with the ambiguity attached to the treatment of Augustus and his imperial holidays and Ovid's manipulation of that ambiguity on behalf of his poetic enterprise.³⁶⁷

Green's third camp, which includes J. F. Miller and Toohey, downplays the effects of politics and instead focuses on the issue of poetic identity, acknowledging "the unsettled, 'polyphonic' nature of the poem, but denying that such opposing voices question or undercut each other."³⁶⁸ For Miller, "Ovid's kaleidoscope persona is a signal feature of the poem's grand ambitions."³⁶⁹ At the same time, Miller, taking into account current scholarly trends, rightly acknowledges the impossibility of treating the poem as altogether apolitical.³⁷⁰ Likewise, Toohey, although he more than once places great stress on the existence of polyphony in the *Fasti*,³⁷¹ does not reject outright a reading that takes into account the political sphere. On the contrary, he confesses, "Both poems [the *Georgics* and the *Fasti*] have their private, doubting side: both show a nagging uncertainty concerning the sustainability and even the ultimate value of Augustus' Roman empire."³⁷² It suffices to say that camps two and three are not worlds apart, but have many overlapping qualities. Miller's assertion that "the fractured persona [of the poet] in fact embodies the variegated approach of educated Romans to religion" speaks to the same

³⁶⁷ Miller (2002a) 182 commenting on the issue of genre in the *Fasti*, groups Hinds, Newlands, and Barchiesi together saying, "For all three of these scholars this generic interplay in the *Fasti* closely parallels its political tensions, its critical commentary on an Augustan ideology ultimately configured as 'epic'."

³⁶⁸ Green (2004a) 12 n. 21, again relying closely on Toohey (1996) 135-36.

³⁶⁹ Miller (2002a) 169.

³⁷⁰ Miller (2002a) 169 with the statement, "In today's *mentalité* of the zero-sum game the essentially apolitical Ovid of previous generations has all but vanished. 'No poet could be unpolitical'" (quoting Wallace-Hadrill [1987] 223).

³⁷¹ Toohey (1996) esp. 143-45.

³⁷² Toohey (1996) 144.

sort of ambiguity observed by the second camp, albeit from a different perspective.³⁷³ Ovid's poetic corpus is naturally endowed with a certain amount of irony and wit, no less so in the *Fasti* than in the *Metamorphoses* or in his earlier love poetry. Does the presence of such features in a self-professed religio-centric work indicate that Ovid was somehow being disrespectful or sacrilegious?³⁷⁴ Surely not.³⁷⁵ Might we attribute any potentially subversive reading of Augustus and his regime to Ovidian cheekiness and leave it at that? Perhaps we could, but considering the background against which Ovid composed this poem, his rocky relationship with the Princeps, and his fondness for pushing the limits of what is appropriate,³⁷⁶ the matter remains open for discussion and will, for the foreseeable future, continue to be so.³⁷⁷

II. Hellenistic and Roman Evidence for Divine Assimilation

Now that the gauntlet has been thrown down for navigating the precarious path of interpreting political messages in Ovid's *Fasti*, we turn to Jupiter and his affiliation with

³⁷³ Miller (2002) 170, who in his more recent treatment of Ovid's *Met.* and Augustan Apollo (Miller [2009] 333) provides the following assessment of Augustan politics: "To be sure, Ovid subverts Augustan icons and conducts his own Augustan discourse in a sometimes outrageously playful manner."

³⁷⁴ By "self-professed" I am referring to Ovid's declaration in the proem of *Fasti* 1 to sing of *Caesaris aras* (1.13).

³⁷⁵ See Miller (1991) 141.

³⁷⁶ Myers (1999) 197 acknowledges that "Ovid's consistently ironic and even flippant tone throughout his pre-exilic poetry has meant that he has generally been seen as anticonformist at the very least, if not in direct conflict with Augustan values and expressions of authority."

³⁷⁷ This question of Ovidian panegyric vs. subversiveness applies also to his earlier poetry, the *Amores* and the *Ars Amatoria*. However, the *Fasti*, despite its shared meter, is distinct from these two other works based on its elevated subject matter and the pre-existing imperial footprint that had already made its mark upon the epigraphical *Fasti*.

Augustus and Augustan propaganda.³⁷⁸ As noted above, Augustus' divine imagery was primarily promoted through comparison with the god Apollo, especially in the medium of poetry.³⁷⁹ Indeed, one might expect Ovid to follow closely the fertile ground of the Augustan poets who exploited this motif.³⁸⁰ In fact, Ovid does, to a certain extent, engage with the Augustus/Apollo dynamic, especially in his *Metamorphoses*.³⁸¹ At the same time, Ovid's *Met.* is framed around controversial comparisons between Augustus and Jupiter that can be viewed as anticipating the extent to which they become pervasive in his exile poetry.³⁸² Miller acknowledges that a change is afoot. Whereas the Augustan poets before Ovid eagerly strove to promote Palatine Apollo—and, by extension, Augustan Apollo—and portray him on par with—or even superior to—Capitoline Jupiter, Ovid, in his unique capacity as the last of the Augustan poets, engineered a reversal of

³⁷⁸ Although the word “propaganda” typically implies that it emanates from the person seeking to control the narrative, Pandey (2018) 9-10 discusses the extent to which other non-imperial forces affected the way in which Augustus' own imagery was viewed.

³⁷⁹ Fears (1981) 65 views this as the result of the political circumstances of the period: “As the political institutions of the republic were honored but in fact totally subordinated to the omnipotence of Augustus, so the supreme god of the republic was honored but in fact relegated to a minor position besides the patron gods of Augustus.”

³⁸⁰ As Miller (2009) 4 explains, there are scant references to Phoebus Apollo in pre-triumviral poetry, but from the time of the 2nd triumvirate onward, “In nearly every genre and on many occasions this deity is linked with Octavius/Augustus.”

³⁸¹ Miller (2009) 332ff. devotes an entire chapter to exploring “the (possible) Augustan relevance of Apollo across Ovid's sprawling poem.” Further, Miller 324-31 has identified two Apolline passages from Ovid's elegies that he argues have an Augustan flavor to them. As for references to Augustan Apollo in the *Fasti*, Miller (*ibid.* 331) claims that Ovid “duly acknowledges” them, citing two such examples (1.711 and 4.951), and attributes the lack of further examples to the fact that “no major Apolline anniversaries occur in the first six months.”

³⁸² Feeney (1991) 222 underscores the significance of these two Jupiter-Augustus comparisons, stating, “Yet the pairing of Jupiter and Augustus is not simply *an* analogy available in the poem. It is the first analogy and the last.”

that trend.³⁸³ We can also draw a distinction between these two aspects of Augustan propaganda—that is to the extent that Augustus himself was capable of controlling the narrative.³⁸⁴ While Augustus’ association with Apollo appears to have stemmed largely from Augustus’ own machinations,³⁸⁵ the practice of likening him to Jupiter can be viewed, at least initially, as merely the extension of traditional Greek practice.

Ever since Alexander the Great had taken control of Greece, it had become common in the Eastern world to identify rulers as having divine qualities.³⁸⁶ For during his auspicious visit to the oracle of Amun at Siwa in the Libyan desert, Alexander was hailed as the son of Zeus-Ammon, a conflation of the chief deities of the Greek and Egyptian pantheon.³⁸⁷ From that point onward he was considered a god on earth and was even depicted in a painting by Apelles holding a thunderbolt with a complexion darker than normal in order to exemplify his divine connection.³⁸⁸ Thereafter, several Hellenistic leaders promoted their association with the divine.

³⁸³ Miller (2009) 336. At the same time, we are privy to some glimpses of this dynamic in the four poems of Propertius (2.1, 2.16, 3.4, and 4.6) that juxtapose Jupiter and the Princes, all of which suggest “the increasing concentration of power in the hands of one man” (Hejduk [2020] 210).

³⁸⁴ See n. 378 above on the nature of propaganda and the ways in which it can be skewed.

³⁸⁵ As mentioned above, this conflation was only deliberate post-Actium. Evidence for this includes the fact that Augustus joined his house on the Palatine with the temple of Apollo Palatinus (see Miller [2009] 186f.) and his restoration of the temple of Apollo Sosianus that he rededicated on his birthday, Sept. 23rd. There is also the fragment of a wall painting recovered from the ruins of Augustus’ house that portrays Apollo as a cithara player. Miller (2009) 1-2 offers a discussion of this fragment and concludes that it is “all but impossible that viewers did not somehow see in this depiction of the god of music the patron deity of Augustus.”

³⁸⁶ The phenomenon of equating Zeus with the *Basileus* or ruler-king can be traced all the way back to Homer and Hesiod (see Weinstock [1971] 300-2).

³⁸⁷ Plut. *Alex.* 27.3-6; Diod. 17.51.1 ff.; Arrian 33.2.

³⁸⁸ Plin. *HN* 35.92; Plut. *Alex.* 4.3.

Most prominent among these were the Diadochi: Ptolemy I Soter and his son Ptolemy II Philadelphus from the Ptolemaic dynasty, Antigonus I Monophthalmus and his son Demetrius I Poliorcetes from the Antigonid dynasty, and Seleucus I, called *Zeus Nicator*, from the Seleucid dynasty.³⁸⁹ Whereas the Ptolemies were at least in part following the tradition of the Egyptian Pharaohs who had always been viewed as the extension of the divine, the Antigonids gained their divine association almost exclusively by acclamation of the Athenians who viewed them as liberators and saviors.³⁹⁰ Even though Alexander may have set the precedent for Hellenistic ruler cult by endorsing and encouraging his divine connection to Zeus-Ammon, there was a great amount of fluidity in terms of which divine figures were associated with which rulers.³⁹¹ This phenomenon is also apparent during the period marked by Rome's occupation of Greece. Perhaps the most prominent example is when Marcus Antonius arrives in Ephesus in 41 B.C and is hailed as the "New Dionysus," a title which he adopts and even promotes in his dealings with Rome and the Western world.³⁹² Thus it makes sense that after Octavian's victory at Actium and the establishment of his supremacy over Greece and the eastern kingdoms that he would inevitably become assimilated with one or multiple divine figures.³⁹³

³⁸⁹ For a useful summary of their divine associations see Fears (1981) 36-37 and Weinstock (1971) 301-2.

³⁹⁰ Plut. *Demetr.* 10

³⁹¹ Alexander himself is said to have dressed up like Hermes (see Nisbet and Hubbard [1970] 35).

³⁹² See Plut. *Ant.* 24.3 and 60.3.

³⁹³ Weinstock (1971) 304 lays out the numerous epithets of Zeus/Jupiter that Augustus became associated with in the East. Galinsky (1996) 318 says the following about Augustus' association with Jupiter in relation to the Greek or Eastern tradition: "The association of the ruler and Jupiter all too easily lent itself to being interpreted in terms of a theocratic monarchy that was far more absolutist than the principate."

In the world of Hellenistic poetry, we already see glimpses of divine assimilation. Callimachus in his Hymn to Zeus remarks that kings are closest to Zeus and goes on to praise one of the Ptolemies as far and away superior to all others.³⁹⁴ In addition, the act of pouring libations to Zeus at the hymn's beginning may be a direct allusion to the divine status of Ptolemy Soter.³⁹⁵ In relation to the significant influence that such overt panegyric had upon Ovid's *Fasti*, J. F. Miller poses the following questions regarding the possible directions in which Ovid takes his Callimachean model: "Does the *Fasti* ironize this aspect of its principal Greek model? Or were Ovid's ambiguous praises of Augustus inspired by such a Callimachean approach to the Ptolemies? Or does his Callimachean poem's embrace of imperial panegyric revise the meaning of Callimachus for Ovid and the Augustan poets?"³⁹⁶ The traditions of Hellenistic Greece aside, the Romans forged their own path toward conflating the earthly with the divine when they endowed the *triumphator*—and perhaps even the early semi-historical kings—with the privilege of dressing up like Jupiter Capitolinus, grasping in his hand the scepter mounted with the image of an eagle, head crowned with a golden wreath, and face painted red as an homage to the cult image of Jupiter Capitolinus himself.³⁹⁷ Of course, until the deification of Julius Caesar,³⁹⁸ this

³⁹⁴ Callim. *Hymn* 1.79-80: ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες, ἐπεὶ Διὸς οὐδὲν ἀνάκτων / θεϊότερον ("But from Zeus hail the kings, since nothing is more divine than the lords of Zeus") and Callim. *Hymn* 1.85-6: ἔοικε δὲ τεκμήρασθαι / ἡμετέρῳ μεδέοντι: περιπρὸ γὰρ εὐρὺ βέβηκεν ("It seems best to judge from our ruler, since he has walked far beyond [all others]").

³⁹⁵ See Hopkinson (1984) 146 n. 42. For the association of Zeus Soter with Ptolemy I Soter and of Zeus Olympios with Ptolemy II see Stephens (2015) 48.

³⁹⁶ Miller (2002a) 176.

³⁹⁷ Gradel (2002) 34-5, Cole (2013) 27, and Fears (1981) 45 esp. n. 192 which provides a useful list of literary evidence.

³⁹⁸ Cassius Dio records that even before Caesar's death and subsequent deification, the senate granted him permanent triumphal honors, amongst which included the title "Jupiter Julius" (Cass. Dio 44.6.3-4). This atypical procedure prompted Lewis (1985) 83 to associate Caesar's

event was merely symbolic and ephemeral, providing the Romans with a fleeting glimpse of the superior power and elevated status of the illustrious *triumphator*.³⁹⁹ But then the game changed and the bestowal of divine status upon a mortal took on a whole new meaning. It was no longer just something that was temporarily possessed by a general in the wake of an outstanding achievement. Rather, it became an in-born quality, reserved exclusively for the *Princeps*, regardless of his merit or successes.⁴⁰⁰ It makes sense, therefore, that the best place to promote such an association was within the poetic universe where the lines between the metaphorical and the literal were continuously blurred.⁴⁰¹

As one might imagine, however, a living figure did not possess the same degree of divinity as a dead one. Thus Gradel is keen on differentiating between the “relative” divinity that Augustus maintained from 27 B.C. until his death and the “absolute” divinity that he was awarded upon his death by the Senate in 14 A.D., remarking, “The world was full of gods

situation with that of the Hellenistic kings: “In Italy where deification before death was repugnant, or at least, alien to Roman tradition, the eastern pattern made its first appearance with Caesar.”

³⁹⁹ Beard (2007) 85-92 discusses the difficulties in trying to reconstruct the ritual cult activities of the triumph, which differ considerably amongst the surviving sources. She devotes the aforementioned pages to tracing the false yet common-place conception that a slave would typically stand beside the *triumphator* and whisper into his year that he was only a mortal. That is not to say, however, that the *triumphator* did not see himself as a divine figure or a stand-in for Jupiter himself during the ceremony.

⁴⁰⁰ Koortbojian (2013) 214 notes, however, that after Augustus, “not only the *divus*, but the living emperor, was to be regarded as Jupiter’s earthly parallel, and both might thus be depicted in the god’s image.”

⁴⁰¹ Grether (1946) 228 remarks, “Poets too were exempt from the general Augustan policy prohibiting the offering of exaggerated honors to the imperial family.” Gradel (2002) 110 adds “Such imagery could express or satisfy views on Augustus which were not accommodated in the formal constitutional façade of Rome.”

anyway. What mattered was that he became a god *of the Roman state*.⁴⁰² As chance would have it, the composition of Ovid's *Fasti*—or at least its revisionist state—flirts dangerously close with the end of Augustus' life, requiring its readers to acknowledge the potential presence of both aspects of Augustus' divinity.⁴⁰³ In the aftermath of Augustus' death, imperial cult worship exploded and there was no shortage of cult statues bearing the unmistakable visage of the deified emperor. Among these the dominant group is known as the "Jupiter" type,⁴⁰⁴ exemplified perhaps by a standing hip-mantled bronze statue of Divus Augustus grasping the thunderbolt in his left hand.⁴⁰⁵ Although the majority of these "Jupiter" type cult statues date to the period after Augustus' death, Koortbojian acknowledges that a few existed even during the emperor's life "to signal the full extent of his worldly authority and powers."⁴⁰⁶

We saw above that the identification of Octavian with Apollo had already been established in the years leading up to Actium, thereafter becoming one of the hallmarks of the Augustan program. Yet, in the case of Jupiter and Octavian/Augustus, as Feeney points out, the majority of evidence exists prior to his assumption of the title Augustus in 27 B.C.⁴⁰⁷ Nor does it

⁴⁰² Gradel, (2002) 270. Koortbojian (2013) 23 pushes back against this notion with the statement, "And, despite the appeal of recent revisionist attempts to reorient discussion around distinctions of power relations...these interpretations fail to acknowledge that for the Romans, *religio* saw the distinction between men and gods as absolute." He says this, however, in the midst of his discussion of Julius Caesar, not Augustus.

⁴⁰³ Several references to Augustus in the *Fasti* are generally agreed upon by scholars to have taken place firmly after Augustus' death and deification (see Fantham [1986]).

⁴⁰⁴ Koortbojian (2013) 213-14.

⁴⁰⁵ FA-S5296-01. Koortbojian (2013) 214-15 also cites an enthroned Divus Augustus statue of the same "Jupiter" type from Leptis Magna (DAIR neg. 1961.1751).

⁴⁰⁶ Koortbojian (2013) 214 specifically referring to the cult statues of Divus Augustus in Tivoli and Caesarea Maritima.

⁴⁰⁷ Feeney (1991) 220.

ever become a leitmotif among the Augustan poets in the same way as the Augustus and Apollo pairing. Our primary evidence for the early establishment of the Jupiter-Octavian comparison is numismatic. Wallace-Hadrill draws attention to a series of coins minted around the time of the battle of Actium that appear to conflate the features of Octavian's face with that of divine figures and vice-versa.⁴⁰⁸ Wallace-Hadrill observes, "The intention of association becomes even more explicit...when the heads of the gods absorb the features of Caesar (or Caesar those of the gods) in such a way that it becomes hard to state who is portrayed." The first of these coins (BMCRE 628) shows what is clearly a bust of Octavian on the obverse, while depicting on the reverse what David Sear has referred to as the "ithyphallic boundary-stone of Jupiter Terminus."⁴⁰⁹ Any doubt as to its association with Jupiter is dispelled by the winged thunderbolts that form at the base of the boundary stone.⁴¹⁰ What is more, the words IMP CAESAR are emblazoned across the middle. The second coin in the series (BMCRE 637) is even more detailed. On the obverse we once again have a bust of Octavian, this time wearing the laurel crown and accompanied by a miniature version of the very same thunderbolt-winged boundary-stone of Jupiter Terminus.⁴¹¹ On the reverse we see Octavian seated on the Curule chair, holding victory in his extended right hand in what Koortbojian refers to as an "unmistakable allusion to Pheidias' Nike-bearing Zeus."⁴¹² Again the words IMP CAESAR appear, this time cutting across Octavian's seated body.⁴¹³ In the case of both obverses, the characteristically waved hairstyle, in particular, makes

⁴⁰⁸ Wallace-Hadrill (1986) 71 and 86 (Pl. II, 7 and 8). *BMCRE* 628 and 637, the former showing Jupiter in the form of a herm and the latter utilizing the imagery of the winged thunderbolt.

⁴⁰⁹ Sear (2000) 301.

⁴¹⁰ Gurval (1995) PL. 3.

⁴¹¹ The roof of Augustus' house contained the painted images of thunderbolts (see Miller [2009] 215 n. 66).

⁴¹² Koortbojian (2013) 141 who calls this the "bringer of victory" coin.

⁴¹³ Wallace-Hadrill (1986) 71 Cf. also *BMCRE* 628 (Wallace-Hadrill [1986] 86).

it clear that the images are of Octavian. Burnett, in reviewing the evidence presented by Kraft and Albert, reiterates the propagandistic nature of these coins, while also specifying that they were produced by the mint of Rome.⁴¹⁴ Regardless of the veracity of this claim, we can with great likelihood point to the minting of coins from Rome—or at the very least from Italy—that combined Octavian’s image with that of divine figures, among whom is Jupiter.⁴¹⁵

Koortbojian takes this assessment a step further. He has observed the striking similarity between the reverse of the “bringer of victory” coin and that of an aureus minted most likely in Asia and dated to the same time period, ca. 29 B.C.⁴¹⁶ This aureus depicts Octavian once again wearing the toga and sitting on the curule chair. In addition, he is holding a scroll in his right hand, above which the following words are evident: LEGES ET IURA P(OPULI) R(OMANI) RESTITUIT. Koortbojian views these two coins as merging two distinct spheres – that of the dutiful magistrate, restoring order to the empire after a turbulent period, and that of the divine conqueror.⁴¹⁷ He concludes, therefore, that our “bringer of victory” coin with its unmistakable conflation of Jupiter and Octavian on both of its sides “was to be construed as symbolizing a

⁴¹⁴ Burnett (1983) 564: Thus at the time of Actium Octavian was producing from the mint of Rome and not from some provincial source, coins which likened him to various gods.” Koortbojian (2013) 141 Pl. VI.7-8 in discussing *BMCRE* 637 refers to it as from a “Roman mint.”

⁴¹⁵ Considering the early date of these coins and Augustus’ later devotion to the cult of Jupiter Tonans, it is curious that Fantham (1995) 53 should say, “Augustus took no personal initiative to enhance the cult of Jupiter Optimus Maximus or his own association with Jupiter.” Augustus was, however, careful not to explicitly refer to himself as a god, not so much because he did not consider himself worthy of such a title, but rather because such a conflation would paint him as too similar to the tyrannical autocrats of the post-Alexandrian era (see Galinsky [1996] 318).

⁴¹⁶ Koortbojian (2013) 142-43. The coin is depicted at Pl. VI.10.

⁴¹⁷ Koortbojian (2013) 142.

beneficium conferred on the Roman people by Octavian himself.”⁴¹⁸ This *beneficium* was in part a gift that only a god could bestow,⁴¹⁹ a novelty among the Romans for a mere mortal. At the same time, the imagery touched on the more traditional Roman sphere of a magistrate governing his constituents. Perhaps the mutually exclusive dichotomy of god and magistrate among the more conservative western world contributed to the reticence of poets and other artists toward creating a more sustained treatment of Jupiter and Augustus prior to the first emperor’s deification. Yet, we are not without several early poetic examples that appear to operate alongside the aforementioned numismatic evidence.

III. Jupiter-Augustus in Horace

Our earliest poetic references associating Octavian—now Augustus—and Jupiter come from Horace.⁴²⁰ In *Odes* 1.12, written in praise of Augustus, Horace links Augustus’ potential for success over a host of foreign enemies with Jupiter’s supremacy by way of a prayer:

Gentis humanae pater atque custos,
 orte Saturno, tibi cura magni 50
 Caesaris fatis data: tu secundo
 Caesare regnes.
 Ille seu Parthos Latio imminentes
 egerit iusto domitos triumpho
 sive subiectos Orientis orae 55
 Seras et Indos,

⁴¹⁸ Koortbojian (2013) 142.

⁴¹⁹ On the precise nature of a *beneficium* see Koortbojian (2013) 11 and 23-24.

⁴²⁰ See Feeney (1991) 220 and also Ward (1933) 202, especially n. 1 in which Ward cites Hirst (1928) who notes the difference between *C.1.2* in which Horace draws a close comparison between Augustus and Mercury “with its tone of anxiety, and its tentative suggestions of deity, written probably in 28 B.C.” and *C. 1.12* which can be dated slightly later (25-23 B.C.) and where “Augustus is plainly put very close to Jove.” For the archeological and numismatic evidence supporting the connection between Mercury and Augustus in *C. 1.2*, see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 34-35 who also read *C.1.12* in light of Hellenistic ruler-cult.

te minor laetum reget aequus orbem:
 tu gravi curru quaties Olympum,
 tu parum castis inimica mittes
 fulmina lucis.⁴²¹ 60

Father and guardian of the human race, born from Saturn, the care of great Caesar has been entrusted to you by the fates: may you reign with Caesar below you. Whether he leads in a rightful triumph the conquered Parthians who threaten Latium or the Seres and the Indians who dwell along the Eastern border, he, though inferior to you, will rule justly over a happy world: you will shake Olympus with your mighty chariot, you will cast down hostile thunderbolts upon unchaste groves. (C. 1.12.49-60)

The parallels between the two are not subtle. The language that Horace uses is designed to gain the reader's acquiescence and accept the inevitability of this new divine dynamic. Jupiter is referred to as *pater* and *custos* rather than the more common term *rex*. Indeed, Horace extends the image of *pater* by drawing further attention to Jupiter's divine lineage and noting that he was also the son of a divine figure—Saturn. He then establishes the division of Jupiter ruling in the sky and Augustus on earth that he will make more explicit in his third book of *Odes*.⁴²² The enemies that Augustus—and by extension Rome—faces are all foreign, with the Parthians being an imminent threat upon Latium itself. Thus the triumph that Augustus will earn is called *iusto* (54) and the rule that he will have is deemed *aequus* (57).⁴²³ The comparison concludes with references to two of Jupiter's most formidable attributes: his weighty chariot (*gravi curru*) and

⁴²¹ Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 168 note the “comparative manuscript authority” of *laetum* for *laetum*, which does not greatly change the meaning of the text.

⁴²² (Pseudo)-Acron commenting on the *tu secundo regnes* of Hor. C 1.12.51 says, *Id est: sit secundus a te, scilicet ut tu in caelo ille in terris regnet* (“That is: may he [Augustus] be second in rank below you [Jupiter], clearly (indicating) that you [Jupiter] rule in the sky, while he [Augustus] rules on earth”).

⁴²³ Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 166 provide further testimony as to the legitimacy of Augustus' *triumphus*.

his hostile thunderbolts (*inimica...fulmina*). We are no doubt meant to apply these features back to Augustus who sits in the curule chair and dispatches his own form of thunderbolts against deserved enemies.⁴²⁴ At the same time, the poet makes it clear that Augustus is inferior to Jupiter, first through the application of *secundo Caesare* in the initial stanza and more emphatically at the very beginning of the final stanza with *te minor*.⁴²⁵

At the beginning of *Odes* 3.5 we again see Augustus likened to Jupiter: *Caelo tonantem credidimus Iovem / regnare: praesens divus habebitur / Augustus adiectis Britannis / imperio gravibusque Persis* (“We believe that thundering Jove rules over the sky; Augustus will be considered a god on earth when he has added the weight of the Britons and Persians to the empire” C. 3.5.1-4). Just as in *Odes* 1.12, Horace distinguishes between Jupiter in the sky (*caelo*) and Augustus on earth (*praesens*).⁴²⁶ While Nisbet and Rudd prefer to treat *credidimus* of 3.5.1 as a gnomic perfect akin to *novi* (“I have gotten to know” and hence “I know”), Hejduk takes a more expansive view and sees a contrast between Jupiter’s long-established hegemony over the sky and Augustus’ potential for exercising control over the earthly realm in the future, which has yet to be firmly established.⁴²⁷ Porphyrio in his commentary on Horace recognizes a further division between that which is heard in the sky from Jove and that which is seen on the earth from Augustus.⁴²⁸ The mention of Jupiter’s epithet *tonantem* is telling. As we shall see later on,

⁴²⁴ The mention of *parum castis...lucis* (59-60) connects back to the concept of “just” punishment.

⁴²⁵ See Hejduk (2020) 122 for Horace’s clever use of *te* as anticipating a verb of adoration in accordance with a proper hymn, but actually detracting from its overall solemnity.

⁴²⁶ For this religious sense of *praesens*, meaning “on the earth” see Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 83 and *OLD* s.v. 3 (cf. also *praesens deus* in Cic. *Tusc.* 1.28).

⁴²⁷ Hejduk (2020) 129.

⁴²⁸ Porph. on Hor. C. 3.5.1: *Ergo si famae, inquit, tantum de Iovis magnitudine credidimus: quanto magis de Augusti divitate credendum est, cuius virtutes et potentiam omnes non audimus,*

Augustus forges a close relationship with the cult of Jupiter Tonans.⁴²⁹ Its presence here serves to connect us back to the Jupiter of *C. 1.12* who hurls his *inimica fulmina* at *parum incastis lucis*, and emphasizes both his omnipotence and his righteousness. In addition, the enjambment of Augustus' name is noticeable, along with the explicit forecasting of his divine status: *praesens divus*.⁴³⁰ Curiously, this seemingly perfect union of the ruler of the gods and the ruler of the earthly world is picked up by none of the other Augustan poets—that is until Ovid.⁴³¹

IV. Jupiter-Augustus in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

Before we delve into the world of the *Fasti*, let us first perform a cursory examination of Ovid's treatment of Jupiter in his *Metamorphoses* and exile poetry, all three of which share a similar period of composition.⁴³² As mentioned above, Ovid addresses Augustus' divine

sed videmus ("Therefore, he says, as much as we believe the tradition with regard to the greatness of Jove: all the more so must we believe in Augustus' divinity, whose merits and power we do not hear, but see").

⁴²⁹ Propertius several times plays with the notion of an Augustan Jupiter Tonans without drawing an explicit comparison between the two figures (cf. Prop. 2.1.39-42 and 2.26.39-44).

⁴³⁰ Horace continues to emphasize Augustus' divine connection in his 4th book of *Odes* (esp. *C. 4.4* and *4.5*). Commager (1995) 176 draws attention to the futurity of Augustus' divinity. Hejduk (2020) 129 emphasizes the dichotomy "between a remote, abstract Jupiter, and an Augustus who is accessible and palpable here and now."

⁴³¹ Miller (2009) 152 n. 132. Manilius, who may have been a later contemporary of Ovid's, employs a similar more direct comparison between Augustus and Jupiter (Manil. *Astr.* 1.798-800: *Venerisque ab origine proles / Iulia descendit caelo caelumque replebit / quod reget Augustus, socio per signa Tonante...* ("And the Julian offspring [i.e. Julius Caesar] from the race of Venus has descended from heaven and filled heaven once again, a heaven which Augustus will rule amid the stars with the Thunderer as his ally"). For the textual uncertainties regarding this passage see Volk (2009) 144. For the dating of Manilius see G. P. Goold (ed. and trans.) *Manilius: Astronomica* (Cambridge, 1977), xi-xiii, Baldwin (1987) and Volk (2009) 127 and 138.

⁴³² Regarding the dating of these three works, we know from Ovid himself that his exile broke off (*rupit opus*) the composition of his *Met.* and his *Fasti* (*Tr.* 1.7.14, 2.552), and his exile poetry

connections most prominently in the first and last books of his sole epic poem. Our first and arguably most memorable look at Jupiter in the *Met.* occurs during the famous council of the gods episode that follows immediately after the provocative formation of the human race from the blood of the defeated giants. Here we are presented with an impressive and imposing depiction of Jupiter in the guise of an autocrat, sitting above his fellow gods, menacingly shaking his head, and leaning upon an ivory scepter (*Met.* 1.177-80).⁴³³ The grandeur of his image and the solemnity of the setting are clear homages to the Iliadic and Vergilian council of the gods where Zeus and Jupiter respectively determine the fate of mankind.⁴³⁴ Ovid, however, opts to describe the council in contemporary terms, referring to the hall as the “Palatine of the great sky” (*magni Palatia caeli* 1.176), where only the “powerful and illustrious sky-dwellers maintain their homes” (*potentes / caelicolae clarique suos posuere penates* 1.173-74).⁴³⁵ Mention of the Palatine evokes an immediate association with Augustus,⁴³⁶ both as his place of residence and as a place where the Senate was accustomed to meet, owing to the temple of Apollo he had built

was obviously composed *post relegationem*, putting the completion of all three works sometime between the year of Ovid’s exile in 8 A.D. and the year of his death around 17 A.D.

⁴³³ *Ergo ubi marmoreo superi sedere recessu, / celsior ipse loco sceptroque innixus eburno / terrificam capitis concussit terque quaterque / caesariem, cum qua terram, mare, sidera movit.* (“Therefore, when the gods took their seats in the marble chamber, (Jupiter) himself from a loftier position, leaning upon his sceptre, shook thrice and then four times the awe-inspiring locks of his head, with which he moved the earth, sea, and stars”). Barchiesi (2005) 184 comments, “Un senso di violenza soprannaturale accompagna questa vera propria epifania di Giove nel poema.”

⁴³⁴ See Segal (2001) 79 and Barchiesi (2005) 182.

⁴³⁵ Barchiesi (2005) 183-4 notes that the *marmoreo...recessu* of *Met.* 1.177 picks up on the mention of the Palatine in the previous line. While marble and ivory are typical for the houses and temples of gods, the temple of Apollo Palatinus was actually multi-colored.

⁴³⁶ As does the mention of *caesariem*, which, according to Barchiesi (2005) 184, may remind the reader of “l’autorità di un *Caesar*.”

and connected to his house.⁴³⁷ Of note too is the obsequiousness demonstrated by the other gods who come when called and limit their responses to various modes of approval and applause, intended to represent the degree to which the Roman Senate now obliges the wishes and requests of the Princeps.⁴³⁸ The notion of the just, sympathetic Vergilian Jupiter that is alluded to by his initial introduction as *pater* (1.163) is quickly put aside in favor of a Jupiter who is prone to great anger (*ingentes...dignas Iove...iras* 1.166), maintains total control over his constituents (*tenuit mora nulla vocatos* 1.167), and who is not afraid to remind his fellow gods of his supreme authority (*mihi, qui fulmen, qui vos habeoque regoque* 1.197).⁴³⁹ In fact, this characterization more closely resembles that of Juno in the *Aeneid* whose severe *ira* is immediately established as the poem's primary concern.⁴⁴⁰ Like the Vergilian Juno who strives to exterminate Aeneas and the Trojans, Jupiter here is bent on the destruction of Lycaon and the entire human race. Both derive their motivation from personal slights—Juno from her embarrassment at losing the contest judged by the Trojan Paris—among other things—and Jupiter because of Lycaon's sacrilegiousness

⁴³⁷ Suet. *Aug.* 29.3 and Ov. *Fast.* 4.951-2. See also Feeney (1991) 199 and Miller (2009) 335. For a more detailed discussion regarding the senatorial meeting that took place on the Palatine, see Thompson (1981).

⁴³⁸ Barchiesi (2005) 190-91 and Miller (2009) 337-38, both of whom cite Tacitus' later account of the spineless Roman Senate. See also Lenzi (2015) 199-205.

⁴³⁹ Miller (2009) 338 commenting on Ovid's deviation from the Vergilian council says, "Jupiter himself is an absolute monarch who does away with the constitutional etiquette of Virgil's divine senate."

⁴⁴⁰ Both *Aen.* 1.4: *memorem Iunonis ob iram* ("On account of the long-lasting anger of Juno") and *Aen.* 1.11: *Tantaene animis caelestibus irae?* ("Are there such angers in the minds of the gods?"). Although Feeney (1991) 199 points out that Ovid differs significantly from Vergil in admitting (*Met.* 1.166) that Jupiter's vast anger is indeed quite fitting for a god of his caliber. At the same time, Feeney (1991) 198 acknowledges that Jupiter's anger constitutes "The first emotion felt by a god in the poem." See also Barchiesi (2005) 182 who comments, "Ovidio pone il suo Giove in parallelo con l'irata Giunone di Virgilio."

and his brazen attempt to serve up human remains to a god.⁴⁴¹ In both the *Aen.* and the *Met.* it is this implacable *ira* that establishes the narrative framework for the remainder of the poem. Just as Juno's *ira* against Aeneas drives forward the plot of the *Aeneid* until the reconciliation episode in book 12, so too does the effect Jupiter's *ira* ripple out over the many ensuing episodes of divine wrath, all of which hold the great flood as their point of origin.⁴⁴² Thus Ovid's Jupiter is operating on three different levels that Ovid deftly integrates into his novel characterization of the great god. He exudes the *gravitas* of the Vergilian Jupiter with his stately motions, he mimics the *ira* of the Vergilian Juno with his contempt for the actions of Lycaon and for humankind at large, and he is thrust into the world of contemporary Roman politics with the mention of the Palatine and the Plebes.⁴⁴³ Add to this "the unabashedly human characterization of the whole episode"⁴⁴⁴ and reader is forced to see an angry, authoritarian version of Augustus alongside a multifaceted characterization of Jupiter.

Ovid presents his reader with a more nuanced and personalized version of the dignified Horatian pairing seen in the Odes. Like Horace, he too touches on the division between the sky and the earth and Jupiter's possession of thunder and lightning. Yet the lines have become more blurred. Although Jupiter is said to reside in the sky, his residence takes on a more tangible

⁴⁴¹ Another parallel is that in both works they compel the winds to do their bidding: Juno by convincing Aeolus to release the winds and shipwreck Aeneas' fleet (*Aen.* 1.50ff.), and Jupiter by releasing the South Wind and stirring up a great storm (*Met.* 1.262ff.).

⁴⁴² I am not arguing that Jupiter's *ira* sustains the plot of the *Met.* in the same way that Juno's *ira* does that of the *Aeneid*, but rather that both works take as their point of departure the *ira* of these two principal deities.

⁴⁴³ Note especially the simile that compares the gods' reaction to Lycaon's wickedness to the Roman Senate's reaction to the assassination of Julius Caesar. Both Augustus (addressed by name only here at 1.204) and Jove are said to appreciate the *pietas* of their constituents (*Met.* 1.199-205).

⁴⁴⁴ Feeney (1991) 200.

description, being referred to as *tecta...regalemque domum* (“a home and regal domicile” 1.170-71) and *Palatia caeli* (“Palatine of the sky” 1.176). We no longer have the firm separation of an abstract Jupiter in the sky and his emissary on earth. Instead, Jupiter is depicted acting like Augustus with the Palatine hill serving as a replacement for Mount Olympus. The implication, therefore, is that Augustus behaves very much like Jupiter, with the distinction between the earthly and heavenly spheres now disintegrated. Ovid even reprises Horace’s invocation of Jupiter as Thunderer (*Tonantem* *C* 3.5.1), increasing the effect by calling him the “great Thunderer” (*magni...Tonantis* 1.170).⁴⁴⁵ For Ovid though, Jupiter’s thunder does not stem from the characteristic thundering of the sky, but is achieved by the movement of his head and the slamming down of his scepter (*Met.* 1.178-80), as if he were a mortal.⁴⁴⁶ Finally, the lightning-bolt, which in Horace was used as a threat against the enemies of Rome (*C.* 1.12.59-60), now symbolizes the control Jupiter exercises over his own people (*Met.* 1.197). Indeed, Ovid has constructed the imagery of this line in such a way that Jupiter holds and rules both the thunderbolt as well as his fellow gods. This intensely personalized and potentially polarizing depiction of Jupiter takes on additional weight upon the realization that it occurs in the poem’s first narrative sequence.

When Jupiter decides he wants to destroy mankind by flood rather than by fire he begins by using water derived from his own rain clouds. This, however, is insufficient and he receives

⁴⁴⁵ This may also be playing on Horace’s reference to Augustus at *magni / Caesaris* (*C.* 1.12.50-55) amidst his comparison with Jupiter. Given the date of the composition of the *Met.*, we can now take into account the importance of the cult of Jupiter Tonans to Augustus who dedicated a temple to him on the Capitoline in 22 B.C. See also Barchiesi (2005) 182 and the discussion below on the cult of Jupiter Tonans.

⁴⁴⁶ Solodow (1988) 92-93 speaks to how the gods in the *Met.* lack the “higher attributes” of divinity that they possess in the works of Sophocles, Aratus and Vergil, reducing them to the realm of mere mortals.

help from Neptune's waves: *Nec caelo contenta suo est Iovis ira, sed illum / caeruleus frater iuvat auxiliaribus undis* ("Nor was the anger of Jove content with his own sky, but his brother aided him with his complementary waves"). Once again, focus is directed on Jupiter's *ira* and the extent to which it governs his actions. In the context of this passage it is clear that *caelo* refers to Jupiter's storm-clouds. As we have seen, however, the more common application of the word *caelo* in relation to the pairing of Jupiter and Augustus is to his home.⁴⁴⁷ Thus one could initially read this line and interpret it as saying that Jupiter's anger has caused him to want to abandon the sky. How might this reflect upon Augustus? Well, it could intimate that Augustus wants to leave behind the earth and enter the sky. Even with the more contextually appropriate reading, this interpretation subsists. Jupiter may have his abundant rain clouds at his disposal, but they are not enough to satisfy his ambitions. He desires aid from a dominion beyond his own station, and gets it. Again, I argue that Ovid has cloaked his language and his narrative in a veil of ambiguity, such that the reader constantly sees a reflection of Augustus in the actions and demeanor of Jupiter.

At the poem's conclusion we see the culmination of what Ovid had been flirting with in book 1—Augustus' apotheosis. The transformation of Augustus into a god, however, hinges upon Julius Caesar's deification and Augustus' list of accolades are put forth as vengeful measures taken against his father's enemies (*Met.* 15.818-28).⁴⁴⁸ For without the precedent of Caesar's apotheosis, Ovid claims, Augustus would have had to acknowledge his mortal identity: *ne foret hic igitur mortali semine cretus, / ille deus faciendus erat* ("Therefore in order that Augustus not

⁴⁴⁷ Hor. *C.* 3.5.1 and Ov. *Met.* 1.168, 1.176, 1.194.

⁴⁴⁸ Krasne (2016) 126 draws attention to the emphasis on the theme of succession in the *Fasti* and the *Met.* and its role in "linking the cosmic power dynamics of the so-called Divine Succession Myth to the dynamics of power and succession in Augustan Rome."

be born from the seed of a mortal, Julius Caesar had to become a god” *Met.* 15.760-61).

Although some scholars find Ovid’s laudatory comments here over the top,⁴⁴⁹ Hardie espouses a less skeptical view, citing numerous authors who make a similar statement about Augustus’ transformation of Caesar into a deity.⁴⁵⁰ Soon after, Ovid employs a divine parallel to show how Augustus has eclipsed the deeds of his adopted father just as Jupiter has surpassed those of Saturn: *denique, ut exemplis ipsos aequantibus utar, / sic et Saturnus minor est Iove* (“Finally, so that I might use an example worthy of them, to such a degree also is Saturn less than Jove” *Met.* 15.857-58).⁴⁵¹ Back in book 1 when Ovid compared the sky to the Palatine, he qualified his assertion with the following remark: *si verbis audacia detur* (“if boldness may be given to my words” *Met.* 1.175). Here at the end when he offers his final comparison of the degrees of greatness between Jupiter, Augustus, and their respective parents, he makes quite a different remark. No longer do boldness (*audacia* 1.175) or fear (*timeam* 1.176) color his assertion. Rather, he is so confident in what he is about to say that he inserts a textual marker in order to emphasize that the only true comparison between Augustus’ superiority to Julius Caesar’s is that of Jupiter’s to Saturn’s. Ironically, this does not carry as much weight as one would initially think. Yes, Jupiter is the reigning king of the gods, but Saturn once held that position. Moreover, Saturn ruled over the golden age of mankind, which, as Ovid himself tell us, was an era characterized by peace and prosperity (*Met.* 1.89-112), while Jupiter only took over the

⁴⁴⁹ For instance, Pandey (2013) 437-38 argues that Ovid makes it appear as if Augustus were responsible for forcing Caesar’s deification upon the people in order to account for his success.

⁴⁵⁰ Hardie (2004) 595-96, commenting, “in sé stesso *facere deum* non è inevitabilmente espressione di cinismo.”

⁴⁵¹ Ovid will use a similar technique in the *Fasti* on the Ides of January where Augustus is given divine honors, while the rest of the great Romans receive merely human honors.

subsequent ages that were eventually fraught with strife and insubordination.⁴⁵² Feeney opines that “The climactic comparison of Jupiter and Augustus exemplifies the slippery terrain of such panegyric, for the gods are not (least of all in this poem) neutral of praise, nor can the terms of comparison be easily fixed or controlled.”⁴⁵³ This again speaks to Pandey’s point that certain aspects of propaganda take on a life of their own and are beyond the control of those seeking to disseminate it.⁴⁵⁴ In addition, Krasne calls attention to the incongruousness of the other pairs of fathers and sons mentioned in this catalogue.⁴⁵⁵ Agamemnon, after all, did not have big shoes to fill in surpassing his father Atreus’ deeds, which include murdering his nephews and serving them up to his brother Thyestes. Of particular note is the pairing of Achilles and Peleus. As Krasne observes, Achilles is certainly greater than his father, but not as great as he could have been, since he may well have been Jupiter’s son, had Jupiter not heeded the warning that a son born from Thetis would grow up to be greater than his father. These exempla thus serve to “muddy the seemingly transparent supremacy of Augustus and Jupiter.”⁴⁵⁶

Ovid follows this cryptic comparison with a return to the Horatian analogy with Jupiter in the sky and Augustus on earth: *Iuppiter arces / temperat aetherias et mundi regna triformis, / terra sub Augusto est; pater est et rector uterque* (“Jupiter rules over the citadels of the sky and the kingdom of the three-fold universe, while the earth is under Augustus’ dominion; both are fathers and rulers.” *Met.* 15.858-60). But must not part of Jupiter’s *mundi regna triformis* include

⁴⁵² Although Feeney (1991) 221 makes the valid point that Augustus is more suited to the iron age since the Golden Age, according to Ovid himself, was entirely devoid of laws. See also Hardie (2004) 613.

⁴⁵³ Feeney (1991) 220.

⁴⁵⁴ See n. 378 above.

⁴⁵⁵ Krasne (2016) 136-37.

⁴⁵⁶ Krasne (2016) 137.

control over the earth and thus spill over into Augustus' domain?⁴⁵⁷ Jupiter is no longer relegated purely to the sky, he is omnipresent. The mention of them both as *pater* immediately after their own *patres* were called inferior is striking.⁴⁵⁸ Once again, we see Ovid playing both with words and with meaning by mixing the concepts of literal and figurative parentage. Jupiter, although he has fathered many children by many different women, does not need a successor since his reign is permanent. Thus his role as a biological *pater* is quite irrelevant. In the case of Augustus, however, succession is of the utmost importance. And by the time Ovid is writing, Augustus' lack of a biological or non-biological successor was no doubt both noticeable and problematic.⁴⁵⁹

The panegyric of Augustus ends with a prayer in which Ovid beseeches the principal gods, including Jupiter,⁴⁶⁰ who again rules on high over the citadels, to delay the time at which Augustus will depart from the earthly realm and be raised into the sky as a god:⁴⁶¹

quique tenes altus Tarpeias Iuppiter arces,
quosque alios vati fas appellare piumque est:

⁴⁵⁷ Unless the expression is being used here more loosely as a stand-in for divine power. For Hardie (2004) 614 notes, "La divisione tripartita si trova di frequente in descrizioni di potere divino."

⁴⁵⁸ The inclusion of *pater* here no doubt serves as a nod to Augustus' most highly coveted title of *pater patriae* bestowed upon him by the Senate in 2 B.C. (see Aug. *R.G.* 25). In the *Tristia*, however, Ovid makes this explicit, saying, *Tu quoque, cum patriae rector dicare paterque, / utere more dei nomen habentis idem* ("You also, since you are called ruler of the fatherland and father, adopt the custom of the god who has the same name" *Tr.* 2.39-40).

⁴⁵⁹ This uncertainty is reflected in the revised dedication of *Fasti* to Germanicus, whom we can presume that Ovid believed would one day become emperor, although he never did.

⁴⁶⁰ Hardie (2004) 615-16 discusses the Alexandrian tradition of concluding a work of poetry with Jupiter/Jupiter: "l'associazione conclusiva tra dio supremo e sovrano è alla maniera alessandrina."

⁴⁶¹ This prayer is similar that of *Verg. G.* 1.498-501 where Vergil prays to Romulus and Vesta in order to preserve the well-being of the young Augustus who is destined to save the world. See also Hardie (2004) 614 who notes that this passage also creates a frame with the exordium of book 1.

tarda sit illa dies et nostro serior aevo,
qua caput Augustum, quem temperat, orbe relicto
accedat caelo faveatque precantibus absens.

And you, Jupiter, who hold the Tarpeian citadels, and those other (gods) whom it is right and proper for a poet to call upon: may that day be delayed and beyond our lifetime, on which the head of Augustus enters the sky leaving behind the world which he rules and grants favor to our prayers from afar. (Met. 15.866-70)

This prognostication of apotheosis for Augustus is couched in familiar terms. Just above Jupiter was said to rule over *arces...aetherias* ("citadels of the sky" 858-59) and now we see him hold sway over *Tarpeias...arces* ("Tarpeian citadels" 866), a reference to no doubt to his temples on the Capitoline hill. Hardie tasks the reader with distinguishing here between the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus and that of Jupiter Tonans, both of which are commonly referenced in the *Fasti*, noting that the former was the god of the state, while the latter was personally dedicated by Augustus.⁴⁶² The verb *temperat*, used above (859) to express Jupiter's control over the cosmos is now used of the world which Augustus rules (*temperat* 869) and which he will be forced to leave behind upon his death.⁴⁶³ Augustus will eventually occupy the realm of the sky (*caelo* 870) and he will then be capable of favoring the very sort of poetry which Ovid is composing. Emma Gee suggests that Ovid's use of *absens* (15.870) here could function as an inversion of the Horatian

⁴⁶² Hardie (2004) 616. The phrase *Tarpeias...arces* occurs at *Fast.* 1.79 in reference to the ascension of the Capitoline Hill by the consuls elect during their inauguration,

⁴⁶³ Horace *C.* 1.12.13-16 also uses *temperat* to describe Jupiter's control over the world: *Quid prius dicam solitis parentis / laudibus, qui res hominum ac deorum, qui mare ac terras variisque mundum / temperat horis?* ("What will I say first regarding the praises earmarked for the father, who controls the affairs of men and of gods, who controls the sea, and the earth, and the world throughout the changing seasons?"). As Hardie (2004) 614 points out, Ovid also uses *temperat* to describe Venus' control of the world in the proem of *Fasti* 4 (4.91).

praesens at C. 3.5.2.⁴⁶⁴ In Horace, we may recall, Jupiter rules from sky, while Augustus is his representative on earth. Soon, however, as Ovid tells us, Augustus will join the ranks of Jupiter in the sky and although he will no longer be visible on earth, his divine status will endure in the form of prayers issued to him.⁴⁶⁵ Recall that at the very beginning of the *Met.* Ovid, adhering in part to the epic tradition of asking the Muses for inspiration, calls upon the gods to favor his undertaking (*Met.* 1.2-3). Augustus himself will now be included among those very deities.⁴⁶⁶

Ovid concludes his *magnum opus* on an ominous note: nothing, not even the anger of Jove (*nec Iovis ira* 15.871), will erase his accomplishment. Hardie, acknowledging the development of this expression in the *Tristia* as a standard way of referring to Augustus' anger, notes that several scholars have used this phrase as evidence for the post-exilic composition of the *Met.*'s epilogue.⁴⁶⁷ Although Feeney admits that there are some who are reluctant to view Jupiter's wrath here in terms of the thunderbolt that exiled Ovid, he reminds us that the wrath of Jove bookends Ovid's work and that it "is not simply *an* analogy available in the poem."⁴⁶⁸ One such scholar who argues for a nonpolemical reading of not only the *ira Iovis* phrase, but of the entire sphragis is Bronwen Wickkiser, who prefers to view Ovid's ending primarily in light of

⁴⁶⁴ Gee (2000) 147. At *Tr.* 5.2.45-6 an absent/exiled Ovid appeals to Augustus in the form of an absent Jupiter: *alloquor en absens absentia numina supplex, / si fas est homini cum Iove posse loqui* ("Behold I absent address divinities as a suppliant, if it is right for a man to be able to speak with Jove").

⁴⁶⁵ Pandey (2018) 81 n. 107 expresses skepticism about the legitimacy of Ovid's claim, stating, "The joke, of course, is that it would hardly be possible for Augustus to enjoy more power as an *absens deus* in heaven than he did as a *praesens deus* in his own city."

⁴⁶⁶ Hardie (2004) notes how Ovid by beginning *Met.* 1 with a prayer and by ending *Met.* 15 with a similar prayer "forma una cornice per le sue *Metamorfosi*." See n. 461 above for the similar structure of *Georgics* 1.

⁴⁶⁷ Hardie (2004) 623.

⁴⁶⁸ Feeney (1991) 222.

the work itself rather than as the product of outside influence.⁴⁶⁹ Regarding the force of these final lines Wickkiser asserts, “When read as part of the poem, the sphragis suggests instead a positive relationship between the princeps and poet in which the poet's own claims to greatness depend for their effect upon strong praise of Augustus.”⁴⁷⁰ When addressing more specifically the effect that the phrase *ira Iovis* has on the sphragis, Wickkiser prefers to connect it to the cosmogonical underpinnings of the poem, which were especially prominent in book 1, and to treat it as one of the four forces (alongside fire, sword, and time) that threaten to destroy the cosmos yet will inflict no harm upon Ovid’s poem.⁴⁷¹ On the opposite side is Dietram Müller, who calls the Augustan connection to Jove’s wrath unmistakable,⁴⁷² positing that Ovid is here contrasting the ephemeral nature of Augustus’ political power with the eternal longevity of Ovid’s poetic power, capped off by the poem’s final word, *vivam* (“I shall live”). Feeney goes on to discuss the implications of imperial power and the difficulty inherent in predicting divine/imperial castigation and beneficence.⁴⁷³ While Ovid seems to have highlighted the former in his *Met.*, the search for the latter will be the focus of much of his exile poetry.

V. Jupiter-Augustus in Ovid’s Exile Poetry

Notwithstanding the noticeable progression of the solemn and formalized treatment of the Jupiter-Augustus dynamic depicted in Horace’s *Odes* to the personalized and complex one we have seen in Ovid’s *Met.*, we are faced with an even more explicit archetype within his exile

⁴⁶⁹ Wickkiser (1999) who at 114 n. 4 provides a summary of some of the more polemical interpretations.

⁴⁷⁰ Wickkiser (1999) 114.

⁴⁷¹ Wickkiser (1999) 120-21.

⁴⁷² Müller (1987) 287 qualifies Ovid’s *Iovis ira* by saying “es ist unübersehbar, daß hier Augustus gemeint ist.”

⁴⁷³ Feeney (1991) 223-24.

poetry.⁴⁷⁴ Whereas it is generally understood that comparisons between Augustus and Jupiter were in the early stages an exercise in hyperbole and rhetoric—as it may well be even in parts of Ovid’s *Met.*—Ovid’s exile poetry takes them to a whole new level.⁴⁷⁵ For there, the hitherto mentioned *ira* of Jupiter/Augustus moves from the mythological into the historical realm with real life implications for the poet.⁴⁷⁶ In *Tristia* 1.1 Ovid directs his little book to travel to Rome, since he himself is not permitted to do so.⁴⁷⁷ Once there he imagines the book scaling the heights of the Palatine, not as the venue for a Senate meeting, but rather as the location whence Jupiter cast his mighty thunderbolt upon Ovid’s own head, thereby exiling him. The Palatine is now the Palatine—not the Palatine of sky (*Met.* 1.176)—but it is described as lofty (*alta Tr.* 1.1.69) and requires that the book ascend (*scandere Tr.* 1.1.70) in order to get there. Ovid initially refers to the Palatine as the place of Caesar’s home (*Caesareamque domum Tr.* 1.1.70), but then qualifies it as a place steeped in divine reverence as he begs forgiveness for his transgressions: *ignoscant augusta mihi loca dique locorum* (“May the *august* places and the gods of those places pardon me” *Tr.* 1.1.71). Such a line is overflowing with meaning. The *loca* is aptly referred to as *augusta* because Augustus lives there, but also because it has an *august* or divine quality to it as a result of being Augustus’ residence. This train of thought is, in turn, picked up by *dique*

⁴⁷⁴ Feeney (1991) 220 remarks, “Ovid here [in the *Met.*] establishes an analogy rather than an identification (in the exile poetry, as we shall see shortly, he needs a different tactic).”

⁴⁷⁵ Gaertner (2005) 13, following Drucker (1977) 58, stresses the “hyperbolic and rhetorical nature” of the early comparisons, likening them to Cicero’s comparison between Jupiter and Sulla (*S.Rosc.* 131).

⁴⁷⁶ Hejduk (2020) 266 remarks, “The ‘wrath of the wounded divinity’ combines the supreme emotionality of Virgil’s Juno with the supreme power of Virgil’s Jupiter as he relentlessly persecutes our long-suffering hero.”

⁴⁷⁷ Smith (2006) 47 calls attention to the dual meanings of *liber* as “book” and “free” in Ovid’s lament about his inability to accompany his book to Rome: *di facerent, possem nunc meus esse liber* (“Would that the gods were making it that I could now be my book/independent self”).

locorum, which alludes to the traditional gods who live on the Palatine, including Apollo and Vesta, but also to Augustus himself who in the next line suddenly becomes Jupiter: *venit in hoc illa fulmen ab arce caput* (“A thunderbolt came onto this head of mine from that citadel” *Tr.* 1.1.72). The *arx*, which had formerly been the citadel of the sky, doubling as the Capitoline hill, is now the Palatine hill, doubling as the citadel of the sky. There is no longer the need to differentiate between Jupiter in the sky and Augustus on the earth. The two are one and the same.⁴⁷⁸

The potential for Ovid’s book to approach the Palatine prompts Ovid to relate his deepest fear: that he might remain permanently in exile, the perpetual victim of the emperor’s wrath. In perhaps one of the most personal couplets in all of Ovid’s work, he acknowledges his fear of an ever-vengeful Jupiter-Augustus: *me quoque, quae sensi, fateor Iovis arma timere: / me reor infesto, cum tonat, igne peti* (“I too confess that I fear that which I have already felt, namely the weapons of Jove: I think that I am being attacked by the hostile thunderbolt whenever it thunders” *Tr.* 1.1.81-82). This time, all identifying features of the Princeps have been removed, save his association with Jove. Augustus does not use the law or his *auctoritas* to banish Ovid, but rather his weapons (*arma*) in the form of his hostile thunderbolt (*infesto...igne*).⁴⁷⁹ Jupiter’s *ira* is no longer anchored by the pre-established mythological content of the poem as it was in the *Met.*, but is free to strike again at any time. Ovid even projects his fear onto his book, telling it to approach Jupiter-Augustus only if his *ira* (1.1.94) has subsided and, if it has, to do so cautiously (*dubitantem* 1.1.95) and fearfully (*timentem* 1.1.95). And even if that *ira* has been

⁴⁷⁸ Cf. Hejduk (2020) 266 who says of the Jupiter/Augustus amalgam in the exile poetry, “All indirectness has vanished.”

⁴⁷⁹ The same *inimica...fulmina* that Jupiter had employed against *parum castis...lucis* (Hor. *C.* 1.12.59-60).

tempered to some degree, Ovid continues, there is no guarantee that it will not flair up again (*resaeviat ira* 1.1.103) and cause the poet even more trouble. McGowan argues that by framing his punishment in purely mythological terms, Ovid creates a poetic reality that allows him to cope with the true external reality.⁴⁸⁰ Yet, for someone who desires to shield himself from the reality of his current circumstances, Ovid shows a keen awareness of the contemporary political landscape and of the possibility of a more severe or permanent *poena*, should he rekindle the Princes' *ira*. Is it not better to view Ovid as embracing the new reality of Augustus' supreme hegemony and couching his exile in relatable and familiar terms? That is not to say that the general Roman populace thought of Jupiter every time they heard the name Augustus. But for the poet who had already closely developed this identification elsewhere and whose primary mode of expression is rooted in the mythological world, the complete replacement of Augustus with Jupiter seems only logical.⁴⁸¹

There are a few places in the *Tristia* where Ovid is less pessimistic with his divine references to the Princes, observing a more traditional and tactful approach. The most prominent example is in his letter to an unnamed noble (*Tr.* 4.4),⁴⁸² who is described only by his distinguished characteristics (*Tr.* 4.4.1-6). Despite the anonymity of the recipient, there seems to

⁴⁸⁰ McGowan (2009) 36.

⁴⁸¹ Also at *Tr.* 1.3.11 (*Iovis ignibus*); 3.1.38 (*magni...Iovis...domum*); 1.4.26 (*infestum...Iovem*); 1.5.78 (*Iovis ira*); 1.5.84 (*ira dei*); 2.179 (*fulmenque tuum*); 3.1.78 (*maxime dive*); 3.4.5 (*saevum...fulmen*); 3.5.7 (*igne Iovis*); 3.6.23 (*numinis...ira*); 3.11.62 (*Iovis ira*); 4.3.69 (*Iovis ignibus*); 4.4.17 (*sua numina*); 4.4.45 (*deus*); 4.4.88 (*placato...deo*); 4.8.46 (*rapido..igne*); 4.8.50 (*numinis ira*); 5.2.35 (*ille deus*); 5.2.46 (*cum Iove*); 5.2.53 (*tuo de fulmine*); 5.14.27 (*cum deus intonuit*).

⁴⁸² Likely Messalinus (cf. *Ov. Pont.* 1.7 and 2.2).

be some doubt as to whether the Princeps will look favorably on what Ovid has to say about him.⁴⁸³ Ovid quickly dismisses this possibility:

nec tamen officium nostro tibi carmine factum
 principe tam iusto posse nocere puto.
 ipse pater patriae—quid enim est civilius illo?—
 sustinet in nostro carmine saepe legi,
 nec prohibere potest, quia res est publica Caesar,
 et de communi pars quoque nostra bono est.
 Iuppiter ingeniis praebet sua numina vatumf,
 seque celebrari quolibet ore sinit.
 causa tua exemplo superiorum tuta duorum est,
 quorum hic aspicitur, creditur ille deus.

“Nor, however, do I think that the tribute bestowed upon you by my poem is able to harm you in the eyes of our exceptionally just Princeps. For the father of the fatherland himself—for what is more civil/public than that?—tolerates being read often in my poem, nor is he able to prevent it, because Caesar is the Republic, and a part of the commonwealth belongs to me as well. Jupiter offers his divinity to the poet’s art, and he allows himself to be discussed by any tongue. Your case is safe owing to the example of two gods, of whom the latter [Jupiter] is seen to be a god, while the former [Augustus] is believed to be one.” (Tr. 4.4.12-20)

This passage offers a fascinating look into Ovid’s thought process on divine assimilation.

McGowan refers us back to Horace *Odes* 3.5.1 where the verb *credidimus* was used to exemplify the long-established belief in Jupiter’s supremacy.⁴⁸⁴ He notes that not only has Ovid changed the Horatian verb tense from perfect (*credidimus*) to present (*creditur*), but he has also “inverted the Horatian aphorism by attaching the belief (*Carm.* 3.5.1: *credidimus*) to Augustus and making Jupiter the *divus praesens* whose power is manifest (*aspicitur*).”⁴⁸⁵ In the lead-up to this

⁴⁸³ Or that by appearing in one of Ovid’s poems he would be considered guilty by association.

⁴⁸⁴ McGowan (2009) 77.

⁴⁸⁵ McGowan (2009) 77.

reorganization of the Horatian viewpoint, Ovid praises Augustus' human qualities that are exceptional to the point of being divine. Two of his traditional titles are mentioned and both are accompanied by adjectives expressing his earthly temperament: *principe* (Princeps) who is *tam iusto* (so just) and *pater patriae* (father of the fatherland), a title befitting his public persona (*civilis*). Ovid then assimilates Augustus with the Republic, calling them one and the same (*res est publica Caesar*), and asserts that he too is a part of that very Republic.⁴⁸⁶ Thus if Ovid wants to write about Roman affairs, he cannot help but incorporate the very symbol of Rome into his writings. The insertion at this point of Jupiter as a figure distinct from Augustus is a bit odd, at least in terms of the *Tristia*. Why mention Jupiter at all if Ovid's focus is on the Princeps and his benevolent nature? Thus far in the *Tristia*, Jupiter's name has been synonymous with Augustus' *ira*. Now suddenly he serves as an example of poetic inspiration and liberality? But perhaps we can look at this from a different angle. Whereas Augustus is a byproduct of Ovid's poetic output and neither endorses (*sustinet*) nor avoids (*nec prohibere*) his inevitable presence within Ovid's work, Jupiter actually takes the initiative of offering (*praebet*) his divinity (*sua numina*) to the poet's art (*ingeniis...vatum*). Further, Jupiter does not put any restrictions on Ovid's poetic capacity and permits himself to be discussed in whatever fashion (*celebrari quolibet ore*).⁴⁸⁷ In essence, Jupiter renders Ovid free to say things about the Princeps that he might be hesitant to say using the Princeps' actual name.⁴⁸⁸ Jupiter affords Ovid a certain degree of poetic license, both as a stand-in for Augustus himself and as a divine bringer of inspiration.

⁴⁸⁶ A true statement since Ovid's "banishment" did not strip him of his Roman citizenship.

⁴⁸⁷ I believe Ovid is playing with two definitions of *celebro*: *OLD* s.v. 6 "to praise, extol, celebrate (in speech, song, writing, etc.)" and *OLD* s.v. 7 "(often w. *sermone* and sim.) to talk about, discuss." *ore* here serves the role of *sermone* and sim.

⁴⁸⁸ Particularly on the issue of Augustus' *ira*, which was thought of as inappropriate for a ruler of such stature (see McGowan [2009] 192-94 esp. n. 66).

The use of *sua numina* also recalls Ovid's own prayer to the Princeps at the end of *Tr.* 2 in the hopes of procuring a new location for his exile: *his, precor, atque aliis possint tua numina flecti* ("I pray that your divinity can be swayed by these and other (prayers)" *Tr.* 2.573). Thus when Ovid claims that Messalinus' *causa* is *exemplo superiorum tuta duorum* (*Tr.* 4.4.19), he is really alluding to two shades of the same divinity. Indeed, just below Ovid reverts back to his established custom of referring to the Princeps as a god: *idque deus sentit* ("The god perceives it" *Tr.* 4.4.45). He even revisits the recurring theme of Jupiter's *ira*, hoping that it might "become milder with the passing of time" (*tempore cum fuerit lenior ira* 4.4.48). This prompts him to make his request again for a milder place of exile (*mitius exilium* 4.4.51) and to appeal directly to "the great extent of Augustus' clemency" (*quantaque in Augusto clementia* 4.4.53).⁴⁸⁹ A progression is evident: it was a god who punished Ovid (*deus* 4.4.45), a god who is still nursing his anger (*ira* 4.4.48), but Augustus (*in Augusto* 4.4.53) who has the capability of showing mercy and granting Ovid's request for relocation. These two complementary modes of expression allow the *vates* to tack and jibe his poetic ship at will. While Ovid may acknowledge the anger of the one, so too may he embrace the benevolence of the other.⁴⁹⁰ Returning then to the initial question surrounding the abrupt separation of Jupiter and Augustus at this particular juncture, we may conclude that Ovid is simply falling back on what Hinds refers to as his hermeneutic alibi.⁴⁹¹ If we look closer, we will see that Ovid has in fact cloaked in ambiguity his profound statement

⁴⁸⁹ McGowan (2009) 78 neatly summarizes Ovid's treatment of the Jupiter-Augustus dynamic within his exile poetry: "Ovid's analogy between Jupiter and Augustus throughout the exile poetry leaves no doubt that the princeps' power over the running of the state...was absolute."

⁴⁹⁰ Hardie (2002) 9 acknowledges the emphasis on divine favor in Ovid's exile poetry: "In the exile poetry the power of a *deus praesens*, and in particular of the imperial god-man, to save becomes an obsessive focus of attention."

⁴⁹¹ See introduction n. 24.

that betwixt Jupiter and Augustus, one is seen (*aspicitur*), while the other is believed (*creditur*) to be a god. While Jupiter may be the divine figure par excellence and be recognized as such, he is not physically visible to the people in the way Augustus is. And while Augustus is highly visible as an already quasi-divine figure through art, architecture, coins, and poetry, recognition of his divinity lies in the domain of the people and their adherence to ritual activity. Thus Ovid satisfies two sides of the same coin by at first separating and then conjoining the identities of these two “divine” figures.⁴⁹² Let us now turn to specific instances of Jupiter in the *Fasti* and consider the ways in which they may color the reader’s perception of Augustus and Augustanism.

VI. Jupiter and Janus on the Kalends of January

Just as we discussed Juno’s affiliation with the Kalends in the previous chapter, so too is it worth examining Ovid’s statement that the Ides belong to Jupiter: *vindicat Ausonias Iunonis cura Kalendas; / Idibus alba Iovi grandior agna cadit* (“The worship of Juno claims the Ausonian Kalends; a greater white lamb falls to Jupiter on the Ides” *Fast.* 1.55-56). As we shall see, the Ides of January contain mention of this very sacrifice, something that the Kalends of January does not do for Juno. Although the adjective *grandior* here modifies the sacrificial victim, its placement next to *Iovi* reminds the reader of Jove’s greatness, which Janus will playfully attempt to undermine in his ensuing dialogue with the poem’s narrator. But even before Janus begins to speak, Ovid describes the inauguration of the new consuls on the first of the month, which features a sacrifice to Jupiter in the guise of a tutelary Roman deity: *Iuppiter arce sua totum cum spectet in orbem, / nil nisi Romanum quod tueatur habet* (“When Jupiter looks down upon the entire world from his citadel, he beholds nothing to protect that is not Roman”

⁴⁹² Not that dissimilar from the post-Actium coins discussed above that interwove features of Augustus and Jupiter on either side.

1.85-86).⁴⁹³ Just prior Ovid tells of a sacrifice of unbroken bullocks (*rudes...iuvenci* 1.83), which, although differing from the sacrifice that will take place on the Ides involving sheep, nevertheless adds gravitas to the stately depiction of Jupiter that follows. As Green notes, the two vantage points from which Jupiter looks down are the citadel of the sky or the Capitoline hill.⁴⁹⁴ The word *arx* is interchangeably used for both, with it referring to the sky at *Met.* 1.163 and 15.858-9 and the Capitoline hill at *Fast.* 6.18, 183, 349, and 387. Since the sacrifice itself is taking place on the Capitoline hill, the site of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, it is preferable to imagine Jupiter being present for that ceremony.⁴⁹⁵ Regardless, Jupiter's extensive gaze is said to fall over Roman occupied territory, a nod to Jupiter's promise to Venus in *Aeneid* 1 that he would endow the future Romans with "power without limit" (*imperium sine fine* 1.279). Although Augustus himself does not appear in this entry, the abundance of bright/gleaming words (*luceat* 1.75; *nitore* 1.77; *fulget* 1.81; *conspicuum* 1.82), culminating in the statement of imperial vastness, bespeak Jovian greatness and no doubt reflect positively upon Augustus. Janus himself will appropriate line 1.86 later in his discussion with Ovid when he claims: *nil mihi cum bello: pacem postesque tuebar* ("I have nothing to do with war: I was protecting peace and the doorposts" *Fast.* 1.253). Such a statement is the antithesis of imperial expansion, couched in similar terms to the vast empire that Jupiter helps preserve.

Our first glimpse of Jupiter from a voice other than that of Ovid the narrator comes from the mouth of Janus. We have seen how Janus manipulates the reader's perception of Juno by

⁴⁹³ The sacrifice was made on the Capitoline hill at the altar in front of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (cf. *Ov. Pont.* 4.9.29-32).

⁴⁹⁴ Green (2004a) 66.

⁴⁹⁵ Hardie (2004) 613 discusses the frequency with which *arx* = *cittadella del cielo* in Ovid, yet says of its usage here, "*Iuppiter arce sua* potrebbe indicare sia il Campidoglio che la cittadella celeste."

painting her as inimical towards the Romans.⁴⁹⁶ The manner in which Janus speaks of Jupiter, however, is more nuanced. When Janus is in the process of answering Ovid's inquiry about his origins and his ability to see both backward and forward, Janus exploits an opportunity for self-aggrandizement. Features that would normally fall under Jupiter's domain are commandeered by Janus under slightly different terms. He claims dominion over the sky, sea, clouds, and earth (*caelum, mare, nubila, terras* 1.117),⁴⁹⁷ but qualifies his power in the next line when he admits that he merely controls the opening and closing of all these realms (*omnia sunt nostra clausa patentque manu* 1.118).⁴⁹⁸ He goes on to claim responsibility for the guardianship of the whole world (*vasti custodia mundi* 1.119), the release of *Pax* (1.121), and the restraint of *Bella* (1.122-23), concepts all closely associated with Augustus.⁴⁹⁹ After stressing the power he wields over human affairs, he then turns to his role as celestial doorkeeper, inserting what Green refers to as a "mock-pompous aside:"⁵⁰⁰ *it, redit officio Iuppiter ipse meo* ("Jupiter himself comes and goes as a result of my service" 1.126). Observe that Janus here encircles Jupiter's name with the words *officio* and *meo*, reiterating that Jupiter is at the behest of Janus. This may serve as a nod back to *Amores* 1.6 where the doorkeeper (*ianitor*) was endowed with Jovian power and had the

⁴⁹⁶ See the discussion in the previous chapter of *Fast.* 1.265-72. For Janus' tendency to exaggerate throughout his speech see Green (2004a) 97-98.

⁴⁹⁷ With Green (2004a) 80 noting, "The asyndeton here helps to convey a sense of boundless sovereignty."

⁴⁹⁸ According to Varro *Antiquitates* fr. 236 Cardauns: *penes Ianum...sunt prima, penes Iovem summa* ("The beginning belongs to Janus and the end belongs to Jove"). See Hardie (2004) 615.

⁴⁹⁹ Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.286-96 where Jupiter predicts Augustus' worldly supremacy (*imperium oceano, famam qui terminet astris* 1.287), the era of peace he will usher in (*aspera tum positis mitescent saecula bellis* 1.287), and the closing of the gates of war at his behest (*claudentur Belli portae* 1.294).

⁵⁰⁰ Green (2004a) 81.

ability to bar the elegiac amator from entering the premises of his beloved mistress.⁵⁰¹ Such a representation clashes with Jupiter's magisterial debut in the *Met.* where he is seated high above the others, wielding the scepter, and presiding over a council of sycophantic gods.⁵⁰² Here in the *Fasti*, Jupiter's movements are, according to Janus, under Janus' control—and by extension dictated by the movement of the Roman Calendar. Jupiter is no longer depicted as having *carte blanche* power, as he was in the *Met.* He is now subject to the statements of the various divine interlocutors as well as to the highly structured nature of the calendar. By making Janus the mouthpiece, Ovid removes himself from the equation and plays the part of the eager listener, constantly probing, but never questioning the veracity of Janus' claims.

At another point in the conversation, Ovid asks Janus about the reason for giving the gods monetary gifts (1.189). Janus responds by saying it is a result of the current age and compares Ovid's era to that of the distant past. He describes the original cult statue of Jupiter as lacking adequate space in his temple and holding a thunderbolt of clay (*Iuppiter angusta vix totus stabat in aede, / inque Iovis dextra fictile fulmen erat* 1.201-02). Although Bömer, following Frazer, wants to see a reference here to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius built by Romulus that apparently housed the *spolia opima*,⁵⁰³ Green convincingly argues that this is rather a reference to the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, also known as Jupiter Capitolinus, which the historical records show initially contained a statue of Jupiter made from clay under the rule of Tarquinius

⁵⁰¹ Cf. especially *Am.* 1.6.16: *tu, me quo possis perdere, fulmen habes* ("You [doorkeeper] hold the thunderbolt with which you can destroy me").

⁵⁰² *Met.* 1.177-252.

⁵⁰³ Bömer (1958) 27 who acknowledges that this early temple lacked a cult statue, preferring to attribute Ovid's mention of the clay statue to the diminutive status of the temple itself: "vielmehr ist *fictilis* ebenso wie *vix stabat* als Ausdruck für die primitive Einfachheit (in der Phantasie des Dichters) aufzufassen."

Priscus.⁵⁰⁴ When the temple burned in the year 83 B.C. a new more luxurious temple was constructed by Quintus Lutatius Catulus that included a statue of Jupiter made from gold and ivory, which replaced the older clay one.⁵⁰⁵ Further, the reference to the Capitoline immediately below (*Capitolia* 203) seems to indicate that this temple was, indeed, that of Jupiter Capitolinus.⁵⁰⁶ Indeed, Richardson goes so far as to cite this very couplet as evidence that the original temple's cult statue brandished a thunderbolt.⁵⁰⁷

The specificity of the temple notwithstanding, the image of *Iuppiter totus* here clashes with Ovid's earlier magisterial depiction of a Jupiter who is not confined to a temple, but looks over *totum...orbem* (1.85). While the reference to Jove's cramped quarters is the culmination of two other such statements just above (the small house of Quirinus [*casa...parva* 1.199] and his tiny bed [*exiguum...torum* 1.200]), the inherent greatness and magnitude of the king of the gods amplifies the humor of seeing him confined to an enclosure barely able to fit him.⁵⁰⁸ Further, the juxtaposition of *Iuppiter* and *angusta* is deliberate, indicating Jupiter's importance in relation to

⁵⁰⁴ Green (2004a) 102, citing Cic. *Div.* 1.16, Plin. *Nat.* 35.157. See also Richardson (1992) 221-24 for additional sources.

⁵⁰⁵ Green (2004a) 102, citing Joseph. *Ant. Iud.* 19.1.2.

⁵⁰⁶ Green (2004a) 103, citing Platner/Ashby s.v. *Capitolinus mons*.

⁵⁰⁷ Richardson (1992) 222. Regarding the cult statue of the new temple built by Catulus, Richardson remarks, "The cult statue was replaced by a seated image, perhaps in imitation of the Zeus of Olympia. He carried a scepter and thunderbolt (Suet., *Aug.* 94.6)." The fact that the old cult statue appears to have depicted Zeus standing rather than sitting might have contributed to Janus' remark that he barely fit within his temple.

⁵⁰⁸ Cf. Prop. 4.1.7 where the primitive figure of the "Tarpeian Father" merely thunders from a bare cliff prior to the construction of his multiple temples upon the Capitoline hill. Cf. also Tib. 2.5.26 for a description of the Capitoline hill prior to the foundation of Rome when "humble huts stood on the citadel of Jove" (*et stabant humiles in Iovis arce casae*).

the petty edifice built to honor him.⁵⁰⁹ Perhaps more significantly, it gives the reader pause, since the phrase *Iuppiter augustus* would be an apt characterization for the god,⁵¹⁰ considering Ovid's conflation of the two elsewhere and the impending association between *summus Iuppiter* and *aug-ustus* on the Ides of January. In fact, the art of embedding this dual sense in the form of *angusta* is not unique to Ovid. For Vergil employed the same technique in *Aeneid* 8 when he has Aeneas enter the house of Evander on the Palatine hill, the future site of Augustus' personal residence, and describes the entry as occurring *angusti subter fastigia tecti* ("beneath the roof of the narrow house" *Aen.* 8.366). The reader is at once transported to Vergil's own time and can imagine Aeneas entering a house that will one day become the *Augusti tecta*.⁵¹¹ Likewise, we can also detect from the juxtaposition of *Iuppiter* and *angusta* an implicit contrast between the ancient temple of Jupiter which can barely contain its statue and the much more grandiose temple that existed under Augustus.⁵¹² Indeed, Janus goes on to make that contrast explicit by comparing the simple customs of old with the elaborate customs of the present.⁵¹³ He concludes

⁵⁰⁹ Perhaps also a nod back to Janus' placement of *Iuppiter* between *and officio* and *meo* at *Fast.* 1.126.

⁵¹⁰ Although Ovid nowhere explicitly refers to Jupiter as *augustus*, in the exile poetry he often weaves back and forth between referring to Augustus as *deus/Iuppiter* and *Princeps/Augustus*. This reading would offer a blend of the two.

⁵¹¹ Fratantuono and Smith (2018) 469, citing Gransden and noting that the word-play occurs here "at the exact midpoint of the book."

⁵¹² Granted *angusta* cannot be grammatically taken with *Iuppiter*. The point is merely that the word itself evokes Augustus even before the reader has made grammatical sense of the line. The rebuilding of the temple of *Iuppiter Capitolinus* had been begun by Sulla and completed by Quintus Lutatius Catulus in 69 B.C. (Tac. *Hist.* 3.72.3). Augustus contributed to major renovations of it without imposing his own name over Catulus' (Aug. *R.G.* 20).

⁵¹³ *Fast.* 1.202: *frondibus ornabant quae nunc Capitolia gemmis* ("They were adorning the Capitol with leaves, which is now adorned with gems").

not by giving preference to more decadent practices of the present,⁵¹⁴ but by treating the two eras equally: *mos tamen est aeque dignus uterque coli* (“nevertheless both customs are equally worthy of being cherished” 1.226).

Green rightfully detects that Janus creates tension by offering contradictory information.⁵¹⁵ He who had claimed just before that gold is preferred to copper (1.221) and that gods enjoy golden temples (1.223-24) concludes by straddling both sides of the fence. This technique mimics the judgment of Ovid after the arguments of the Muses over the derivation of May as well as after that of Juno, Juventas, and Concordia over the derivation of June.⁵¹⁶ After listening to the Muses and the Gods plead their case, Ovid preaches impartiality and refuses to make a decision that favors any particular deity. Pasco-Pranger views this indecision as Ovid’s way of promoting multiple etymologies that “ask the reader to turn attention to the relation of old to young, past to present, and simultaneously to the month-pair just over the horizon.”⁵¹⁷ So too does Janus place one foot in the present and one in the past as a way of drawing out the dichotomy between Augustus’ magnificent and costly building program and the far less ornate design of those temples in the olden days. Further, Janus’ statement, *laudamus veteres, sed nostris utimur annis* (“we praise the old, but we take advantage of our times” 1.225), serves as a stand-in for Ovid’s own agenda in the *Fasti*, in which he complements the simplicity and tradition of the past with the novelty of contemporary imperial festivals. The phrase *nostris...*

⁵¹⁴ This decadence is implied when Janus says, *creverunt et opes et opum furiosa cupido, / et, cum possideant plurima, plura petunt* (“Both wealth and the raging desire for wealth have increased, and when people possess the most, they still seek more 1.211-12).” See also Green (2004a) 98 who says, “for the most part, early Rome is seen as encapsulating all the good qualities of mankind, whereas modern Rome represents ultimate degeneration.”

⁵¹⁵ Green (2004a) 112.

⁵¹⁶ *Fast.* 5.107-10 and 6.97-100.

⁵¹⁷ Pasco-Pranger (2006) 18.

annis (1.225) here has special significance and can be viewed as the extension of Ovid's initial programmatic promise to sing of *tempora*, with an added focus on Ovid's own times. Such a reading coalesces nicely with the inherent dual nature of *biceps* Janus who naturally looks both forward and backward.⁵¹⁸ A closer look at Janus' reference to the earlier temple of Jupiter may shed some light on this phenomenon.

While the couplet of 1.201-02 describes what the temple of either Jupiter Feretrius or, more likely, Jupiter Optimus Maximus, looked like when it was first built, it also includes subtle allusions to its Augustan counterpart.⁵¹⁹ One sign of this is the aforementioned placement of *angusta* immediately after *Iuppiter*, which also occupies the *sedes* right before the caesura and thus gives the word even greater emphasis. The standard reading leaves no doubt that Jupiter's statue takes up the majority of space in this *angusta aedes* from primitive Rome. Yet, if the reader in his/her haste accidentally read the adjective describing the *aedes* as *Augusta* rather than *angusta*, a reversal would be at hand.⁵²⁰ Surely a reconstructed Augustan temple would have ample room for a much larger cult statue of Jupiter. In the following line we are even given a glimpse of the new temple founded by Augustus for another of Jupiter's cults. The reference to Jupiter's clay thunderbolt (*fictile fulmen* 1.202) activates a secondary association with the cult

⁵¹⁸ Fantham (1995) 52 poses the question, "If Ovid's Janus is two faced, must this be a signal that Ovid too is sending double messages?" In this case, and in many others, it would seem that Ovid does present the reader with two (or more) distinctive views.

⁵¹⁹ Green (2004a) 97-98 discusses the general difficulties of comparing the past to the present during the Augustan period, commenting, "In effect, Janus' speech exposes the (ineluctable) tension in Augustan discourse between, on the one hand, a legitimate pride in the splendour of contemporary Rome and, on the other hand, a respect for the simple values of the primitive city (which carries with it a notion of *degeneration* through time)."

⁵²⁰ Hejduk (2020) 253 notes the contrast.

and temple of Jupiter Tonans,⁵²¹ for whom Augustus vowed a temple in 26 B.C. after narrowly avoiding being struck by lightning while on campaign in Cantabria.⁵²² This temple, which was also on the Capitoline, famously ornate and had walls made of solid marble.⁵²³ Further, from looking at the reverse of an Augustan denarius that bore his own image on the obverse, we can confirm that the cult statue of Jupiter Tonans held either a scepter or spear in his left hand and a thunderbolt in his right hand.⁵²⁴ The difference, of course, is that the cult statue of the Augustan temple of Jupiter Tonans likely held a thunderbolt of gold as opposed to one of clay. The mention of the thunderbolt formed from clay (*fictile fulmen*) also signifies a drastic change between the literary past and present/future. In the exile poetry there is a constant focus on the damage done onto Ovid by Jupiter/Augustus' *fulmen*, with attention often directed at the nature of its fire (*ignis*).⁵²⁵ In contemporary times that fiery image was captured by the golden thunderbolt that the cult statue of Jupiter held in his hands. Thus, in a way, the older depiction of Jupiter is deprived of the power of his *ira*, which has a distinctly Augustan flavor, especially in relation to the effect it has (or will have) on the poet himself.⁵²⁶ This speaks to the tension of the

⁵²¹ Richardson (1992) 226-27 who notes, "There is naturally confusion of Iuppiter Tonans and Jupiter Capitolinus in the literary sources, so it is impossible to tell which is meant sometimes."

⁵²² Suet. *Aug.* 29. and Cass. Dio. 54.4.2-4. It was dedicated in 22 B.C.

⁵²³ Pl. *HN* 36.50.

⁵²⁴ Zanker (1988) 109, Fig. 89a. This matches Janus' description of the statue holding a thunderbolt in its right hand (*Fast.* 1.202).

⁵²⁵ See n. 481 above. Kenney (1982) 444 attests that "The identification of Augustus with Jupiter, often in association with the thunderbolt image, occurs in over thirty of the fifty poems that make up *Tristia* Books 1 and 3-5." See also Ward (1933) 210.

⁵²⁶ Hejduk (2020) 253 who sees in the *Fasti* a general trend of the disarming of Jupiter and the reducing the strength of his thunderbolt comments, "An inadequate statue may not diminish the power of Jupiter or his weapon in fact, but it does telegraph the poem's strategy of dampening it wherever possible."

entire Janus episode between the utopian days of old and the degenerative present that Green has observed.⁵²⁷ Although Janus humors Ovid with his feigned attempt at balancing the positive aspects of the past and present, he does not do a very good job at masking his preference for the days of yore. Ovid's entry for the Ides of January, however, will show that the present era is without a doubt the more significant one, owing to one factor alone—the greatness of Augustus. Ultimately, Janus' version of Jupiter in cramped quarters, holding a thunderbolt forged from clay, and endowed with limited powers, apart from having obvious comedic value, establishes a dichotomy with the more grandiose, contemporary version of Jupiter to whom Augustus will be compared on the Ides and beyond.

VII. The Ides of January

Ovid begins the Ides of January with the aforementioned sacrifice that was customarily held on every Ides in honor of Jupiter: *Idibus in magni castus Iovis aede sacerdos / semimaris flammis viscera libat ovis* ("On the Ides in the temple of great Jove a chaste priest sacrifices the entrails of a gelded ram in the flames" *Fast.* 1.587-58).⁵²⁸ Here the *castus sacerdos* no doubt stands in for the *Flamen Dialis*,⁵²⁹ the high priest of Jupiter, and a gelded ram (*semimaris...ovis*) has replaced the *alba agna* of 1.56. The sacrifice is said to take place "in the temple of great Jove" (*in magni...Iovis aede*), almost certainly a reference to the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline hill,⁵³⁰ although references to Jupiter Tonans abound elsewhere.

⁵²⁷ Green (2004a) 98 and 102 where he observes "*fictilia* becomes symbolic of earlier generations' morality."

⁵²⁸ On the previous entry Jupiter also receives an offering when Hercules celebrates his victory over Cacus by sacrificing a bull to Jove (*Fast.* 1.579).

⁵²⁹ See Hejduk (2020) 259.

⁵³⁰ See Green (2004a) 269. Also, the mention of "large/great Jupiter in a temple" may serve to reverse the image of the "Jupiter in a small temple" that Janus provided at *Fast.* 1.201.

Although *magnus* is a stock epithet for Jupiter and one that Ovid uses rather freely,⁵³¹ its presence here anticipates the series of titles that Ovid will provide in ascending order, culminating in the comparison between Augustus and Jupiter. In fact, Jupiter's divine honor is immediately juxtaposed with Augustus' earthly honor, as we are told in the very next couplet, addressed to Germanicus: *redditaque est omnis populo provincia nostro / et tuus Augusto nomine dictus avus* ("[on this same day] every province was restored to our people and your grandfather was honored with the name 'Augustus'"). Although Ovid elects to group these two events together on the Ides of January, we know from the *Fasti Praenestini* that the title of Augustus was conferred upon him on the 16th not the 13th of January in 27 B.C.⁵³² Barchiesi has argued convincingly that this phenomenon represents a deliberate attempt to conflate two opposing actions, namely the idea of restoration (of the Republic) and transformation (of Augustus from human to divine status), and to sandwich them between two aspects of the Carmentalia,⁵³³ thereby creating what he refers to as a syntagmatic tension.⁵³⁴

Another sort of tension is created when Ovid designates the sacrifice as taking place in the temple of *magni Iovis* on the day on which the Princeps was first called *Augustus*. As Green notes, Ovid devotes a couplet apiece to the honors bestowed upon Jupiter and Augustus.⁵³⁵ Green goes on to say that by doing so, Ovid "neatly forges an initial similarity between the two which will be made explicit at the climax of the eulogy."⁵³⁶ While it is true that these couplets

⁵³¹ Jupiter is described as *magnus* at *Fast.* 1.294, 1.650, 2.670, 3.448, 3.730, 5.40, 5.248, 6.79, and 6.196.

⁵³² See Degraffi (1963) 113.

⁵³³ Evander and Carmenta's arrival in Latium (1.461-586) and the grim action of how the Ausonian *matronae* were stripped of the honor of riding in carriages (*carpenta*) (1.617-36).

⁵³⁴ Barchiesi (1997a) 94-95.

⁵³⁵ Green (2004a) 271.

⁵³⁶ Green (2004a) 271.

foreshadow the explicit comparison between Augustus and Jupiter, that comparison will be between Augustus and *summus Iuppiter*, both of which represent the highest forms of nomenclature. By initially referring to Jupiter as *magnus* rather than *summus* Ovid preliminarily upends his subsequent hierarchy of Roman leaders. Although this initial designation of *magnus* is technically independent of the later usage of *Magnus* describing Pompey the Great, it nevertheless sets an odd precedent for the degrees of progression that will follow, culminating in *summus Iuppiter* and Augustus. Yet, Ovid proceeds to tell the reader that Augustus is unique: *contigerunt nulli nomina tanta viro* (“such a title fell upon no (other) man” 1.592). In doing so, Ovid not only emphasizes the prestige of Augustus’ special title, but alludes to his divine status by claiming that this designation fell to “no man.” We then hear of several prominent Roman leaders who earned their titles from the name of the region/tribe they conquered.⁵³⁷ Augustus, however, called *Caesar* (1.599),⁵³⁸ has conquered so many territories that his *nomina* would extend indefinitely were he to adopt this style of naming: *si petat a victis, tot sumet nomina Caesar / quot numero gentes maximus orbis habet* (“If Caesar were to seek titles from the conquered, he would assume as many names as the greatest circle of lands has races” 1.599-600). The inclusion of *maximus* may serve as a clever nod to another epithet of Jupiter who similarly holds numerous titles, achieved not by conquering, as in the case of Augustus, but by the broad spectrum of his worship.⁵³⁹ Although the phrase *maximus orbis* no doubt refers to the world,

⁵³⁷ Among these are Publius Cornelius Scipio *Africanus* (1.593), Publius Servilius Vata *Isauricus* (1.593-4), Quintus Metellus *Creticus* (1.594), Marcus Valerius *Messalla* (1.595), Publius Cornelius Scipio *Numantinus* (1.596), and Nero Claudius Drusus *Germanicus* (1.597-98), the last of whom is the father of the poem’s primary dedicatee.

⁵³⁸ There is debate as to whether the *Caesar* of 1.599 is Augustus or Julius Caesar, but I concur with Green (2004a) 272 and 276 in reading Augustus here.

⁵³⁹ Each epithet of Jupiter denotes a slightly different aspect of his worship.

maximus is a marked word, owing to the previous mention of *magni Iovis* and the escalation of the titles that Ovid is about to discuss.⁵⁴⁰ Thus although grammatically it does not relate to Augustus himself, it serves to further connect him with Jupiter Optimus Maximus and anticipates the upcoming section where he will be placed on par with the divine.

Ovid then transitions away from geographical titles toward those gained by other methods, culminating in the trifecta of *magnus*, *maior*, *maximus*. Yet, Ovid backs himself into a proverbial corner by adhering too closely to the hierarchy of the titles at the expense of the persons attached to them. The progression from Pompey to Caesar seems natural enough and Ovid capitalizes on the latter's defeat of the former in order to emphasize Caesar's superiority (1.603-4). But what of the shift from *magnus* to *maior*? Julius Caesar in fact considered adopting the name *Magnus* for himself,⁵⁴¹ but Ovid could not use such a title for Julius Caesar as it would give him the same designation as Pompey. Further, none of the degrees of *magnus* was ever a part of Caesar's name, as was the case for the others, and in the context of the *Fasti* the term *maior* merely indicates that Julius Caesar is superior to Pompey Magnus, and not to the two remaining figures. In another sense, however, the designation of *maior* and the act of being *maius* is something typically reserved for Augustus and is frequently employed in reference to Augustus by the Augustan poets, including Ovid.⁵⁴² Calling Caesar *maior* in the manner of

⁵⁴⁰ For a list of the hierarchy of *magnus*, *maior*, *maximus* elsewhere in Latin literature see Wills (1996) 237-38.

⁵⁴¹ See Weinstock (1971) 53 n. 4 and 181 n. 1, which cites Catul. 11.10 in which Catullus refers to the *Caesaris monimenta magni* (or *Magni*).

⁵⁴² For example, *maius* has an Augustan resonance when used to describe Augustus' name written upon the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus: *spectat et Augusto praetextum nomine templum,/ et visum lecto Caesare maius opus* ([Mars] looks upon the temple inscribed with the name Augustus, and the work seemed greater upon reading the name Caesar" *Fast.* 5.557-58).

Augustus would be fine if Ovid's hierarchy went directly from Caesar to Augustus, but it does not. The Fabii Maximi separate Caesar from Augustus: *nec gradus est supra Fabios cognominis ullus: / illa domus meritis Maxima dicta suis* ("nor is any degree of *cognomen* beyond that of the Fabii: that house was called *Maxima* on behalf of their services").⁵⁴³ Ovid here is clearly praising the great Quintus Fabius Maximus Cunctator, a nod to his appearance in the show of Roman heroes in *Aen.* 6, where Vergil also refers to him as *Maximus*: *tu Maximus ille es, / unus qui nobis cunctando restituis rem* ("You are that greatest one, you who alone restore the State for us by delaying" *Aen.* 6.846). Vergil's comment about Fabius "restoring the State for us" is in a way echoed by Ovid's earlier statement that Augustus "restored every province to our people" (1.589). In addition, Ovid's statement at 1.605 that no degree of title supersedes that of the Fabii bears a striking similarity to his statement at 1.592 above that the title of Augustus was unmatched by anyone (*contigerunt nulli / nomina tanta viro*). Thus a family of Republican heroes, whose story will be told in more detail on the Ides of February in the absence of the imperial family, are more closely aligned with Augustus than his own predecessor and father figure in whose wake he would establish his divine legacy.⁵⁴⁴ For at the conclusion of the Ides of February Ovid expands upon his praise of the Fabii with a word-for-word reformulation of the Vergilian counterpart: *scilicet ut posses olim tu, Maxime, nasci, / cui res cunctando restituenda foret* ("[One member of your family survived] no doubt so that one day, Maximus, you could be born, by whom the State will be restored through your tactic of delay" *Fast.* 2.241-42).

⁵⁴³ It is interesting that the entry immediately before that of the Ides addresses the aetiology of the Ara Maxima, an altar founded by Hercules following the sacrifice of a bull to Jupiter (*Fast.* 1.579-81), resembling the sacrifice of the sheep to Jupiter that began this entry (*Fast.* 1.587-88).

⁵⁴⁴ See the earlier discussion of *Met.* 15 for the question of how integral a role Augustus actually played in the early stages of Caesar's deification.

It may be that Ovid is simply paying homage to his close friend, Paullus Fabius Maximus, to whom many of his exile writings are addressed in the hopes of procuring a recall from wretched Tomis.⁵⁴⁵ Indeed, one of Ovid's appeals to his friend from exile is couched in familiar terms. Ovid begins *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.2 as follows: *Maxime, qui tanti / mensuram nominis imples* ("Maximus, you who fill the measure of so great a name..."). Both the vocative address and the phrase *tanti mensuram nominis* remind us of Ovid's earlier praise of Pompey: *Magne, tuum nomen / rerum est mensura tuarum* (1.603). While Pompey Magnus bears a name that is the measure of his deeds, Ovid's friend Paullus Fabius Maximus bears a name that is the measure of his character. Augustus' name will prove to be the measure of his divinity.

Mention of the Fabian gens does more than merely draw attention to their ancestral heroism. Recall that the comparison between Jupiter and Augustus had been prefaced by the entry's first two couplets (1.587-90). Upon hearing the Fabii's cognomen *Maxima*, one cannot help but think of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the very god to whom Augustus is about to be linked. In response to such high praise concerning the Fabii, Ovid adds some clarity: the *Maximi* along with all of the other aforementioned leaders are celebrated with human honors (*humanis celebrantur honoribus* 1.607), whereas Augustus "has a name that is joined with highest Jove" (*hic socium summo cum Iove nomen habet* 1.608).⁵⁴⁶ As Barchiesi points out, by adopting the name 'Augustus' derived from *augeo*, the Princeps separates himself from all past Roman heroes including those with *cognomina* reflecting the degrees of their greatness, and puts himself "in company of *highest* Jove."⁵⁴⁷ Yet Barchiesi neglects to stress the significance of choosing the

⁵⁴⁵ Boyle (2003) 215 sees this entire passage as occurring after the death of Paullus Fabius Maximus in 14 A.D., thus making Ovid's reference to the Fabian gens heavily ironic.

⁵⁴⁶ For the debate of whether *hic* (1.608) refers to Augustus or Tiberius see Green (2004a) 278-79. I follow Green in preferring to construe *hic* with Augustus.

⁵⁴⁷ Barchiesi (1997a) 94.

Ides on which to promote Jupiter's connection with Augustus. On no other day is this comparison more fitting. That is arguably Ovid's primary reason for moving forward in the calendar the day on which Octavian actually received this honorific title,⁵⁴⁸ namely so that his connection to Jupiter might be all the more powerful. Ovid's transition, however, from those elite Romans who receive human honors to Augustus who uniquely shares a place with Jupiter does not alleviate other concerns. For one, it is a bit odd that Julius Caesar, despite already having been deified, is grouped together with those celebrated with "human honors." One might expect Ovid to allude to his divine status, as he does on the Nones of February in the *Pater Patriae* passage, where Augustus' glory stems from deifying his own father.⁵⁴⁹ But instead, he puts Augustus in a league of his own. Secondly, the title used for Jupiter is now *summus*, which although it serves as an upgrade from the earlier *magnus*, does not entirely shed the presence of the *Fabii*, whose name is said to be *supra* ("beyond" 1.605) all others. For the words *summus* and *supra* are etymologically linked with *summus* being a superlative adjective formed from the preposition *supra*.⁵⁵⁰

We were told above (1.590), erroneously of course, that Octavian received the name Augustus on this day. We now hear the second part of that story: that it was the Roman senators, called *patres*, who bestowed that honor upon him (1.609). Ovid then goes on to define *augusta* as *templa sacerdotum rite dicata manu* ("temples that have been ritually dedicated by the hands of priests" 1.610). The mention of priests and ritual dedications serves to combine the sacrifices that are taking place in the temple of Jupiter on this day with Augustus' own role as *Pontifex*

⁵⁴⁸ See n. 532 above.

⁵⁴⁹ *Fast.* 2.144: *caelestem fecit te pater, ille patrem* ("[Romulus'] father made you a divine, whereas that one [Augustus] made his father divine."

⁵⁵⁰ Maclardy (1901) 76, 100, 150, and 242.

Maximus and his consecration of numerous temples, mentioned elsewhere in the *Fasti*. Finally, Ovid completes this etymological tour-de-force by stating *et quodcumque sua Iuppiter auget ope* (“And whatsoever Jupiter augments with his power (is also derived from *August*)” 1.612). The word *opes*, which earlier (1.594) referred to a city’s power assimilated by the human conqueror, is now something to be wielded by mighty Jupiter. The juxtaposition of *Iuppiter* and *auget* cements the bond between the *rex deorum* and the Princeps. Whereas they initially shared adjacent couplets (1.587-90), they now stand side-by-side next to each other, both divine, and both the bearers of the most prestigious *nomen* among gods and men.

Ovid concludes the entry with a prayer, also capitalizing on the aforementioned connection between *augeo* and Jupiter: *augeat imperium nostri ducis, augeat annos, / protegat et vestras querna corona fores* (“May Jupiter augment the power of our leader, may he augment his years, and may his garland of oak protect your door-posts” 1.613-14). But all of these wishes are firmly grounded in the earthly realm. The desire that the *dux* have more power, years, and protection all separate him from the divine and put back amongst his mortal counterparts. Yet the presence of *vestras* points to a plural group that no longer includes Augustus alone.⁵⁵¹ The prayer continues, not for Augustus, but for his heir apparent, likely Germanicus: *auspicibusque deis tanti cognominis heres / omine suscipiat, quo pater, orbis onus* (“Under the auspices of the gods, may the heir of such a great name take up the burden of the world with the same omen as his father” 1.615-16).⁵⁵² Ovid himself has now taken over the role of the *sacerdos*, who performed the sacrifice to Jupiter at the entry’s beginning, and his final prayer replaces Jupiter with the

⁵⁵¹ Green (2004a) 281 discusses the ambiguity of *vestras*, saying that it could refer to Augustus and Tiberius, but more likely that it points further down the line and refers to Tiberius and Germanicus.

⁵⁵² For the question of who the heir is see Green (2004a) 281.

more generic *deis*, while his inclusion of *tanti cognominis* harkens the reader back to the *nomina tanta* of 1.592. There, Ovid had stated that the highly coveted title of Augustus had previously fallen to no other individual. Here, however, at the episode's end, Ovid changes course and hopes that Augustus' unspecified heir will go on to bear that very title and carry on the legacy of his father, the very thing the sole surviving Fabius will do on the Ides of February when the rest of his family are killed in the battle of the Cremera. At the same time, the presence of the word *cognominis* recalls the only usage of the word above at 1.605, bringing the Fabians back into the equation once again. Thus, although the prayer and the entry conclude with a desire for imperial longevity under the auspices of the gods, Ovid subtly reminds the reader of the cost and difficulty of achieving such greatness, as also indicated by the gravitas of the phrase *orbis onus* ("burden of the world").⁵⁵³ To sum up, throughout the passage, Ovid guides the reader through a complex web of nomenclature that seemingly culminates in the triumphant image of Augustus and *summus Iuppiter*, predicting a bright future for the imperial household. But on a deeper level the comparison is not as black and white as it might appear. Indeed, the context and diction of Ovid's continuation of the Carmentalia on the next entry calls into question the very concept of augmenting and causes the reader to consider the previous episode in an altogether different light.

VIII. The Aftermath of the Ides of January

After this seemingly laudatory exposition of Augustus' earthly achievements and the adamant assertion that Augustus and Jupiter share a divine etymological connection vis-à-vis the way they augment everything around them, the transition back to the Carmentalia on the 15th of January is far from smooth. Not only does Ovid renew his discussion of the Carmentalia festival

⁵⁵³ A phrase which reminds the reader of Atlas, hoisting up the world upon his shoulders.

after the digression of the Ides, something which he does not do elsewhere in the poem, but he also tells a story that is both dark and rooted in old Republican traditions: Roman matrons were deprived of the privilege of riding in carriages and subsequently withheld sexual intercourse from their husbands (1.619-24). The act of violently stabbing their own wombs and denying their husbands children clashes directly with the notion of *augustus* and its association with “augmenting.”⁵⁵⁴ Ovid also employs the word *onus* in the same *sedes* of both passages (1.616 and 1.624), perhaps to highlight the dichotomy. On the Ides, *onus* is used to symbolize the power that a certain *heres*, likely Tiberius,⁵⁵⁵ will take up upon the death of his father. In the Carmentalia passage, *onus* stands in for the fetus, which the women rip from their wombs in order to deprive their husbands from having an heir (1.624).⁵⁵⁶ There, it is modified by the word *crescens* (“growing”), notable as a synonym for *augeo*, the word whose connection to Augustus’ name Ovid underscores.⁵⁵⁷

One could take these connections a step further and say that these grim rites of the Carmentalia represent the antithesis of Augustan marriage legislation, which served to increase the population and gave special dispensation to those with multiple children.⁵⁵⁸ The subsequent act of the senators’ restoration of this stolen honor (*patres.../ius tamen exemptum restituisse*

⁵⁵⁴ Ovid opts for a version that depicts the *matronae* taking violent and drastic measures in contrast to the peaceful measures of protest as described by Livy (34.1.5ff.). For the clash between these two episodes see Barchiesi (1997a) 96.

⁵⁵⁵ See n. 552 above.

⁵⁵⁶ *Onus* has a similar meaning also at *Fast.* 2.452 in the prayer to Juno Lucina for the safe and easy delivery of the child. Green (2004a) 287-88 notes that this sense of *onus* “is found first and regularly in Ovid, but rarely elsewhere.”

⁵⁵⁷ Ovid emphasizes this etymology by repeating it three times: *auget* (1.612), *augeat* (1.613), and *augeat* again (1.613).

⁵⁵⁸ See Green (2004a) 285.

1.625-26) can be read as a negative parallel to Augustus' restoration of the provinces on the previous day (1.589).⁵⁵⁹ Pasco-Pranger makes the valid point that Carmenta's connection with this episode is tenuous as best.⁵⁶⁰ Rather than making use of Carmenta's role as a goddess of child-birth, Ovid instead opts to connect her with an obscure and almost certainly incorrect etymology for the wagons (*carpenta*) in which the *matronae* rode. As Pasco-Pranger goes on to note, the presence of Carmenta's sisters or fellow exiles,⁵⁶¹ Porrima and Postverta, and their dual prophetic powers that allow them to look both backward and forward offer a further link between this catastrophic episode of the past and that of the Augustan present.⁵⁶² Ovid provides an additional hint suggesting that this passage is in dialogue with the previous Augustan panegyric: *nomina percipies non tibi nota prius* ("you will perceive names not previously known to you" 1.632). Although *nomina* here has nothing to do with titles or with imperial success, its presence will recall its frequent usage on the Ides (1.592, 1.597, 1.599, 1.604), culminating in the Princeps' new title of *Augustus* and its connection with *summus Iuppiter*. The relative obscurity of Porrima and Postverta clashes with the extreme notoriety of the title Augustus, who is linked to the most famous and conspicuous god of them all. Indeed, both passages conclude with the fleshing out of etymologies: Augustus from *augeo* (1.612-16), Porrima from *porro* (1.635), and

⁵⁵⁹ The verbs of "restoring" are slightly different with *reddita* from *reddo* used at 1.589 and *restituisse* from *restituo* used at 1.626. It is also interesting that the *patres* or senators restore this privilege to the *matronae*, since they are also the ones who give the provinces back to Augustus immediately after this grand gesture (see Green [2004a] 270) and who grant him the name Augustus (*sancta vocant augusta patres* 1.609).

⁵⁶⁰ Pasco-Pranger (2002) 266. See also Green (2004a) 283 who calls Ovid's etymology of Carmenta from *carpenta* "far-fetched and unparalled."

⁵⁶¹ *Sive...sive* (1.633-34) indicating that even Ovid cannot make up his mind about their actual relationship to Carmenta.

⁵⁶² Pasco-Pranger (2002) 266 and (2006) 193.

Postverta from *venturum postmodo* (1.636). It is striking that Ovid chose to juxtapose his passage of imperial praise with an obscure ritual of the past, corroborated only partially by an account in Livy and lacking any epigraphic attestation.⁵⁶³ All of these features combine to cast a cloud not soon to be dispersed over imperial or, more specifically, Augustan greatness.

On the very next day, Jan. 16th, Ovid harkens back to his theme of the Ides and once again connects Jupiter to Augustus, this time going so far as to completely replace the Princeps with the chief deity. It is, in fact, the only time throughout the entire poem where Ovid speaks of Augustus in the guise of Jupiter.⁵⁶⁴ It is a brief reference, but one that is powerful and well-placed, serving as the capstone of an entry that criticizes the circumstances under which the original temple of Concord was constructed, while praising its Tiberian counterpart. This continues Ovid's theme of issuing praise and criticism alongside one another. On the Ides the Roman senators were implicitly lauded for the benefits they conferred upon the Princeps and for recognizing his divine quality, while on the 15th they were cast as tyrannical and obstinate, forced to see the error of their ways after the women make a collective stand. One might also note that in both the aforementioned entries as well as that of the 16th Ovid finds fault with the practices of the olden days, while lavishing praise upon the current era and the imperial family. Recall that Janus had dealt with this very same dichotomy, preferring instead to look nostalgically upon the past, while calling into question the extravagance and lasciviousness of the Augustan era. But here on the 16th Ovid eschews any mention of luxury or ornamentation, stressing instead the type of peace that resulted from each temple's construction.

⁵⁶³ For the differences between the *Fasti* and Livy narratives (Liv. 34.1-8) see Green (2004a) 283-4.

⁵⁶⁴ As observed by Scott (1930) 53. Recall that this phenomenon is a frequent occurrence in the exile poetry,

Ovid leaves behind the darkness associated with the second half of the Carmentalia and embraces a brighter topic that features gleaming Concord (*candida...Concordia* 1.637-39) along with her snow-white temple (*niveo...templo*). Yet, whereas the dedication of Camillus' temple in 367 B.C. occurred in the wake of the resolution of a potentially disastrous civil conflict,⁵⁶⁵ Tiberius' dedication of the temple of Augustan Concord in 10 A.D. followed immediately after his victory over the Germans, which allows Ovid to claim that its dedication stemmed from a "better cause" (*causa...melior* 1.645). The mention of Tiberius then prompts Ovid to praise the singular link between Augustus and Tiberius, namely Livia, in the episode's closural couplet: *hanc tua constituit genetrix et rebus et ara, / sola toro magni digna reperta Iovis* ("Your mother established this goddess both by her accomplishments and by an altar, she alone worthy to have shared the marriage-bed with mighty Jove" 1.649-50). In a striking example of metonymy, Jove stands in for Augustus. The placement of *magni* at the caesura and *Iovis* at line-end reinforces the grandeur of Augustus as Jupiter, while the phrase itself brings us back to the Ides and the sacrifices that took place "in the temple of great Jove" (*in magni...Iovis aede* 587), which anticipated the divine association made at the entry's end. Here, we have the addition of Livia, who is recognized both as the mother of Tiberius and as the wife of Augustus. She too becomes divine in the pentameter when she is described as sharing Jove's bed, a reference that implicitly associates her with Jove's wife Juno. Interestingly, this is not the first mention in the *Fasti* of Livia's divine status, something she will not achieve until many years after Ovid's death.⁵⁶⁶ Towards the beginning of the Carmentalia Carmenta herself foretells her own future divinity and likewise that of Livia: *sic Augusta novum Iulia numen erit* ("So too will Julia Augusta be a new

⁵⁶⁵ Cf. Liv. 6.42.9-14 and Plut. *Cam.* 42.

⁵⁶⁶ She will not be deified until her grandson Claudius sanctions it in 42 A.D. See Green (2004a)

divinity” 1.536). There is also perhaps a connection to part two of the Carmentalia where wives were literally and figuratively separated from their husbands. Pasco-Pranger, noting the regenerative quality of the word *genetrix*, here used to describe Livia, views the marital harmony of Augustus and Livia as a correction of the “conflict between wives and husbands [that] threatened the generational continuity of Rome (621-22).”⁵⁶⁷ That may be, but the image of marital harmony is far from guaranteed when considering the mythological background of the marriage of Jupiter and Juno.

Another problem presents itself. There were, apparently, two temples dedicated to Concord by members of the imperial family, both of which are recorded by Ovid in the *Fasti*. The first is the one discussed above, dedicated by Tiberius on Jan. 16th 10 A.D., possibly with the assistance of his mother Livia.⁵⁶⁸ The other is the dedication of the shrine of Concord within the Porticus Livia on June 11th 7 B.C. There, the focus is on the dedication occurring on behalf of Augustus: *te quoque magnifica, Concordia, dedicat aede / Livia, quam caro praestitit ipsa viro* (“Livia also honors you, Concordia, with a magnificent temple, which she herself presented to her dear husband” 6.637-8).⁵⁶⁹ Although Newlands refers to this couplet as “a sign of domestic harmony at its highest level,”⁵⁷⁰ she observes that it clashes with the surrounding episodes where

⁵⁶⁷ Pasco-Pranger (2006) 196.

⁵⁶⁸ Cass. Dio 56.25 speaks of a temple of Concord (ὁμονοεῖον) dedicated (καθιερώθη) by Tiberius, bearing both Tiberius’ name as well as that of his dead elder brother Drusus. This is almost assuredly the temple mentioned by Ovid on Jan. 16th and Livia’s name is nowhere to be found.

⁵⁶⁹ Platner and Ashby (1929) remark, “It is probable therefore that the temple was close to or within the porticus, but the small rectangular structure marked on the Marble Plan (frg. 10) can hardly have been a temple deserving of the epithet *magnifica*.”

⁵⁷⁰ Newlands (2002b) 227.

“themes of dynastic discord and female violence” are prevalent.⁵⁷¹ We are faced with a similar scenario on the 16th of January where the celebration of imperial harmony follows immediately after an episode that highlights both female violence and the highest form of discord between wives and their husbands.⁵⁷² This jarring transition makes the reader question the degree to which Concord is truly embedded within the imperial household.⁵⁷³ While Tiberius’s victory over the Germans certainly acts as a display of Rome’s might, the concluding couplet’s focus on Livia and Augustus in the form of Juno and Jupiter does not exemplify the sort of “domestic harmony” that we would expect.

A few things need to be noted regarding the historical record of these two temples of Concord. First, Ovid is our sole source for this earlier temple (6.637-38), which he claims involved Livia in some way.⁵⁷⁴ The account of Cassius Dio serves both to clarify and confuse: προστάξας, ὅπως τό τε ἴδιον καί τὸ τοῦ Δρούσου ὄνομα αὐτῷ ἐπιγράψῃ, τά τε νικητήρια ἤγαγε καί τὸ τεμένισμα τὸ Λίουιον ὠνομασμένον καθιέρωσε μετὰ τῆς μητρός (“and [Tiberius] having assigned to himself the task of restoring the temple of Concord, so that he might inscribe his own name and that of Drusus upon it, he celebrated his triumph and together with his mother he dedicated that which was called ‘the precinct of Livia’” Cass. Dio 55.8.2). On the one hand, we have the mention of both a temple of Concord as well as that of the Porticus Liviae. Yet, upon closer examination, it becomes apparent that they refer to two separate things. The

⁵⁷¹ Newlands (2002b) 245, referring specifically to the stories of the cult of Mater Matuta (6.475-68) and of Tullia’s evil actions (6.585-636).

⁵⁷² That is the deprivation of sexual rights and procreation.

⁵⁷³ Simpson (1991) 455 n. 24 observes, “Concordia was *not* an Augustan Virtue...Any suggestion of Concord in the Julian family at about this time (cf. Suet. *Aug.* 65) would surely have been met with popular derision.”

⁵⁷⁴ See Richardson (1992) 99-100.

language used to describe the dedication of the temple by Tiberius and his brother Drusus is precisely the same as we see at Cass. Dio 56.25.1,⁵⁷⁵ which refers to the dedication of the more well-attested temple in 10 A.D.⁵⁷⁶ However, we are able to extract two pieces of information from this passage. First, the Porticus of Livia was dedicated not by Livia alone, but rather with Tiberius, a fact glossed over by Ovid in his entry on June 11th. Second, the more famous temple of 10 A.D. was dedicated, according to Dio, by Tiberius without any assistance from Livia.⁵⁷⁷ So, how does this color our reading of Ovid? Another passage of Cassio Dio may be of some help: καὶ αὐτῷ ἐν τε τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἡρώων ψηφισθὲν μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας οἰκοδομηθὲν δὲ ὑπὸ τε τῆς Λιουίας καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Τιβερίου ἐποιήθη (“and for him [Augustus], a shrine voted by the Senate and made by Livia and Tiberius was built in Rome” Cass. Dio 56.46.3). We know, therefore, that Tiberius and Livia collaborated also in the construction of a temple intended to recognize Augustus’ deification.⁵⁷⁸ So perhaps Ovid is compressing three separate temple dedications into a single couplet: that of Tiberius and Livia on behalf of Concord in 7 B.C. (also at *Fast.* 6.637-8), that of Tiberius himself on behalf of Concord in 10 A.D., and that of Tiberius and Livia on behalf of divine Augustus in 14 A.D.

⁵⁷⁵ τὸ Ὁμονόειον ὑπὸ τοῦ Τιβερίου καθιερώθη, καὶ αὐτῷ τό τε ἐκείνου ὄνομα καὶ τὸ τοῦ Δρούσου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ τεθνηκότος ἐπεγράφη. (“The temple of Concord was dedicated by Tiberius, and both his own name and the name of his dead brother Drusus were inscribed upon it”).

⁵⁷⁶ For the primary temple of Concord which was dedicated by Tiberius on Jan. 16th 10 A.D. see Richardson (1992) 98-99.

⁵⁷⁷ See n. 575 above.

⁵⁷⁸ Although Pliny the Elder only mentions Livia in relation to the temple’s construction (*H.N.* 12.94), it is clear that it was the joint venture of Livia and Tiberius (cf. Grether [1946] 235 n. 74). See also Platner and Ashby (1929) 62. Richardson (1992) 45-46 curiously glosses over Livia’s involvement in the construction of this temple.

In his address to Tiberius, Ovid states, *templaque fecisti, quam colis ipse, deae* (“you built a temple for the goddess, which you yourself worship 1.649”). This seems like a surefire reference to the temple built by Tiberius alone in 10 A.D. Ovid then follows that with: *hanc tua constituit genetrix et rebus et ara* (“Your mother established this goddess both by her accomplishments and by an altar”). The meaning of this line is far from clear. *Tua genetrix* can be none other than Tiberius’ mother Livia, but what of the expression *constituit...et rebus et ara*? Christopher Simpson is adamant that this refers to the “ceremonial inauguration (i.e. re-inauguration) of the site” by Livia.⁵⁷⁹ He claims that while Tiberius was procuring the official rites of restoring the temple from the Senate in 7 B.C., the very event recorded by Cassius Dio (55.8.2), Livia took part in the consecration of the temple’s altar *in situ*.⁵⁸⁰ But considering 7 B.C. was both the year of the dedication of the Porticus Liviae, which, according to Ovid, contained an *aedes Concordiae*, as well as the year in which Tiberius underwent his reconstruction of the primary temple of Concord, I believe Ovid intends for the reader to understand both projects here. And finally, when he refers to Livia as “the only one worthy of sharing the bed of great Jove,” he is alluding to the temple built for Divine Augustus in 14 A.D. by both Tiberius and Livia.

The reference to Augustus as Jove, which depicts Augustus as fully deified, is likely made in the wake of his death and can be viewed as an extension of the divinity imparted upon him on the Ides where he is depicted as eclipsing all of his Roman counterparts whose accomplishments are limited to the earthly realm.⁵⁸¹ The mention of her as *genetrix* (1.649) may

⁵⁷⁹ Simpson (1991) 451.

⁵⁸⁰ Simpson (1991) 454-55. See also Green (2004a) 297 for Livia’s potential involvement in one stage of the temple’s dedication.

⁵⁸¹ This reference belongs to the period of post-exilic revisions. See Johnson (1997) 417 and Newlands (2002b) 245.

be an allusion to the beginning of Lucretius, thus emphasizing her role as the progenitor of the imperial household.⁵⁸² Although Ovid employs the term *genetrix* somewhat freely as a generic word for “mother,” he refers to Cybele in book 4 as *alma...genetrix fecunda deorum* (“the kindly and fruitful mother of the gods” 4.319), which is clear nod to Lucretius’ *Aeneadum genetrix...alma Venus* (“Venus, the kindly mother of the descendants of Aeneas” Lucr. 1.1-2). In addition, a relief discovered at the Basilica di San Vitale in Ravenna shows a woman seated beside Augustus offering him a winged victory and a shield. Grether identifies this figure as Livia in “a kind of Venus-Genetrix-Victrix.”⁵⁸³ This could just as easily be Livia in the guise of Juno, offering victory to Augustus, a motif similar to that which we saw on the “bringer of victory” coin.⁵⁸⁴ One could argue, however, that the appearance of Concord and imperial prosperity evaporates in part once Livia and Augustus’ relationship is compared to that of Juno and Jupiter who are notorious for having a marriage fraught with infidelity. The couplet that follows, which will be discussed at length below, may hint at such marital discord.

It is important to consider the role that Livia played within the imperial household and to acknowledge the pervasive nature of her divine assimilation. In the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, Ovid refers to her as *princeps femina* (“the first lady” *Pont.* 3.1.125). Such a title speaks to the integral position she held, not only in the eyes of her husband Augustus, but also in those of the *res publica*. Purcell speaks of the double-edged aftermath of Livia’s death following the lengthy

⁵⁸² That would, of course, mean that Livia is also being likened to Venus in addition to Juno. Although Green (2004a) 297-8 attributes this line to Ovid’s desire “to forge a sense of *concordia* among the members of the imperial family,” it is doubtful that Ovid would achieve such a goal by referring to Livia both as the embodiment of Venus and of Juno, who were portrayed as bitter rivals throughout the *Aeneid*. On the other hand, an allusion to Venus would be fitting as she served as the *genetrix* of the Julian gens.

⁵⁸³ Grether (1946) 229.

⁵⁸⁴ See n. 412 above.

period during which she exhibited behavior that went far beyond that of a typical Roman matron: “the reward was, finally, deification; the penalty, a scurrilous vilification in the popular tradition which goes beyond most ancient invective in its hostility.”⁵⁸⁵ In 35 B.C. Livia, along with Augustus’ sister Octavia, were both granted the privilege of *sacrosanctitas*, an honor normally reserved for tribunes and one that is unparalleled for women of that era.⁵⁸⁶ This event was commemorated publicly by the erection of statues on behalf of both women.⁵⁸⁷ In the East she was hailed as σεβαστή and θέα εὐέργετις and had a plethora of divine associations akin to those of Augustus and of the many generals who had conquered eastern territories.⁵⁸⁸ From exile Ovid even asks his wife to parlay with Livia in the hopes of influencing Augustus to forgive his *error* and grant him a pardon (*Pont.* 3.1).⁵⁸⁹ Grether, speaking of the numerous divine cult honors bestowed upon Livia offers the following statement: “These honors, beginning early in the principate of Augustus and continuing throughout her long life and after her death, illustrate the part played in the imperial cult by the wife of the reigning emperor, the mother of the reigning emperor and priestess of Augustus, and, finally, the deified ancestress of the Julian House.”⁵⁹⁰ Grether also mentions an inscription found in town of Falerii dated between 4 and 14 A.D. that reads: *Genio Augusti et Tib(erii) Caesaris Iunoni Liviae*.⁵⁹¹ Here she is explicitly called Juno and, in a similar capacity, she too served as the protector of Roman *matronae* and lavished many

⁵⁸⁵ Purcell (1986) 80.

⁵⁸⁶ Cass. Dio 49.38.1. See also Purcell (1986) 85-87.

⁵⁸⁷ Purcell (1986) 85.

⁵⁸⁸ Inscriptions survive from Athens and Thasos that record these titles. See Grether (1946) 231 and Purcell (1986) 87.

⁵⁸⁹ See Green (2004a) 236-37.

⁵⁹⁰ Grether (1946) 223.

⁵⁹¹ *C.I.L.* XI. 3076; Grether (1946) 225. Note also the association of Juno with Falerii, which is emphasized by Ovid at *Am.* 3.13 and alluded to at *Fast.* 6.49.

honors upon them.⁵⁹² Notice also that this inscription combines the very figures that appear in Ovid's *Fasti* couplet. In addition, we hear from the *Acta* of the Arval Brethren that Livia was eventually honored as a divine figure with a sacrifice on her birthday: *natali Iuliae Augustae in Capitolio Iovi Optimo Maximo bovem marem inmolavit* ("[The head priest of the Arval Brethren] sacrificed a bull to Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline in honor of the birthday of Julia Augusta").⁵⁹³ Note that Livia is now referred to in precisely the same way Ovid's prophetess Carmenta had predicted at *Fast.* 1.536 (*Augusta...Iulia*). In addition, the sacrifice itself is carried out for Jupiter in honor of Livia, once again harkening back to Ovid's couplet. Coins have been found from the Tiberian era that show Livia in the likeness of Juno and Grether believes that coins from Thapsus bearing the inscription *Iuno Augusta* "were inspired by the figure on Roman coins and were meant to honor Livia."⁵⁹⁴ Thus there is ample textual and numismatic evidence to go along with Ovid's depiction of Livia as a divine figure even during her lifetime. Let us now examine the nuances attached to this reference in the *Fasti*.

The first word of the line equating Livia with Juno is *sola* (1.650).⁵⁹⁵ This is, of course, misleading, since Augustus had two wives prior to Livia.⁵⁹⁶ Yet, from a mythological stand-point

⁵⁹² Purcell (1986) 87.

⁵⁹³ Henzen (1874) XLIII.

⁵⁹⁴ Grether (1946) 239-40. She was even called *Augusta* in the *Fasti Verulani* see (Degrassi (1963) 161).

⁵⁹⁵ Perhaps Ovid is thinking of this line when the old farmer Hyrieus tells a disguised Jupiter of an oath he had sworn to his now deceased wife: '*coniugio*' dixi '*sola frueri meo*' ("You alone", I said, 'will enjoy the privilege of being my wife'" 5.528).

⁵⁹⁶ Green (2004a) 298 emphasizes also the potentially scandalous circumstances surrounding Augustus' marriage to Livia—for both underwent divorces so that they could marry one another. Equally scandalous is the fact that Livia was pregnant with Drusus the Elder, her second son by her former husband Tiberius Claudius Nero, when she divorced him and married Augustus

Livia in the guise of Juno is surely the only one worthy of sharing the bed of a Jove who famously bedded numerous inferior women. A nearly identical comparison is made by Ovid in a passage from his *Epistulae ex Ponto*. There, Ovid speaks to his wife in Rome, requesting that she make an approach to Livia and plead with her on his behalf. In a section that appears to appeal to Livia's vanity, Ovid describes Livia as *quae Veneris formam, mores Iunonis habendo / sola est caelesti digna reperta toro*. ("She, who by having the beauty of Venus and the character of Juno, alone was found worthy of the celestial marriage-bed," *Pont.* 3.1.117-8). Whereas *Veneris formam* is a clear reference to beauty,⁵⁹⁷ *mores Iunonis* is open to a much broader interpretation.⁵⁹⁸ If *mores Iunonis* is intended to emphasize Livia's chastity, then we encounter the same problem we saw in the *Fasti*, namely Livia's controversial marriage to Augustus. P. J. Johnson questions the innocence of both of these divine comparisons, linking them to the subsequent catalogue of evil women,⁵⁹⁹ who, along with Venus and Juno, incur generally negative treatments throughout Ovid's *Met.*⁶⁰⁰ Johnson also acknowledges the difficulty in interpreting the word *digna*, which may indicate true worthiness or merely that the two them

(Cass. Dio 48.44.4). Green adds, "It is intriguing that Ovid on three occasions—and Horace once—should construct flattery based on this falsehood."

⁵⁹⁷ A reference to Venus' beauty, however, is not inherently positive as it could evoke her role in precipitating the Trojan war, a point not mentioned by Johnson.

⁵⁹⁸ Thakur (2014) 198 n. 85 takes note of the potential negative comparison between Livia and Juno, but prefers to see it as positive, stating, "However, Ovid's direct comparisons to Juno and Vesta are far more reverential and reflect aspects of her character promoted by Augustan ideology."

⁵⁹⁹ This list of evil females from Greek mythology includes Procne, Medea, the Danaids, Clytemnestra, Scylla, Circe, and Medusa.

⁶⁰⁰ Johnson (1997) 417 who adds, "The comparisons of Livia with these eminent goddesses are, on the face of it, harmless eulogy and in keeping with the creeping deification of Roman rulers; in the context of Ovidian mythology, however, they are devastating."

deserve each other.⁶⁰¹ Johnson leans more toward the latter sense of *digna*, citing two clearly ironic Ovidian usages of the word from the *Met.*⁶⁰² I, however, am more inclined to fall back upon Hinds' umbrella term, "hermeneutic alibi,"⁶⁰³ and conclude that different readers may extract either sense of *digna*. It is also worth drawing attention to the slight differences between the two parallel lines from the *Pont.* and the *Fasti*. While both explicitly mention Juno, the *Pont.* pentameter classifies the *toro* as *caelesti* (*Pont.* 3.1.118) rather than *Iovis* (*Fast.* 1.650), thus leaving out the explicit mention of Jupiter. Just afterward in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, Ovid describes Livia as *femina...princeps* (*Pont.* 3.1.125) and then goes on to represent her as a direct stand-in for Juno herself (*vultum Iunonis* 3.1.145). Since both pentameters are easily replaceable with one another, the simplest explanation for this phenomenon is that the *Pont.* pentameter focuses more closely on Livia, while the *Fasti* pentameter marks the culmination of a brief homage to the imperial family more broadly.⁶⁰⁴ Nevertheless, as we shall see, the fact that the *Fasti* pentameter ends with the word *Iovis* is itself problematic and may induce the reader to reconsider the sense of *digna*, and indeed the tone of the entire passage. Ovid thus steers his reader towards a genuinely positive interpretation of the divine couple with the heavily Augustan flavor of Concordia and the praise lavished upon Tiberius and then Livia, yet employs ambiguous language in the final line that will be picked up by a controversial couplet that may

⁶⁰¹ Ovid employs a wholly positive sense of the word in the context of Baucis' relationship with her husband Philemon in the *Met.*: *dicite, iuste senex et femina coniuge iusto / digna, quid optetis* ("Tell me what you desire, just old man and woman worthy of a just husband" *Met.* 8.704-05).

⁶⁰² Johnson (1997) 418 n. 52.

⁶⁰³ See introduction n. 24.

⁶⁰⁴ As Green (2004a) 292 points out, the 16th of January was also the day on which Octavian officially became Augustus, thus providing Ovid an added incentive to praise Tiberius and call him *dux venerande* (*Fast.* 1.647).

be read as an allusion to Jupiter's promiscuity, thereby further undermining the sense of divine harmony that began the passage.

Immediately following the line in which Livia and Augustus stand in for Juno and Jupiter is the mention of the constellation Aquarius on the 17th of January:

Haec ubi transierint, Capricorno, Phoebe, relicto
per iuvenis curres signa regentis aquam.

When these things have gone by and Capricorn has been left behind, Phoebus, you will
course through the sign of the young-man who regulates the water. (*Fast.* 1.651-52)

The reference to Capricorn in addition to indicating the time of the year, may serve to further tether Jupiter to Augustus. For Augustus was conceived under the sign of Capricorn and featured the zodiac sign on several of his coins.⁶⁰⁵ One is perhaps tempted to read this reference as activating a negative aspect of Jupiter's past through the implied presence of Ganymede, the Trojan prince who was abducted and raped by Jupiter. The evidence for this is, however, quite scant. On the one hand, Ovid refers only fleetingly to the constellation, which, as Green points out, is in keeping with Ovid's general style of presenting astrological signs throughout the *Fasti*.⁶⁰⁶ Further, Ovid neither specifically mentions Ganymede or Aquarius, but rather alludes to both with the somewhat cryptic line, *per iuvenis curres signa regentis aquam* (652). On the other hand, Ovid could have described Aquarius using terms that exclude the mention of Ganymede

⁶⁰⁵ See Suet. *Aug.* 94.12 and Gee (2000) 138-41 who also has an image of the Gemma Augustea, which depicts a seated Augustus being crowned with the corona civica by Oikumene as well as a representation of Capricorn and the Cornucopia positioned between Augustus and the personification of Roma. Gee (2000) 140 n. 44 claims that Augustus on the Gemma Augustea is "enthroned as Jupiter," citing Germanicus' version of Aratus *Phaenomena*, which associates Capricorn with Augustus' apotheosis.

⁶⁰⁶Green (2004a). 300.

altogether or could have passed it over entirely.⁶⁰⁷ Scholars too are divided on the issue.

Newlands, while acknowledging the possibility that the allusion to Ganymede and, by extension, to Jupiter's promiscuity may detract from the seemingly genuine imperial panegyric that precedes, also offers the following qualifying sentiment, "Even brief astrological notices can encode mythical allusions that serve either to complement or subvert the official concept of *Romanitas*—or indeed they may offer the possibility of both readings."⁶⁰⁸ Fantham, on the other hand, summarily dismisses the prospect of a subversive reading, claiming, "Sex was a privilege of power, not a disqualifier as it seems to be in our democracies."⁶⁰⁹ That may be so, but sex in and of itself is not the only issue at play here. As Feeney argues, the *Fasti* as a whole capitalizes on the imagery of enforced silence and the punishment of those who attempt to speak up against the more powerful.⁶¹⁰ Although Feeney does not touch upon this particular example, it is within reason to include the rape of Ganymede by Jupiter amidst other more explicit examples of the

⁶⁰⁷ Although Green (2004a) 300 cites several examples of Ganymede used elsewhere in conjunction with the appearance of Aquarius, Gee (2000) 174 asserts, "Not so natural is the identification of the constellation with Ganymede." Likewise, Harries (1989) 166 claims, "Mythology did not consistently identify Ganymede with Aquarius" and backs up that statement with several references (see esp. n. 17). Barchiesi (1997a) 82 apparently subscribes to this belief as well. Yet Robinson (2011) 157-58 is the most recent scholar to address this issue and rejects the claims of Gee and Harries, referring the reader to his 2007 article, "Ovid, the *Fasti*, and the Stars," where he shows not only that Ganymede is traditionally linked with Aquarius, as found in Eratosthenes, the main source for Ovid's catasterism myths (cf. 20 n. 107), but also that the astronomical sign Aquarius is justified for the Nones of February (he does not address its relevancy on the 17th of January).

⁶⁰⁸ Newlands (1995) 47.

⁶⁰⁹ Fantham (1995) 53-54 in discussing the second example of Aquarius and Ganymede that follows closely after the *pater patriae* passage (*Fast.* 2.131-46).

⁶¹⁰ Feeney (1992).

strong silencing the weak.⁶¹¹ The aspect of silencing embedded into the Ganymede reference will become much more acute when we see it again in book 2, this time set alongside the violent rape of Callisto.

Let us consider for a moment the procedure involved in assessing whether this reference to Aquarius ought to be read as more than just another astronomical entry. Miller in his study of Augustan Apollo speaks of the necessary criterion of “a textual trigger that activates political meaning.”⁶¹² In this case, we might ask ourselves the same question, namely what markers are there in the text that would make the reader think that Ovid is being subversive?⁶¹³ This is, of course, a heavily subjective question that varies according to the situation and cannot and will not ever be answered with any level of certainty. Nevertheless, here we would single out the fact that Ovid has seemingly idealized the circumstances surrounding Livia’s marriage to Augustus and compared their alleged marital bliss to that of Jupiter and Juno, whose marriage, at least from a mythological standpoint, was fraught with manifold issues.⁶¹⁴ Ovid famously has a penchant for creating tension where none need be apparent.⁶¹⁵ Such was the case with Concord and Juno, two deities, both of whom represent the interests of Augustus and the imperial household in different ways, yet who—within Ovid’s *Fasti*—are also subtly at odds with one

⁶¹¹ This is especially true of the Lara episode (see Feeney [1992] 11f.) which features Jupiter exacting punishment for words spoken contrary to his interests (*Fast.* 2.571-616).

⁶¹² Miller (2009) 6.

⁶¹³ Hinds (1987) 25 expresses the following sentiment on potential Ovidian subversion: “Every passage ever written by Ovid about Augustus admits of a non-subversive reading: but that is not in itself a refutation of Ovidian subversion.”

⁶¹⁴ Through the use of *sola* (*Fast.* 1.650). See n. 596 above.

⁶¹⁵ This ties in with Barchiesi’s so-called “syntagmatic tensions” and the fact that Ovid often juxtaposes controversial entries, defying the epigraphic calendar and thus deliberately creating unnecessary tensions.

another. Also of value is the process of identifying other parallel instances, ideally within the same text. For example, if this sort of juxtaposition occurred only once, the reader would be more likely to dismiss the prospect of a subversive reading. In the case of the *Fasti*, however, the appearance of Ganymede/Aquarius closely after a comparison between Jupiter and Augustus is not an isolated instance, but one that recurs in near duplicate form in book 2. Let us turn now to that episode.

IX. The Nones of February: Celebration of Augustus as *Pater Patriae*

On the Nones of February Ovid finds himself faced with a dilemma. He has reached a day that requires the more solemn meter of epic in order to convey the subject's true importance,⁶¹⁶ but he is relegated to mere elegiac couplets (*alternò carmine* 2.121). The day is that upon which Augustus received the title *pater patriae* in 2 B.C. and in reference to his task, Ovid says, *maximus hic fastis accumulatur honor* ("This is the greatest honor heaped upon the *Fasti*" 2.122).⁶¹⁷ This prelude to the praise of Augustus is full of hyperbole and other subtle markers that have caused several scholars to doubt its sincerity.⁶¹⁸ Most interesting perhaps is

⁶¹⁶ To convey this concept Ovid wishes that he were writing in Homer's meter, dactylic hexameter (2.119-21).

⁶¹⁷ Ovid here is no doubt playing with the word *fasti*, claiming that this day is of utmost importance with respect to the epigraphic Roman calendar, but also that he has made it a day of greatest importance by giving it special recognition in his literary version of the calendar. For the importance Augustus himself attached to his designation as *pater patriae* cf. Aug. *R.G.* 35, where he claims it as his most coveted honor.

⁶¹⁸ Such aspects include Ovid's augmentation of the motif of needing more mouths/voices in order to satisfactorily praise a subject. Here Ovid seeks an unparalleled "thousand voices" (*mille sonos* 2.119) as opposed to the more typical ten or a hundred mouths/voices (see Hinds [1992] 133, Newlands [1995] 189-90, and Robinson [2011] 140-142 for a detailed account of this phenomenon and its possible implications). Another outlier is Ovid's choice of *Maonides* (2.120) for Homer, an epithet that occurs frequently in Greek epigram and thus more reminiscent of "elegiac *levitas*" than "epic *gravitas*" (see Robinson [2011] 142-43). See also Herbert-Brown

These lines are laden with repetition, emphasizing their hymnic quality. *Tibi*, *nomen*, and *hoc* are all repeated verbatim in the initial couplet, as is *dedit* with a different person and number, which recurs again in the following line. The plebs, the senate, and the equestrians represent the three Roman classes and thus anticipate the separation of realms that Ovid will discuss when he arrives at the comparison between Augustus and Jupiter.⁶²² The object of *dedit* in 1.129 appears to be the *nomen*/title “pater patriae,” which, Ovid tells us, Augustus earned much sooner than its bestowal upon him.⁶²³ The mention of *pater orbis* at 1.130 looks back at Augustus’ formal title as well as forward to his conflation with Jupiter as *pater hominum*.⁶²⁴ It also reminds the reader of the earlier image of Jupiter looking down from the Capitoline/sky and viewing the entire world (*totum...orbem* 1.85), symbolizing both Roman and divine hegemony. Here the power of the Romans is replaced by the greatness of Augustus, who himself is said to be the father of the world. Yet, despite such high praise, Ovid proceeds to separate the domain of Augustus and Jupiter in a manner similar both to Horace (*C.* 1.12.49-52) and to the closing portion of Ovid’s *Met.* (15.858-60). Whereas Ovid’s entry on the Ides of January fostered the notion that Augustus and Jupiter share the very same divine status, here it clear that Augustus is still a mortal and that his rule is limited to the earthly realm (*terras*), while Jupiter reigns in the lofty sky (*in aethere...alto*). In the final couplet Augustus’ official title of *pater patriae*, denoting his preservation of Rome, becomes blended with Ovid’s unofficial title of *pater orbis*, which

⁶²² Perhaps a nod to the three kingdoms ruled over by Jupiter according to Ovid *Met.* 15.859 (*mundi regna triformis*) right before he calls both Jupiter and Augustus *pater*. Robinson (2011) 146 shows that Ovid’s wording is also very similar to Augustus’ *Res Gestae*, which mentions all three groups: *senatus et equester ordo populusque Romanus* (*R.G.* 35).

⁶²³ For he received the *corona civica* in 27 B.C. (see Robinson [2011] 146).

⁶²⁴ For this reason, *pater orbis* is preferable to alternative reading of *pater urbis*, especially since the latter was apparently used of Romulus (*Liv.* 1.16.6) who will in a moment serve as a negative foil for Augustus.

globalizes Augustus' achievement and can be viewed as heightening his grandeur. The concluding sentiment that Augustus is the father of humans (*hominum tu pater*), while Jupiter is the father of gods (*ille deum*) can be read as a reformulation of his statement at *Met.* 15.860 that "both are fathers and rulers" (*pater est et rector uterque*).⁶²⁵

The analogy is a rather simple one, yet acts as a launching board for the subsequent comparison between Romulus and Augustus.⁶²⁶ Romulus, the founder of the Roman calendar,⁶²⁷ is told to give way (*concedes* 2.133) to Augustus, the re-founder of the Roman calendar. What follows is a very carefully crafted synkrisis that appears to augment Augustus and trivialize Romulus.⁶²⁸ But does it really? Right after the comparison, Ovid shifts gears by telling the reader

⁶²⁵ Robinson (2011) 148-9 makes the interesting point that in the Roman tradition Jupiter's relationship to mankind is expressed as *hominum rex*, which, by association, would align Augustus more closely with Romulus' title of *dominus* than with the more neutral—or even positive—title of *princeps*. Ovid does refer to Jupiter on the Kalends of March as *altorum rexque pater deum* ("king and father of the other gods" 3.334), which Heyworth (2019) 42 calls, "a strikingly epic pentameter."

⁶²⁶ It is in fact very similar to the comparison made by Horace both at *Odes* 1.12 and 3.5 (see above).

⁶²⁷ *Fast.* 2.27-28: *Tempora digereret cum conditor Urbis, in anno / constituit menses quinque bis esse suo.*

⁶²⁸ Scholars have acknowledged the difficulty in interpreting this passage. For instance, Wallace-Hadrill (1987) states "The belittling of Romulus is two-edged: it contributes to a general impression of Romulan Rome that commands scant respect." For a more detailed discussion see Herbert-Brown (1994) 44ff., whose opinion is that this comparison does not paint Augustus in a negative light, since Romulus represents the past, while Augustus represents the culmination of the new Golden Age (60). Barchiesi (1997a) 81 appears to agree for the most part with Wallace-Hadrill, commenting, "I would say that this encomium of the prince oversteps the acceptable limits of Augustan rhetoric." Johnson (1983) 13, on other hand, does not see Ovid as trying to undermine Augustus or his legislation, but rather to satirize him: "He is, as a satirist, concerned only with what appear to him the discrepancies between what Augustus claims to be and what he is." Hinds (1992b) 132 says of the comparison between Augustus and Romulus, "It is in this

that a particular constellation has become visible. This constellation is none other than that of Aquarius, which he once again equates with Ganymede, this time more explicitly:

Iam puer Idaeus media tenus eminet alvo,
et liquidas mixto nectare fundit aquas.

Already Ida's boy juts out up to the middle of his belly, and pours out pure water mixed
with nectar. (*Fast.* 2.145-146)

As in the earlier reference to Aquarius in book 1, Ovid alludes to Ganymede indirectly, this time by referring to him as *puer Idaeus* ("Ida's boy" 2.145).⁶²⁹ The mention of visibility up to the waist (*media tenus...alvo*) surely functions as a reference to the partial visibility of the constellation Aquarius, but also may allude to the visibility of the parts of the youth's body that would be involved in sexual activity. Further, the following line, which on the surface innocently references Ganymede's duty of serving as Jupiter's royal cupbearer, can take on a more sexualized tone if the pouring out of liquid is read as an ejaculation. Unlike the reference to Ganymede and Aquarius on the 17th of January, which can be read as influencing the interpretation only of the preceding passage, the Ganymede reference on the Nones of February can be viewed as affecting the reader's perception both of what comes before and after. Yet, as

passage, quite brilliant in its disingenuousness, that Ovid's rewriting of Romulus comes closest to revealing a hidden agenda." Murgatroyd (2005) 92, speaking more generally on the subject of subversion in the *Fasti* says, "My own reading is that Ovid amused himself by turning things on their head and now taking over the role of eulogist, but toys with that role, unable in the *Fasti* (as in his earlier poetry) to resist (necessarily) subtle digs at a grand figure such as Augustus, but making them in a spirit of light-hearted irreverence rather than strong antagonism or serious criticism." Robinson (2011) 139 defers to several of the aforementioned views, admitting, "As always, the text is open to very different readings."

⁶²⁹ At *Fast.* 1.651 Ganymede's identity was expressed principally in his role as cup-bearer: *per iuvenis curres signa regentis aquam*.

Barchiesi acknowledges, the degree to which these connections exist rests on the ability of the reader to engage very closely with the text, a concession he is willing to make.⁶³⁰ The reader is charged not only with extracting Jupiter's impropriety from the Ganymede reference and recalling the comparison made between Jupiter and Augustus several lines earlier, but also with retrojecting this new line of interpretation into the previous passage. Barring the possibility that we are asking too much from the reader, when Ovid states, *quodcumque est alto sub Iove*, ("whatever lies beneath lofty Jove" 2.138), he may be alluding to more than just land and power. In fact, the phrase *sub Iove* appears in the *Met.* in a context that emphasizes its explicitly sexual connotation.⁶³¹ Thus a reading of *Fast.* 2.138 with Ganymede in mind can certainly detract from the solemnity of the passage by casting a shadow upon Jupiter's—and thus also Augustus'—wholesome image.⁶³² The situation becomes even more entangled by the fact that the very next line consists of the denunciation of Romulus as a rapist (*tu rapis* 2.139) and praise of Augustus for his promotion of chaste wives (*castas...maritas* 2.139). But if Jupiter's rape of Ganymede is alluded to and Augustus is the earthly stand-in for Jupiter, then is Augustus really all that different than Romulus? One might attribute this double-entendre merely to Ovidian wit or question its existence entirely, but the fact that such a reading exists in the midst of a highly-wrought encomium on behalf of the Princeps, right before Ovid turns to Augustus' marriage reform, should, at the very least, give the reader pause.

⁶³⁰ Barchiesi (1997a) 82.

⁶³¹ *Met.* 3.363: *sub Iove suo nymphas in monte iacentis* ("Nymphs often lying beneath her (Juno's) Jupiter on the mountain slope").

⁶³² Of tangential relevance is the anecdote told by Suetonius that Lucius Antonius, the brother of Marcus Antonius, accused Augustus of lying beneath (*substraverit*) Aulus Hirtius in Spain for the sum of three hundred thousand Sesterces (*Aug.* 68). For more on Augustus' alleged extramarital affairs see Cass. Dio. 54.16.3 and Rudd (1976) 6-8.

Such a reading may also influence the interpretation of the closing pentameter of the *pater patriae* passage: *caelestem fecit te pater, ille patrem* (“your father [Mars] made you [Romulus] a god, while that one [Augustus] made his father [Caesar] a god” 2.144). The presence of Ganymede immediately after this line represents a third and far less honorable way of achieving apotheosis than the manner in which Romulus and Julius Caesar had both attained it.⁶³³ This does not necessarily affect the dichotomy of the selfless Augustus, who deified his own father, and Romulus, who required his father’s intervention in order to achieve apotheosis. Rather, it prompts the reader to question the value of apotheosis itself, if it can be achieved merely through favoritism by the gods without the presence of merit.⁶³⁴

Harries also connects the appearance of Ganymede on the Nones of February with the relevant portion of Ovid’s *Met.* (10.155-61), which highlights Jupiter’s passion for the boy (*Ganymedis amore / arsit*, *Met.* 10.155-6) and the marital discord that ensues when he defies his wife and makes Ganymede his official cup-bearer.⁶³⁵ While this potentially negative portrayal of Jupiter may reflect back on the *pater patriae* passage, it has far more in common with the narrative that follows. As such, I would argue that the Ganymede couplet serves as a fulcrum for the passages before and after. On the one hand, it prompts the reader to look back and recall that Augustus and Jupiter are portrayed as equivalent or at least as having equivalent powers and values. It then invites the reader to take that information and apply it to the lines that follow,

⁶³³ Harries (1989) 166.

⁶³⁴ Jupiter’s apotheosis of the dolphin at *Fast.* 2.118 is prefaced with the recognition of its pious deeds: *di pia facta vident* (“The gods see pious deeds” 2.117).

⁶³⁵ Harries (1989) 167. *Met.* 10.160-1: *qui nunc quoque pocula miscet invitaque Iovi nectar Iunone ministrat* (“[Ganymede] who still mixes the wine cups and pours Jove his nectar, despite Juno’s reluctance”). Compare this to Horace’s imperially-positive treatment of the subject at *C.* 4.4.1-4, where Jupiter’s eagle is likened to the young Drusus on the grounds that it had reliably abducted Ganymede (*expertus fidelem / Iuppiter in Ganymede flavo* 4.4.3-4).

thereby importing Augustus into a very controversial passage that features a different, darker side of Jupiter.

X. Jupiter in the Callisto Narrative

The Callisto episode (*Fast.* 2.153-92) will be discussed at greater length in the subsequent chapter, where the focus will be on Jupiter and Juno as a pair. Here, however, we will examine this episode from the perspective of Jupiter, taking account of the Ganymede couplet and the *pater patriae* passage. As Barchiesi prudently clarifies, we ought not concern ourselves with the question of whether Augustus and his achievements are being undermined, but with the question of whether the juxtaposition of passages marked by different themes might be intended to produce a conditioned response.⁶³⁶ Of equal importance are the considerations of Harries, to whom Barchiesi is responding, and his contention that two thematically incongruent passages that are juxtaposed produce “counter-effects” that serve to upset the balance of the poem.⁶³⁷ One would be hard pressed to find a section in the *Fasti* that offers a harsher juxtaposition of passages than the panegyric of Augustus and the rape of Callisto,⁶³⁸ both of which share Jupiter as a common character. Barchiesi, however, is not convinced that the Ganymede reference on its own is problematic. He postulates two possible ways of interpreting the Ganymede couplet that would not produce the “counter-effects” that Harries observes. The first is to put more weight on Ganymede’s Trojan lineage (*puer Idaeus* 2.145) and his role as a cup-bearer (*liquidas mixto nectare fundit aquas* 2.146) which, he claims, is especially plausible, given that Jupiter himself is not explicitly mentioned. Thus, according to Barchiesi, any potential for disharmony with the

⁶³⁶ Barchiesi (1997a) 81.

⁶³⁷ Harries (1989) 164.

⁶³⁸ Another front runner would be the juxtaposition of the largely comical story of Anna Perenna and the serious recollection of the murder of Julius Caesar both on the Ides of March.

preceding praise of Augustus evaporates once Jupiter is removed from the equation. On the contrary, the presence of Ganymede in his capacity both as an ancestor of Augustus, via the Julian family's alleged descent from Trojan blood, and as the royal cup-bearer, whose function is to "look down on the imperial event, and to sprinkle his nectar and rain," serves to enhance the positive image of the Princeps.⁶³⁹ While this possibility is at first sight quite convincing, it fails to account for Jupiter's presence in the ensuing Callisto narrative.

Barchiesi's second explanation for Ganymede's presence at this critical juncture is less credible. After admitting that Jupiter's rape of Ganymede may in fact be signaled by the couplet, Barchiesi contends that such an allusion may not be damaging at all. He claims that it can be interpreted as "a manifestation of omnipotence to render a boy-toy immortal."⁶⁴⁰ While it is true that such an interpretation would not necessarily malign Jupiter and that it would tie in well with Jupiter's rape of Callisto, it is difficult to transfer it over to Augustus, who was just above promoted as a pragmatist and a proponent of chaste wives in comparison to Romulus, the megalomaniacal rapist. Barchiesi also uses Horace *Odes* 4.4, which mentions Jupiter's rape of Ganymede in an overtly positive Augustan context, as a control passage in order to show that a reference to Ganymede and/or Jupiter does not necessarily imply malicious intent on the part of the poet.⁶⁴¹ Yet, as Robinson points out, the positive portrayal of Ganymede and Jupiter in a Horace poem that neither explicitly compares Augustus to Jupiter nor focuses at any length on a particular theme does not immediately negate the possibility of a suspicious or negative reading of their portrayal in the *Fasti*.⁶⁴² Although it is not out of the realm of possibility that this couplet

⁶³⁹ Barchiesi (1997a) 82.

⁶⁴⁰ Barchiesi (1997a) 82. This is quite close to Fantham's claim that the sexual aspect is merely an indication of power, not of wrongdoing (see n. 609 above).

⁶⁴¹ Barchiesi (1997a) 83.

⁶⁴² Robinson (2011) 158.

is intended to further bolster Augustus, it seems far more likely that its true purpose is to instigate a “counter-effect” in response to the panegyric of Augustus or at the very least to make the reader question its true meaning in the way modern scholars such as Harries and Barchiesi have done.

There are several verbal parallels between the Callisto narrative and the preceding passages that warrant attention. Harries equates the *lucum* desecrated by Callisto at 2.165 with the *luco* of 2.140, in which Romulus is said to have harbored *nefas*.⁶⁴³ Yet, if Romulus is to be compared with Callisto, then surely the reader ought to keep in mind the Jupiter and Augustus parallel. This, of course, is highly problematic, considering Jupiter’s act in the Callisto narrative involves both violence and rape, two aspects directly associated with Romulus, not Augustus.⁶⁴⁴ Indeed, Harries sees the character of Diana here as being most representative of the moral qualities of Augustus.⁶⁴⁵ Both are staunchly opposed to the violation of chastity: Augustus with his demand that wives remain chaste (*castas...iubet...maritas* 2.139), and Diana with her command that Callisto not pollute her chaste waters (*nec castas pollue...aquas* 2.174). Of further interest is the presence of the word *princeps* at *Fast.* 2.160. Just above, Augustus’ title of *princeps* was compared favorably with Romulus’ cruder title of *dominus*.⁶⁴⁶ Now Diana assures her protégé that she will become *comitum princeps* (2.160) if only she is able to keep her vow. In the lines following we learn that Callisto was unable to do so, not through any fault of her own,

⁶⁴³ Harries (1989) 167.

⁶⁴⁴ See *Fast.* 139-40: *tu rapis* (“you rape”) ...*vis tibi grata fuit* (“violence pleased you”).

⁶⁴⁵ Harries (1989) 167.

⁶⁴⁶ *Fast.* 2.142: *tu domini nomen, principis ille tenet* (“You (Romulus) hold the name of *dominus*, while he (Augustus) holds the name of *princeps*”).

but as a result of Jupiter's divine power.⁶⁴⁷ The forest is dense here and we are unable to make any extensive one-to-one comparisons between characters of the Callisto narrative and those of the *pater patriae* passage. Diana seems to exemplify Augustan values, Callisto futilely aspires to the position amongst her troop that defines Augustus' own position, and all the while Jupiter hovers in the background as a negative exemplum, unworthy of his regal description in the preceding panegyric.

Among several hypotheses put forth by Wilkins regarding the impact of the Callisto narrative is the idea that Ovid has intentionally crafted a scenario that links Jupiter's actions to those of Augustus as a subtle way of reminding Augustus about his own indiscretions and of his overly harsh treatment of the poet.⁶⁴⁸ Regardless of whether or not this was Ovid's intention, he has, however, packed his second book of the *Fasti* with episodes highlighting rape and marital infidelity. Beyond the already discussed Ganymede couplet and Callisto passage are the attempted rape of Omphale by Faunus (2.303-58), Jupiter's attempted rape of Juturna (2.585-96), Mercury's rape of Lara (2.599-616), and the rape of Lucretia by Sextus Tarquinius (2.721-852). Not all of these involve Jupiter, but they do all follow in the wake of Romulus' decision to populate Rome by raping and the possible allusion to Jupiter's rape of Ganymede (2.139).⁶⁴⁹

⁶⁴⁷ *Fast.* 2.162: *cavit mortales, de Iove crimen habet* ("She avoids mortals, and derives her crime from Jove").

⁶⁴⁸ Wilkins (1988) 380. See n. 596 above for references to Augustus' alleged extramarital activities. Hejduk (2020) 177-88 makes the convincing argument that Ovid frequently fashions himself as Callisto, since they were both banished from their native environment, both victims of unfair divine wrath. In the exile poetry Ovid continuously becomes more and more like Callisto, even assuming a shaggy and unkempt appearance akin to that of the bristly bear into which Callisto was transformed.

⁶⁴⁹ See Murgatroyd (2005) 92ff. who identifies possible aspects of subversion in nearly every rape episode. See also Richlin's chapter "Reading Ovid's Rapes" in *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome* (1992) 158-79, Hejduk's "Epic Rapes in the *Fasti*," (2011)

XI. Jupiter on the Feralia

The Ides of February are devoid of any substantial reference to Jupiter, despite the fact that he was conspicuous on the Ides of January and had played a prominent role in the days leading up to the Ides of February.⁶⁵⁰ Instead the day is devoted to the heroism of the Fabii in relation to their near extinction in the battle of the Cremera and the continuation of their gens by the sole survivor, whose descendant, Quintus Fabius Maximus, would one day save the Republic. The absence of Jupiter from this episode can be viewed as a reflection of the events related on the Ides of January, where Augustus and his Principate vied against the Republican Fabii for the highest title. Although Augustus, said to be on par with *summus Iuppiter*, seemingly won that contest, here the Fabii are lauded to the heavens for their tragic loss and altruism. Regardless of its reflection upon Augustus, it no doubt establishes a counterpart to the next entry involving Jupiter, where he will be depicted as selfish and only concerned with satisfying his base desires.

Jupiter resurfaces again a few days later on the Feralia (Feb. 21st), a festival of the dead, on which ancestral spirits were placated. In telling the tale of the origins of the goddess Muta, on whose behalf an old woman performs the rites necessary to appease the spirits (2.571-82), Ovid provides us with a rather unbalanced account of the king of the gods. Jupiter is initially presented as an elegiac predator, seeking to rape the nymph Juturna. This depiction is unflattering for several reasons. First, the reader would not soon forget that Jupiter was said to have raped

20-31, and W. R. Johnson's "The Rapes of Callisto," (1996) who is intrigued by the fact that Richlin leaves Jupiter's rape of Callisto out of her list of the *Fasti's raptae* (Johnson [1996] 16-17).

⁶⁵⁰ Including the *pater patriae* passage (2.119-44), potentially the Ganymede couplet (2.145-46), and the Callisto narrative (2.153-92).

Callisto earlier that very month (2.162).⁶⁵¹ Further, as Robinson cleverly points out, one of Jupiter's most common epithets, *Invictus*,⁶⁵² has been inverted, such that he is now *victus*, not with respect to war, but love (*Iuppiter, inmodico Iuturnae victus amore* 2.585).⁶⁵³ Here the juxtaposition of *Iuppiter* and *inmodico* immediately suggests a sort of destabilization,⁶⁵⁴ as Jupiter is said to go beyond the limits of what is proper, not, as we find out, with respect to his use of power, but rather in the domain of love. We may read this as Ovid's way of elegizing the normally bellicose Jupiter *Invictus*,⁶⁵⁵ just as he did for Mars when Ovid has him remove his helmet (*posita...casside* 3.172) and for Minerva when Ovid has her lay aside her spear (*posita...cuspide* 6.655). At the same time, however, Jupiter's greatness is still intact and he is described in the next line as having "endured things that ought not be suffered by so great a god" (*multa tulit tanto non patienda deo* 2.586).⁶⁵⁶ In addition, just below we see Jupiter described—by himself no less—as *summo...deo* (2.592) in an attempt to convince the nymphs that it is in Iuturna's best interests to succumb to a god of his magnitude. Recall once again Ovid's adamant desire to connect *summus Iuppiter* with the Princeps' title of *Augustus* on the Ides of January and

⁶⁵¹ See above for the especially controversial nature of Jupiter's actions in the Callisto narrative.

⁶⁵² Ovid notes that Jupiter *Invictus* was celebrated within the Roman calendar on the Ides of June (*Fast.* 6.649-50).

⁶⁵³ Robinson (2011) 377 who adds, "[this word play] suits the undercutting of Jupiter's grandeur we see throughout this narrative." See also Murgatroyd (2005) 77 for a similar observation.

⁶⁵⁴ Robinson (2011) 377-8 discusses the alternative manuscript tradition of *indomito* in place of *inmodico*, which he notes are "both used of passion."

⁶⁵⁵ While also serving as an ironic reversal of the Jupiter in the *Amores* who so often functioned as an obstacle to the success of the elegiac amator (see Hejduk [2020] 221).

⁶⁵⁶ The concept of "suffering" that *pator* evokes blends nicely with the image of the elegiac lover reluctantly smitten with excessive love/passion that is so common throughout the *Amores*. See Hejduk (2020) 208-209, esp. n. 48, for a comparison of the phrase *tanto non patienda deo* with Prop. 4.4.30 (*non patienda Iovi*) and the ways in which both foreshadow punishment, while simultaneously evoking the inappropriateness of Augustan Jove as an elegiac lover.

of the appearance of *summo...Iovi* in the Callisto narrative at 2.182, where it was used to indicate that Jupiter was recently Callisto's lover. Much like the Callisto parallel, the context surrounding the employment of *summus* at 2.592 does not evoke any of the high-minded characteristics of Jupiter that Ovid sought to equate with Augustus on the Ides of January and the Nones of February. Instead, it focuses on his emotional rather than his rational frame of mind, highlighting his insatiable infatuation with Juturna and his inability to take no for an answer, all qualities that would reflect poorly on the Princeps, even if Augustus is neither explicitly or implicitly mentioned in this passage.

In a mock counterpart to a traditional feature of epic poetry, wherein Jupiter presides over an assembly of the gods,⁶⁵⁷ Jupiter here summons a council of nymphs in order to secure his love-interest Juturna (2.589-90).⁶⁵⁸ Recall that in *Met.* 1 Jupiter, in the guise of Augustus, summons a council of the gods in order to deal with the treacherous actions of Lycaon. Ovid describes that scenario as follows: *ingentes animo et dignas Iove concipit iras / conciliumque vocat* ("He conceives anger in his mind that is substantial and worthy of Jove and summons a council" *Met.* 1.166-67). Note the verbal similarities to our present mock-council of nymphs. The summoning is, of course, couched in similar terms (*convocat hic nymphas* 2.589), but just prior we hear that Jupiter's suffering is unworthy of such a great god (*multa tulit tanto non patienda deo* 2.586), a near identical inversion of the statement in the *Met.* that his great anger was in fact appropriate for a god of his magnitude. Yet, the mock humor of the Feralia passage

⁶⁵⁷ Lively (2011) 20.

⁶⁵⁸ Such councils include that of *Aen.* 10 (1ff.), *Met.* 1 (163ff.) and *Fasti* 6 (353ff.), the last of which is also a slightly parodic take on this traditional Homeric feature. A comparison to the council of the gods in *Met.* 1 is particularly interesting, since there Jupiter is explicitly compared with Augustus and exhibits anger in an austere and meaningful way, quite the opposite of the situation here in *Fasti* 2.

soon dissipates and Jupiter's reaction upon learning of Lara's betrayal morphs into one of anger and rage akin to that which he exhibited in *Met.* 1 upon learning of Lycaon's treachery. One might ask, how does this reflect upon Augustus, who was clearly alluded to in the similarly-worded council of the gods in *Met.* 1?

Suetonius tells us that Augustus engaged in frequent acts of clemency and moderation.⁶⁵⁹ In another section, Suetonius states that "in the remaining aspects of his life, it is agreed that he was the most temperate and lacked suspicion of any vice."⁶⁶⁰ However, the intemperate actions of Jupiter here may bear a more personal touch. Given the constant fear that Ovid exhibits from exile of incurring additional punishment at the hands of Jupiter/Augustus,⁶⁶¹ Jupiter's mercurial disposition in the Feralia episode, coupled with his character's immediate metamorphosis from the elegiac pursuer of Juturna to the epic punisher of Lara, may reflect Ovid's own view of the actions taken by Augustus in banishing him to Tomis without due process. The fact that Lara here is punished by Jupiter for helping out her fellow nymph may likewise parallel Ovid's frustration at being exiled for keeping his silence about something he witnessed, perhaps involving Augustus' daughter, Julia.⁶⁶² For in a way, both Ovid and Lara receive the same

⁶⁵⁹ Suet. *Aug.* 51: *Clementiae civilitatisque eius multa et magna documenta sunt.*

⁶⁶⁰ Suet. *Aug.* 72: *In ceteris partibus vitae continentissimum constat ac sine suspicione ullius vitii.*

⁶⁶¹ For example, Ovid's fear that punishment is at hand every time he hears thunder (*Tr.* 1.1.81-82).

⁶⁶² See Goold (1983) for an extensive account of the possible reasons for Ovid's banishment, wherein he devotes a sizable portion to the aftermath of Julia's adultery and her subsequent banishment (pp. 102-104).

punishment. Both are punished with silence, Lara by having her tongue cut out, and Ovid by his removal from the Latin speaking world.⁶⁶³

XII. A Toast to Augustus on the Caristia

Ovid deftly connects the events of the Feralia on Feb. 21st with the subsequent celebration of the Caristia on Feb. 22nd through his description of the birth of the Lares,⁶⁶⁴ to whom food and incense are offered. The Caristia marks the *Fasti*'s return to a more celebratory tone and a departure from the rather macabre ritual of the Feralia, during which potentially harmful dead spirits had to be appeased.⁶⁶⁵ There is also a noticeable shift from the public nature of the Feralia to the private nature of the Caristia, which focuses more acutely on the household and its longevity. Yet, as Miller points out, Ovid goes through great lengths to highlight the religious flavor of the event, eschewing a description of the actual celebration and *convivium* in favor of a series of ritual directions.⁶⁶⁶ By employing a future imperative, *esto* (2.623), followed by a volitive subjunctive, *absint* (2.627), Ovid stresses that action must be taken to exclude impious members of family in order to achieve the harmonious state that the Caristia

⁶⁶³ See Feeney (1992) for the pervasive notion of forced silence in the *Fasti*. The similarities between Ovid and Lara recall Hejduk (2020) 278-89 who draws attention to how closely Ovid fashions himself after Callisto (see n. 648 above).

⁶⁶⁴ Although this does not concern Jupiter, the mention of the Lares evokes the cult of the *Lares Compitales*, which Augustus was recently responsible for restoring, and may be read as in relation to the suppression of free speech under the Princeps (see Newlands [1995] 160ff., especially n. 40, which outlines the view of Feeney [1992]). The *Lares Compitales* will figure more prominently on the Kalends of May where they follow immediately after Ovid's account of Jove's upbringing and his ascension to the divine throne.

⁶⁶⁵ Ov. *Fast.* 2.619-20 stresses the change in tone: *scilicet a tumulis et qui periere propinquis / protinus ad vivos ora referre iuvat* ("Clearly it is pleasing to turn our faces immediately from tombs and relatives who have perished to the living").

⁶⁶⁶ Miller (1991) 92.

exemplifies.⁶⁶⁷ In order to illustrate his point, Ovid proceeds to name several blatantly impious characters drawn from Greek myth. Among these is Tereus, king of Thrace and husband of Procne, who famously raped his wife's sister Philomela and cut out her tongue. The severing of a woman's tongue is not a common theme in Greek or Roman myth and is limited to the instance noted here.⁶⁶⁸ This brief catalogue of sinners has received criticism from Fränkel, who chastises Ovid for interrupting his ritual procedure with a "gratuitous" mythological insertion that detracts from the passage's solemnity.⁶⁶⁹ Miller has countered this interpretation by showing that what Fränkel sees as "gratuitous" is rather a series of "elements in a planned poetic design" that, on the one hand, adds specification to an anonymous list of sinners and, on the other, allows the poet to use Greek mythology as a way of explaining the very ritual he is reenacting.⁶⁷⁰ I would take this a step further and suggest that by using the specific mythological example of Tereus, Philomela, and Procne, Ovid here is alluding to Jupiter's cutting out of Lara's tongue, which is in fact what led to the existence of this celebration as a result of the events that transpired thereafter. Thus there is no place in the Caristia for a Jupiter who behaves in the fashion of Tereus. Yet Jupiter's absence—deliberate or otherwise—from this festival should not be problematic, since the focus is on paying honor to the gods of the family, *dis generis* (2.631), not the gods of the state.

One then wonders why the Princeps should have a share in the celebratory toast or why the closing address does not merely consist of a general prayer for health and happiness

⁶⁶⁷ Ov. *Fast.* 2.623 ff.: *innocui veniant: procul hinc, procul impius esto...* ("May only the innocent come: keep away from here, away I say, impious one...")

⁶⁶⁸ Newlands (1995) 160 and Robinson (2011) 383.

⁶⁶⁹ Fränkel (1945) 243 n. 25.

⁶⁷⁰ Miller (1991) 94-95.

throughout the year.⁶⁷¹ If Jupiter ought to be absent from this private setting, then surely Augustus should be as well. According to C. M. McDonough, that is not the case. The portion of the closing toast that hails Augustus as *pater patriae* immediately harkens us back to the Nones of Feb. where Augustus' most beloved title is front and center. It is McDonough's contention that while the passage on the Nones utilizes a comparison between Jupiter and Augustus, "A contrast rather than comparison is implied in the steady passage from Lara to Lares to *cari*: while Jupiter's immorality takes place against a host of family tensions, Augustus is saluted as such tensions are resolved....so the *pater patriae* presides over a ritually renewed family quite distinct from the dysfunctional domain under Jupiter's control."⁶⁷² Such an interpretation has merit. After all, it seems quite clear that the Caristia represents positive family values in a very identifiable setting, the household, as opposed to the preceding scattered narrative, which emphasized rape, violence, and the use of unchecked power amidst a very obscure geographical background.⁶⁷³ Miller goes so far as to interpret this positive employment of *pater patriae* (2.637) as correcting what he calls the "latent irony" of the *pater patriae* passage on the Nones.⁶⁷⁴ But it is likely that the culminating toast of the Caristia actually has very little to do with Augustus himself and even less to do with Jupiter. For in the *cena Trimalchionis* the guests all utter the following toast:

⁶⁷¹ McDonough (2004) 365 acknowledges that libations were often offered to the Princeps both in public and private settings, yet says, "Nonetheless it is jarring to find a toast here to the *pater patriae* where we expect one to the *paterfamilias*." Edwards (1993) 60, however, conflates Augustus' title of *pater patriae* with his being "the ultimate *paterfamilias*," claiming, "The whole state had become his household."

⁶⁷² McDonough (2004) 366, citing the argument of Harries (1989) 166-67, discussed above, that praise of Augustus in the *pater patriae* episode is undermined.

⁶⁷³ There is no indication of where the assembly of the nymphs occurred apart from the mention of *silvis* (2.587). Likewise, the transition from the upper world to the underworld is achieved merely through the vague *accepit lucus euntes* (2.611).

⁶⁷⁴ Miller (1991) 98.

“*Augusto, patri patriae, feliciter*” (*Sat.* 60.7). The implication is that these particular words have endured as a traditional toast long after Augustus’ death. Although such a realization detracts slightly from McDonough’s argument that Jupiter stands in for the broken household, while Augustus represents the intact one, the larger question relates to Ovid’s holistic treatment of Jupiter and Augustus in the *Fasti*. For it is curious that Ovid should cease to employ direct comparisons between Augustus and Jupiter beyond the second book of the *Fasti*, when he clearly strove to bookend his *perpetuum carmen* with the very same connection. Indeed, as was stated earlier, the middle thirteen books of the *Met.* lack any direct conflation of Augustus with Jupiter, while the poem culminates in the striking and controversial admission that Jupiter governs the heavens while Augustus governs the earth (*Met.* 15.858-60). In the *Fasti*, however, Ovid frontloads the association of Jupiter and Augustus, emphasizing it only in the first two books. Yet, those two marked passages (Jan. 13th and Feb. 5th) are enough to embed the conflation in the reader’s mind for the remainder of the poem, such that the reader cannot wholly divorce subsequent appearances of Jupiter and Augustus in the *Fasti*, even when there is very little cause for seeing one in the other. Let us now turn to an episode in the *Fasti* that alludes to a very personal and historical connection between Jupiter and Augustus.

XIII. Jupiter Elicius and the Kalends of March

Beyond the scope of the *Fasti*, the one aspect of Jupiter most associated with Augustus is the cult of Jupiter the thunderer. We have already mentioned Augustus’ near encounter with a lightning strike and his subsequent devotion to the cult of Jupiter Tonans.⁶⁷⁵ Indeed, Augustus’ construction of the temple of Jupiter Tonans, dedicated in 22 B.C., is among the many listed in

⁶⁷⁵ See n. 522 above.

his *Res Gestae*.⁶⁷⁶ Suetonius further showcases Augustus' close relationship with this particular cult by relating the anecdote that in response to a dream in which Jupiter appeared to Augustus and expressed his concern that his primary cult of *Capitolinus* was becoming overshadowed by Tonans, Augustus offered reassurances by hanging bells atop the temple of Tonans and referring to it as "*Capitolinus*' doorkeeper."⁶⁷⁷ The temple itself, however, is explicitly mentioned by Ovid only once in his *Fasti* on February 1st (2.69-70).⁶⁷⁸ Yet, the motif of Jupiter the wielder of lightning is pervasive throughout the work. Surely not every reference to the most famous characteristic of Jupiter ought to be read as a reflection of Augustus, but we ought not exclude the possibility that these specific mentions of Jupiter might evoke in the reader thoughts of the Princeps and influence the way in which he is perceived. This is especially the case, given the frequency with which Augustus and a lightning-wielding Jupiter are compared in Ovid's exile poetry,⁶⁷⁹ where it serves as yet another platform of appeal for the exiled poet.⁶⁸⁰

⁶⁷⁶ Augustus dedicated the temple of Jupiter Tonans on Sept. 1st 22 B.C. in fulfillment of a vow made in 26 B.C. during the Cantabrian war (see Platner and Ashby [1929] 305-06 and Robinson [2011] 102).

⁶⁷⁷ Suet. *Aug.* 91.2

⁶⁷⁸ Discussion of this passage will take place in the subsequent chapter, as the entry involves both Jupiter and Juno.

⁶⁷⁹ For a list of these instances see n. 481 above. See also Robinson (2011) 102 and McGowan (2009) 80 who notes that "In the exile poetry, the *princeps* is put on par with Jupiter and often even replaces him to become the supreme god of what is in fact Ovid's unique, exilic mythology."

⁶⁸⁰ Many scholars see Ovid's use of Jupiter as a stand-in for Augustus in his exile poetry as a negative reflection on the Princeps. Kenney (1982) 445 for example says, "This repeated equation of Augustus with the traditional Jupiter and of his power with the thunderbolt is more critical than complimentary." See also Ward (1933) 210 for a brief outline of the various ways in which Ovid evokes Jupiter as Augustus in his exile poetry. Hejduk (2020) 267 is keen to differentiate between the vengeful and antagonistic figure of Jupiter Tonans in the *Tristia* and the more receptive and gentler version of the same figure in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*.

One of the most conspicuous examples of awe-inspiring Jupiter hurling his lightning bolt in Ovid's *Fasti* occurs on the Kalends of March, on which day Ovid tells of Jupiter Elicius, or "Jupiter who is drawn down from the sky."⁶⁸¹ The impetus for the story of Jupiter Elicius is the aetiology of the Salii, priests of Mars, the god responsible for the month and who has thus far served as the month's primary interlocutor. Amidst voracious and frequent thunderstorms Numa seeks a way of propitiating Jupiter and lessening the effects of his wrath. At first, Jupiter's lightning is a symbol of fear for both Numa and the Romans: *rex pavet et volgi pectora terror habet* ("The king quivers and terror grasps the hearts of the crowd" 3.288). But by the story's end Jupiter's lightning is welcomed by Numa and his attendant audience as a harbinger of the shield that will fall from the sky and serve as the symbol of Roman's future imperial hegemony (3.368-74).

As we have seen, Romulus is compared unfavorably to Augustus on the Nones of February. That much is not in question.⁶⁸² Elsewhere in the *Fasti*, the actions of Romulus are depicted in such a way as to foster this rift between Rome's original founder and its contemporary re-founder.⁶⁸³ Yet the *Fasti* is not devoid of a legendary king whose demeanor and contributions are closely aligned with those of the Princeps. Considering Augustus' own

⁶⁸¹ Liv. 1.20 also gives a brief account of the story of Jupiter Elicius, tying it to the many acts Numa undertook when he first became king.

⁶⁸² Herbert-Brown (1994) 44ff. argues not that there are any positive or redeeming qualities in the depiction of Romulus in the *pater patriae* passage, but that Augustus would have appreciated Ovid's role in dispensing with the elephant in the room, namely "the disreputable *exempla* of Romulus" (Herbert-Brown [1994] 62) that Augustus himself had sought to avoid.

⁶⁸³ Romulus' lack of success in the Lupercalia *aetion* (2.373ff.), his feigned piety upon learning of Remus' death at the hands of Celer (4.850), and his murder of his uncle Amulius (3.67) to name a few. See also Hinds (1992b) 117ff. who views Romulus' actions, particularly in book 3, as being "uncompromisingly warlike."

contributions to the Roman calendar and his devotion to religious principles, it should come as no surprise that Numa, not Romulus, should be viewed as Augustus' closest mortal comparandum.⁶⁸⁴ That is not to say that Ovid intended for Numa to function as a stand-in for Augustus, but rather that the reader can detect similarities between the two, especially in light of the contrast drawn between Augustus and Romulus in the *pater patriae* episode.⁶⁸⁵ We are told on the Kalends of March that Numa was able to curb the Romans' desire for war "by law and fear of the gods" and that "laws were thence given lest the more powerful control everything."⁶⁸⁶ Compare this to the statement about Romulus and Augustus in book 2: *vis tibi grata fuit, florent sub Caesare leges* ("Violence was pleasing to you (Romulus), while laws flourish under Caesar Augustus." 2.141). Heyworth in his commentary on *Fasti* 3 goes so far as to say, "In these respects he [Numa] is Augustus as *princeps*."⁶⁸⁷

Jupiter the thunderer then enters the narrative in epic fashion:⁶⁸⁸ *ecce deum genitor rutilas per nubila flammas / spargit et effusis aethera siccat aquis* ("Behold, the father of the gods disperses red flames through the clouds and dries up the heavens by pouring out rain" 285-86). Throughout the first two books Ovid had used the epic marker *ecce* in order to signal the arrival of Janus (1.64), the donkey carrying Silenus (1.433)—clearly mock-epic—, Hercules, called *heros* (1.543), and the old woman on the Feralia (2.571). Now we see Jupiter in his most original

⁶⁸⁴ Hinds (1992b) 118ff., especially 120 n. 7, shows the various ways in which Numa is depicted as the peaceful counterpart to a primitive and war-like Romulus.

⁶⁸⁵ Heyworth (2019) 139 comments "Now Ovid expands on Numa's reforms more generally, exploiting the negative picture of Romulus established in the contrast between him and Augustus at 2.133-44."

⁶⁸⁶ *Fast.* 3.278-79: *iure deumque metu / inde datae leges, ne firmior omnia posset.*

⁶⁸⁷ Heyworth (2019) 139.

⁶⁸⁸ For thunder as a symbol of epic amongst the Augustan poets in imitation of Callimachus, see Heyworth (2019) 140.

form as a weather god, summoning both fire from his lightning bolts and torrential rain from his storm clouds.⁶⁸⁹ After a particularly treacherous thunderstorm, Numa's wife Egeria comforts Numa with the following words: '*ne nimium terrere: piabile fulmen / est*' ait '*et saevi flectitur ira Iovis*' ("Do not have great fear: the thunderbolt, 'she said', can be expiated and the wrath of savage Jove can be deflected" 3.289-90). The language Egeria uses recalls that of Deucalion and Pyrrha after the great flood in *Met.* 1: '*si precibus*' dixerunt '*numina iustis / victa remollescunt, si flectitur ira deorum*...' ("If, 'they said', the divinities become mild, pacified by just prayers, if the anger of the gods can be deflected..." *Met.* 1.377-78). Although the *Met.* passage addresses the anger of the gods more broadly, while the *Fasti* focuses solely on Jove's wrath, both scenarios result from actions taken by Jupiter, the former involving water and the latter fire.⁶⁹⁰ It is hard not to see a parallel between Numa's actions—his initial fear of the lightning and the subsequent measures he took in order to placate Jupiter—and Augustus' experience of nearly being struck by lightning in Cantabria and thereafter devoting himself to the cult of Jupiter Tonans. This story has no epigraphic attestation, either for the first of March or for any day in the Roman calendar. Thus its placement on the first of March in Ovid's *Fasti* must be deliberate. By emphasizing the peaceful actions of king Numa and the merciful response of a lightning-wielding Jupiter on the first day of the month devoted to war, Ovid is no doubt stressing a different aspect of the month than would be expected.⁶⁹¹ Jupiter, who begins the passage

⁶⁸⁹ Notice the hexameter ends with *ignes*, while the pentameter ends with *aquis*, which serves to combine the two opposing elemental powers of Jove.

⁶⁹⁰ One obvious difference between the two passages is that while Egeria is certain of the ability to appease Jupiter's thunderbolt and tells Numa whom to ask for help, Deucalion and Pyrrha merely hope that a method of appeasement might exist.

⁶⁹¹ This is in keeping with the elegiac removal of Mars' helmet and the peaceful resolution between the Sabines and the Romans that preceded the Jupiter *Elicius* passage. See Merli (2000) 37ff. and Hinds (1992b) 118ff.

behaving in a hostile manner and making free use of his thunderbolt for harm's sake, concludes the passage employing his thunderbolt merely as a confirmation of the success of Numa's actions, thereby preventing any further death. It represents the very same premise of Augustus nearly being killed by a thunderbolt, only to adopt that cult as his new protective agent.

Yet, beyond the possibility of interpreting Numa's actions as equivalent to those of Augustus', there lies another reading. Recall that Ovid himself sought to expiate the thunderbolt of Jove—that is to alleviate the wrath of Augustus—in his exile poetry.⁶⁹² Thus it reasons that Ovid to some degree may have fashioned Numa after himself.⁶⁹³ We see this when Ovid the narrator steps in and calls attention to the fact that *quaque trahant superis sedibus arte Iovem / scire nefas homini* ("It is a crime for man to know by which art they draw Jupiter down from the heavens" 3.324-25). This statement can be read as a subtle admission both of Ovid's inability to get through to Augustus and procure a pardon and his exasperation at being ignorant of the method by which (*qua...arte*, 3.324) he might be able to do so. Indeed, the plea of Numa to Jupiter, *da certa piamina...fulminis* ("Grant me sure appeasement of the thunderbolt" 3.333), is framed in similar terms as that of Ovid to Augustus. Throughout his exile poetry, Ovid often makes the point that in his case the punishment did not fit the crime.⁶⁹⁴ In this passage Ovid links himself to Numa's religiously correct actions by drawing attention to his own respect for religious sanctity:

⁶⁹² Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.71-2; 1.1.81-82; 1.9.21-22 (for the Latin with translations see pp. 167-68 above).

⁶⁹³ Barchiesi (1997a) 111 comments, "Numa is presented not only as an originator of the early usages that provide the poem with its subject matter, but also as a sort of frontrunner of Ovid himself."

⁶⁹⁴ Most clearly at *Tr.* 1.2.97-98: *si tamen acta deos numquam mortalia fallunt, / a culpa facinus scitis abesse mea* ("Nevertheless if mortal deeds do not deceive the gods, you know that crime was absent from my fault") and *Tr.* 2.107-08: *scilicet in superis etiam fortuna luenda est, / nec veniam laeso numine casus habet* ("Evidently in matters concerning the gods ill-fortune must be atoned, and when a god is offended, misfortune is not considered an excuse").

nobis concessa canentur / quaeque pio dici vatis ab ore licet: “I will sing what is allowed and what is permitted to be said by the pious mouth of the poet” 3.325-26).⁶⁹⁵ Just below Numa qualifies his plea for the expiation of Jove’s thunderbolt as follows: *si tua contigimus manibus donaria puris, / hoc quoque quod petitur si pia lingua rogat* (“if we have touched your altars with pure hands and if a pious mouth also asks for what is sought” 3.335-36).⁶⁹⁶ Thus they both emphasize the piety of their words, Ovid to the reader and Numa to Jupiter.⁶⁹⁷ Jupiter, however, responds to Numa’s impassioned plea with “obscure words” (*dubio...ore* 3.338) and makes it difficult for him to meet Jupiter’s demands. But the difficulty does not lie in Numa’s deciphering of Jupiter’s commands, but rather in his unwillingness to sacrifice a human when the god’s orders are so open to interpretation. Jupiter wants a head to be severed (*caede caput* 3.339) and Numa counters with that of an onion (*cepa* 3.340). Jupiter insists on a man’s head (*hominis* 3.341), but Numa compromises by offering a man’s hair (*capillos* 3.341). Jupiter demands a life (*animam* 3.342), and Numa offers up that of a fish (*piscis* 3.342).⁶⁹⁸ Finally, Jupiter relents and the tension, which had been palpable up to this point in the narrative, is cut by Jupiter’s laugh (*risit* 3.343), marking the return from epic back to elegy,⁶⁹⁹ and Jupiter’s acceptance of this offering. In addition, Jupiter’s statement that Numa is *vir conloquio non abigende deum* (“a man not to be driven away from conversation with the gods” 3.344) echoes Ovid’s own statement at

⁶⁹⁵ Heyworth (2019) 148 connects this to Ovid’s exile via several exilic passages that employ similar language, saying, “Allusion establishes a connexion with his exile for supposedly exceeding the bounds of permissible speech.”

⁶⁹⁶ Heyworth (2019) 149 also observes that the *pia* of 3.336 picks up on the *piamina* of 3.333.

⁶⁹⁷ An observation also made by Heyworth (2019) 148.

⁶⁹⁸ Heyworth (2019) 150 comments, “The story provides a comic explanation for the unusual cult offerings to Jupiter Elicius.”

⁶⁹⁹ Heyworth (2019) 150 compares Jupiter’s laugh here to that of Venus in response to Ovid’s cheekiness at *Fast.* 4.5.

6.7: *fas mihi praecipue voltus vidisse deorum* (“It is especially right for me to have seen the faces of the gods”), which is then reaffirmed by Juno just below at 6.23: *ius tibi fecisti numen caeleste videndi* (“You have forged for yourself the right to see celestial god(s)").⁷⁰⁰ But unlike Ovid, Numa receives a guarantee for his efforts, with Jupiter promising him *imperii pignora certa* (“sure signs of empire” 3.346).⁷⁰¹ Jupiter then departs in a roar of thunder, leaving Numa awestruck: *dixit et ingenti tonitru super aethera motum / fertur, adorantem destituitque Numam* (“[Jupiter] spoke and amidst a huge blast of thunder is carried above the shaken sky, and left behind a reverential Numa” 3.347-8). One might here think of Ovid who confesses in his *Tristia* that he shudders every time it thunders, afraid of incurring additional wrath from Augustus.⁷⁰² Although a reading of this passage that views Numa as a reflection of a contemporary Ovid, frustrated at his failure to secure a pardon from the Princeps, is far from undeniable, it nevertheless ought to be entertained, considering the degree to which Ovid attributes his fate to the *fulmina Iovis* in his exile poetry, the emphasis of this narrative on the dangers of the thunderbolt and the need to deflect it, and the explicit collation of Jupiter and Augustus in *Fasti* 1 and 2.

⁷⁰⁰ See also Heyworth (2019) 151 who likens Numa’s divine closeness to “another man who has not been kept from colloquy with gods despite their best efforts: Ovid.”

⁷⁰¹ An allusion no doubt to Jupiter’s prophecy at *Aen.* 1.279 where he promises the future Romans *imperium sine fine* (“empire without a limit”). Note the verbatim repetition of these words by Numa to the Romans at 3.354, who relates to them Jupiter’s promise as precisely as possible.

⁷⁰² *Tr.* 1.1.81-82 (see p. 168 above). Heyworth (2019) 151 notes that by thundering yet again, “Jupiter comically ignores the point of Numa’s appeal.” Augustus’ ignoring of Ovid’s appeals in the exile poetry are far less comical.

XIV. Praise of Veiovis

The entry on the Nones of March (March 7th) provides Ovid with an excellent opportunity for building upon the concept of Augustus' appropriation of the Nones.⁷⁰³ This is especially true given that Ovid describes Veiovis, whose Capitoline temple was dedicated on that day,⁷⁰⁴ as a young Jupiter who has not yet taken up the thunderbolt,⁷⁰⁵ a perfect subject matter for a work that has professed to sing about *arae* instead of *arma*.⁷⁰⁶ Further, on the previous day, March 6th, Ovid celebrates the anniversary of the day on which Augustus became Pontifex Maximus:

Caesaris innumeris, quos maluit ille mereri,
accessit titulis pontificalis honor. 420
ignibus aeternis aeterni numina praesunt
Caesaris: imperii pignora iuncta vides.

The honor of Pontifex was heaped upon the countless titles of Caesar, which he preferred to earn. The godhead of eternal Caesar presides over the eternal fires: you see joined signs of empire. (*Fast.* 3.419-22)

This celebration of yet another of Augustus' titles harkens back both to the Ides of January, the day on which he is said to have been given the name 'Augustus', the equivalent of *summus Iuppiter* (1.587-616), and to the Nones of February, where his title of *pater patriae* is compared to that of Jupiter's in heaven (2.127-32). It is no coincidence that on the next entry Ovid

⁷⁰³ As was the case for February (see n. 617 above).

⁷⁰⁴ See Degraffi (1964) 421 who cites Liv. 35.41.8 for the dedication of a temple to Ve(d)iovis on the Capitoline. For the location of the temple of Veiovis on the Capitoline see Richardson (1992) 406.

⁷⁰⁵ *Fast.* 3.437: *aspice deinde manum: fulmina nulla tenet* ("then look at his hand: it holds no thunderbolt").

⁷⁰⁶ See Hinds (1992a) 94-95 who compares the [*Iuppiter*] *inermis* of 3.440 with the [Mars] *inermis* of 3.8 who opened the book.

addresses another title of the god Jupiter, that of *Veiovis*. Further, even though the *ignibus aeternis* of 3.421 no doubt refers to the eternal flame of Vesta, the phrase *imperii pignora* (3.422) immediately takes us back on the Kalends of March where Jupiter Elicius promises Numa *imperii pignora certa* (3.346). The *ignibus*, therefore, doubles as the sacred flame of Vesta and the thunderbolt that heralded the arrival of the *ancile* shield, the very sign of Rome's *imperium*. Finally, the phrase *aeterni numina... Caesaris* in reference to Augustus further highlights his divine status and reminds us of his prior comparisons with Jupiter.⁷⁰⁷

But could not Ovid have made this connection with Jupiter even more explicit by pushing this celebration one more day in order to align it with the dedication of the temple of Veiovis? He accomplished something similar on the Ides of January when he moved the day on which the Princeps adopted the title of Augustus so that he could combine it with the day on which Augustus restored the provinces.⁷⁰⁸ Yet, instead of stressing Augustus' peaceful tactics or giving a nod to the Julian family's close association with Veiovis on the Nones of March,⁷⁰⁹ Ovid focuses on Romulus' granting of asylum to criminals and the petty beginnings of a great Empire.⁷¹⁰ Recall that on the Kalends of January Janus compared Augustus' building of a grandiose temple for Jupiter to an earlier, more primitive temple, where the cult statue held a

⁷⁰⁷ Heyworth (2019) 166 says of this phrase, "a striking assertion of Caesar's divine power and immortality."

⁷⁰⁸ See pp. 182-83 above.

⁷⁰⁹ Heyworth (2019) 168 discusses the potential to connect this temple of Veiovis on the Capitoline to that in Bovillae "whose altar was part of the gentilician cult of the *gens Julia*." Admitting that such a link is far from certain, Heyworth nevertheless concludes that it could serve to highlight the modern family's connection to power through Jupiter and his thunderbolt, as opposed to the older Julian gens that was deprived of such power through relative political obscurity. See also Hinds (1992a) 96 n. 16.

⁷¹⁰ Note the contrast between the *de tenui...origine* (3.433) of Romulus' time and the *imperii pignora* (3.422) of Augustus' time.

thunderbolt made from clay (1.201-02). Here, we have another early temple to Jupiter,⁷¹¹ which not only lacks a golden thunderbolt, but lacks the thunderbolt entirely. Scholars have argued that by emphasizing that Jupiter's statue here "holds no thunderbolt" (*fulmina nulla tenet* 3.438) and that "from the earliest time he was unarmed" (*primo tempore inermis erat* 3.440), Ovid both endorses his controversial etymology of Veiovis as "little Jupiter" and simultaneously "fits him into the generic scope of this elegiac poem."⁷¹²

At the same time, such an image conjures up our most recent passage concerning Jupiter on the Kalends of March, where he is shown putting aside the power of his thunderbolt and using it merely as a signaling tool rather than a tool of destruction (3.368-70). The Veiovis passage even highlights the fact that Jupiter first took up the thunderbolt to combat the giants who were threatening his domain (3.339-40).⁷¹³ The image of unarmed Jupiter is also one that jives well with the image of Augustus as priest, described in the previous entry. Just as the Ides of January aimed to show Augustus' greatness vis-à-vis his shared epithet of *Augustus* with *summus Iuppiter*, and just as the Nones of February aimed to show Augustus' benevolence vis-à-vis his shared epithet of *pater patriae* with Jupiter, so too does the Nones of March implicitly draw a comparison between the non-martial aspects of Augustus and Jupiter, the former as Pontifex, and the latter as *inermis*. This passage, particularly the mention of the she-goat who nursed Jove in

⁷¹¹ Richardson (1992) 406 cites Livy (35.41.8) who tells us that the temple was vowed in 198 B.C. and dedicated in 192 B.C.

⁷¹² Heyworth (2019) 170. See also Hinds (1992a) 94-97 who discusses the possibility that the cult statue of Veiovis held arrows, negating Ovid's description as *inermis*, or that it may have even held a thunderbolt, making Ovid "guilty of a more literal untruth" (Hinds [1992a] 97 n. 18). Hejduk (2020) 251-52 summarizes Hinds and views this passage as yet another example of the general disarmament of Jupiter in the *Fasti*.

⁷¹³ This mention of the Gigantomachy will be picked up again in book 5 when Polyhymnia sings of Jupiter's magnanimous actions in thwarting this coup (5.35-46).

Crete (3.443-4),⁷¹⁴ also sets the stage for a much more in-depth account of the upbringing of Jupiter on the Kalends of May, which culminates in a Jupiter with full powers who is capable of bestowing honor upon those who nursed him.⁷¹⁵ And there Augustus will play a much more prominent role.

XIV. An absent Jupiter on the Ides of March

Thus far, despite Ovid's initial promise not to return to the special relationship between the Kalends and Ides and Juno and Jupiter respectively (1.61-62), he has done so on several occasions.⁷¹⁶ One place in particular where we would expect a narrative that incorporates elements of Jupiter and Augustus is on the Ides of March. The fact that this is both the day on which Caesar, Augustus' adopted father, was assassinated and the day on which Jupiter received his traditional sacrifice gives Ovid the perfect opportunity for combining those two elements in a grandiose way. Instead, Ovid opts for a vastly different route, relegating Jupiter to a description of the heavens to which Caesar ascended (*Iovis atria* 3.703) and shocks the reader by reducing Caesar's death and apotheosis to a mere 14 lines (3.697-710), while granting the bulk of the day's narrative to the carnivalesque Plebeian festival of Anna Perenna (3.523-656).⁷¹⁷ Newlands argues that Ovid exploits the populist aspect of the festival of Anna Perenna in order to create a contrast with the recent memorialization of the day that resulted from Julius Caesar's death.⁷¹⁸ She sees the juxtaposition of the Anna Perenna festival and the commemoration of Caesar's

⁷¹⁴ The she-goat also establishes a connection with Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* (see Heyworth [2019] 171).

⁷¹⁵ It should be noted, however, that on the first of May there is no mention of *Veiovis*, only of *Iovis*.

⁷¹⁶ The one exception so far being Jupiter on the Ides of February.

⁷¹⁷ Jupiter also appears when Ovid puts forth the theory by some that Anna was actually Azanis, the nymph who first fed the young Jove in Arcadia (6.659-60).

⁷¹⁸ Newlands (1996).

assassination as having subversive value by “offering an implied critique of the process by which power was wielded to reshape history and Roman identity.”⁷¹⁹ Part of her argument involves drawing attention to the vast differences between the populist cult deity, Anna Perenna, and the solemn respected goddess of the Olympic Pantheon, Vesta, whom Newlands refers to as “a specifically Augustan deity” in terms of her appearances in the *Fasti*.⁷²⁰ I would argue that the absence of Jupiter adds to this dichotomy by removing another very “Augustan” element, at least as far as the *Fasti* is concerned. In terms of Jupiter’s relevance, specifically on the Ides of March, Degrassi cites two different texts. The first is that of John the Lydian’s *de mensibus*, which mentions that “There is a celebration for Jupiter on the Ides of March.”⁷²¹ The second is a fragment from the *Fasti Verulani* which marks the 15th of March as devoted to *Feriae Iovis*, “A celebration of Jupiter.”⁷²² Despite the late 6th century date of John the Lydian, the *Fasti Verulani* is much closer to Ovid’s own time with a date of 14-37 A.D.⁷²³ Thus the inclusion of a festival to Jupiter on the Ides of March is something that Ovid could have made use of, both to enhance the pathos associated with Caesar’s death and to bolster the image of Augustus in light of his subsequent success in punishing Caesar’s assassins.⁷²⁴ The fact that Ovid instead opts for a

⁷¹⁹ Newlands (1996) 321.

⁷²⁰ Newlands (1996) 333.

⁷²¹ Lyd. *De mens.* 4.49: Εἰδοῖς Μαρτίαις ἑορτὴ Διός.

⁷²² Degrassi (1963) 423.

⁷²³ Miller (2002b) 199 n. 1.

⁷²⁴ For example, Ovid could have compared Augustus’ victory over the armies of Brutus and Cassius to Jupiter’s victory over the rebellious titans. This would accord nicely with Augustus’ own view on the matter, as recorded in his *Res Gestae* (1.2). This precedent is established elsewhere in Augustan literature, particularly on the shield of Aeneas in *Aeneid* 8, where the description of the battle of Actium exploits elements of the gigantomachy (see Gee [2000] 56-7). Also relevant is the statement of Ward (1933) 206: “De Mirmont offers the suggestion that some

jarring juxtaposition between Anna Perenna and Vesta without even acknowledging the celebration of Jupiter is yet another indication of his bipolar treatment of Augustan ideology.

XV. Jupiter and Maiestas

Before the Kalends of May and the entry devoted to Jupiter's upbringing on Crete three of the Muses argue over the month's etymology. Polyhymnia makes the first speech, asserting that the month of May owes its name to *Maiestas*, which Pauly Wissowa defines as the embodiment of *imperium*, *potestas*, *dignitas*, and *auctoritas*.⁷²⁵ Therein Polyhymnia describes the circumstances of Gaia's release of the giants and Jupiter's retaliatory actions:

Terra feros partus, immania monstra, Gigantas	35
edidit ausuros in <u>Iovis</u> ire domum.	
mille manus illis dedit et pro cruribus angues,	
atque ait "in <u>magnos</u> arma movete deos."	
exstruere hi montes ad sidera <u>summa</u> parabant	
et <u>magnum</u> bello sollicitare <u>Iovem</u> ;	40
<u>fulmina</u> de caeli iaculatus <u>Iuppiter</u> arce	
vertit in auctores pondera <u>vasta</u> suos.	
his bene Maiestas armis defensa deorum	
restat, et ex illo tempore culta manet.	
assidet inde <u>Iovi</u> , <u>Iovis</u> est fidissima custos,	45
et praestat sine vi scepra timenda <u>Iovi</u> .	

Earth produced savage offspring, immense monsters, the Giants, who dared to attack the home of Jove. She endowed them with a thousand hands and snakes for legs, and said, "Take up arms against the great gods." They heaped up mountains to the tops of the stars and were preparing to engage great Jove in war; Jupiter hurled his thunderbolt from the citadel of the sky and turned the vast masses upon its very creators. Maiestas survives, well-defended by these weapons of the gods, and from that time she remains worshipped.

of the lost Augustan epics may have contained the comparison of Augustus with Jupiter by means of the Gigantomachia").

⁷²⁵ *RE* 14.27 542ff.

Thence she sits at Jove's side, she is Jove's most loyal guardian, and she preserves the scepter of Jove to be feared without force. (Fast. 5.35-46)

This episode was briefly referenced in the Veiovis passage discussed above (3.439-42) and represents one of the earliest and most potent uses of Jupiter's thunderbolt.⁷²⁶ This passage cites Jove's name a noticeable six times within a mere twelve lines.⁷²⁷ The subject matter is as epic as it comes and Jupiter is described as "great" (*magnum* 40) and his scepter as "fearful" (*timenda* 46).⁷²⁸ This is precisely the theme that Ovid himself once began to tell, only to be thwarted by having his girlfriend slam the door in his face, thus redirecting his focus back to his familiar elegy, though still couched in martial terms: *mea tela* (*Am.* 2.1.21).⁷²⁹ At the same time, the story of the Gigantomachy is pervasive throughout Greek literature and art as a way of depicting the transition of political power. More relevant to this study, however, is the frequency with which the Augustan poets employed this motif as a way of indicating Augustus' superiority.⁷³⁰ The transition of power from the Titan Saturn to the Olympian Jupiter is alluded to in the section just above where Ovid says: *hic status in caelo multos permansit in annos, / dum senior fatis excidit*

⁷²⁶ See n. 713 above.

⁷²⁷ Barchiesi (1991) 9 interprets the "triple repetition of *Iuppiter*" as one of several indications that Polyhymnia is singing a hymn.

⁷²⁸ Barchiesi (1991) 8 and Fantham (1985) 267 both discuss the clear Hesiodic tone of Polyhymnia's speech. Barchiesi (1991) 8 also notes "Polyhymnia's emphasis on greatness" vis-à-vis the multiple uses of *magnus* throughout. To those I would add *summa* (39) and *vasta* (42).

⁷²⁹ In *Am.* 2.1.11-21 Ovid jokingly says that he was planning on telling the weighty story of the war with the Giants and even had Jupiter's thunderbolt in his hand. But when his lover slammed the door in his face, he accidentally dropped both Jove and the lightning, forcing him to retreat back into his familiar genre of elegy. See Miller (forthcoming) 9 for a list of the other poetic examples of the Gigantomachy being used as a *recusatio*.

⁷³⁰ Miller (forthcoming) 9 cites Hor. *C.* 3.4 and Ov. *Tr.* 2.333-38 as the primary examples, but also adds, "arguably in many other passages (e.g. Tib. 2.5.5-10 and Prop. 3.9.47-56)."

arce deus (“This state persisted in the sky for many years, until, owing to the fates, the senior god fell from the sky” 5.33-34). As J. F. Miller points out in his forthcoming commentary on *Fasti* 5, Jupiter’s dethroning of Saturn is elsewhere in the *Fasti* couched in violent terms, perhaps anticipating the force that Jupiter will use against the Giants.⁷³¹ Yet, the fact that *Maiestas* had already precipitated a new era of divine harmony amongst the gods prior to Saturn’s expulsion problematizes his replacement with the seemingly superior Jupiter.⁷³² This, in turn, causes the reader to question the legitimacy of Jupiter/Augustus’ newfound power and its effect on moral order, represented by *Maiestas*. We might also see in lines 41-2 a precursor to the post-exilic Jupiter/Augustus who smites Ovid with the thunderbolt and in essence knocks him away from Rome in a manner similar to how Jupiter here knocks the Giants down from their triple-stacked mountains.⁷³³

One observation worth noting, however, is that Jupiter’s use of the thunderbolt here is entirely defensive. He is not seeking to use them against an unwitting enemy, nor does he deploy them on behalf of specific family members. The Giants “who dared to attack the home of Jove” (36) and “who are preparing to engage great Jove in war” (39-40) are clearly the aggressors.⁷³⁴ Even Gaia is directing them to attack the Olympians (38). On the other hand, upon Jupiter’s

⁷³¹ Miller (forthcoming) 9, citing *Fast.* 1.236 (*pulsus*) and 4.197 (*excutiere*).

⁷³² Miller (forthcoming) 11 draws attention to the fact that *arce* at 5.41 shows that Jupiter now occupies the citadel from which Saturn was dispelled at 5.34.

⁷³³ Miller (forthcoming) 11 notes the possible pun on *auctores* (5.42), which here refers to the Giants as “perpetrators,” but would apply equally to Ovid in the more literal sense from the post-exilic perspective.

⁷³⁴ Although one could argue that it was Saturn’s dethronement that prompted their legitimate retaliation.

successful repulsion of the Giants, *Maiestas* is celebrated specifically in Jovian terms.⁷³⁵ She is defended by his weapons, sits by his side, serves as his most loyal guardian, and even helps protect his royal scepter (45-46). It is evident that her greatness is reflected in her service to Jupiter. Yet, Miller notes that this signifies a substantial change from her earlier status where she is described as *consedit medio sublimis Olympo* (“sitting jointly on high in the middle of Olympus” 5.27).⁷³⁶ In the wake of Jupiter’s victory over the giants and his consolidation of power, *Maiestas*’ place in the cosmic universe is now tethered solely to him, such that she serves as “the personified source of respect for authority conjoined with the new ultimate authority.”⁷³⁷ Thus both Jupiter and Augustus embrace a new regime that on the surface pays homage to the traditions of the past, but in reality heralds a new dynamic centering upon autocratic rule.

Beyond the scope of this passage, Horace speaks of Augustus’ *maiestas* (*Ep.* 2.1.258) and Ovid in his exile poetry goes so far as to call Augustus’ *maiestas* “gentle” (*Tr.* 2.512).⁷³⁸ Further, we must not forget the etymological connection between *maiestas* and *maius*, the latter of which we have seen is often applied to Augustus and Augustan themes.⁷³⁹ Thus once again we can detect another latent grouping of Jupiter and Augustus, the very symbol of *maiestas*. Ovid solidifies this connection by proceeding to describe *Maiestas* in terms that could only apply to the Princeps: *illa datos fasces commendat eburque curule, / illa coronatis alta triumphat equis*. (“She looks after the entrusted fasces and the curule chair of ivory, and she loftily celebrates a

⁷³⁵ Brookes (1992) 25 comments on the etymological relationship between *magnus* and *Maiestas*, remarking that the *magnum...Iovem* of 5.40 may “hint at a special relationship between Jupiter and *Maiestas*.”

⁷³⁶ Miller (forthcoming) 12.

⁷³⁷ Miller (forthcoming) 12.

⁷³⁸ With Ovid saying at *Tr.* 2.512: *maiestas adeo comis ubique tua est* (“To such an extent is your gentle majesty everywhere”).

⁷³⁹ See n. 542 above and the surrounding pages.

triumph on garlanded horses” *Fast.* 5.51-52).⁷⁴⁰ While the hexameter points toward features that would be associated with the consulship, such as the fasces and the curule chair, the pentameter serves to remind the reader that triumphs are now reserved only for members of the imperial family. So once again Ovid presents a show of imperial greatness, cloaked in Republican trappings.⁷⁴¹

XVI. Jupiter, Augustus, and the Lares on the Kalends of May

On the Kalends of May Ovid sees fit to tell a story not attested in any of the epigraphic *Fasti*, namely the rearing of the infant Jupiter in the hills of Crete (5.111-28). Contrary to an alternative, and arguably more traditional version of this story, in which Amalthea is the goat whose broken horn provides the baby Jupiter with nourishing milk,⁷⁴² in Ovid’s account Almalthea is a Naiad, who has in her possession the aforementioned she-goat that supplies the infant king of the gods with milk.⁷⁴³ One might ask what this particular story is doing on the Kalends of May. The answer is readily apparent in the first two lines: *ab Iove surgat opus. Prima mihi nocte videnda / stella est in cunas officiosa Iovis* (“Let the work rise from Jove. On the first

⁷⁴⁰ Miller (forthcoming) 12 notes, “The triumph of Maestas (55) neatly corresponds to the great victory of Jupiter.” He also makes the astute observation that Maestas’ protection of the Fasces and the Curule chair echoes the manner in which she is said to protect Jupiter’s sceptre (5.46).

⁷⁴¹ Fantham (1986) 268-72 views this couplet as well as the lines preceding it as marking a move away from praising the emperor and more towards praising the general populace. She argues that the Republican tones of this section are indicative of the less autocratic early stages of Tiberius’ principate. However, the final mention of a triumphal celebration no doubt shines the light back on the imperial family, regardless of who is emperor at the time.

⁷⁴² The traditional story is found in Callim. *Hymn* 1.49, Arat. *Phaen.* 163, and Hyg. *Astr.* 2.13.

⁷⁴³ Ovid’s version of the story is also found in Eratosth. *Cat.* 13, Apollod. 2.7.5, Lactant. *Instit.* 1.22, and Hyg. *Fab.* 139, where the nymph is called Adamanteia.

night I can see the star that served Jupiter in his cradle”).⁷⁴⁴ Thus Ovid is reverting back to the *signa* that he had initially promised the reader at the work’s very beginning (1.1-2) and is attempting to link the beginning of May and, by extension, the beginning of his calendrical entries for the month of May, with the chief god. There is, of course, a noticeable word play in the statement *ab Iove surgat opus*. On the one hand, *surgat* refers to the rising of the constellation Auriga and the visibility of its brightest star Capella, which will be closely linked with Jove. On the other hand, *surgat* refers to the circumstances of the story about to be told, namely the literal upbringing or “rising” of the baby Jupiter. Ovid’s decision to start the first of May with an attribution to Jupiter also flies in the face of the three contenders for the month’s name, Maiestas, Maiores, and Maia, as argued by the Muses Polyhymnia, Urania, and Calliope respectively.⁷⁴⁵ Rather than endorsing any of these three possibilities, Ovid instead abruptly shifts gears and claims that the month should rise from Jupiter. Yet, as we shall see, Ovid did not merely have Jupiter the god in mind when he wrote this entry.

Despite Augustus’ birth in September under the astrological sign Virgo, he preferred to identify with Capricorn, the sign at the time of his conception in December.⁷⁴⁶ Indeed, Augustus often represented Capricorn on his imperial coins.⁷⁴⁷ It is clear that Ovid, who either never wrote

⁷⁴⁴ As Boyd (2000) 66 points out, this second proem begins with Ovid’s translation of the opening of Aratus’ *Phaenomena* (ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα). Bömer (1958) 297-8 offers other parallels of ancient poems beginning with Zeus/Jupiter such as Pind. *Nem.* 2.1ff., Callim. *Hymn* 1.1., and Theoc. *Id.* 17.1. See also Hinds (1987) 138 for Ovid’s debt to Aratus.

⁷⁴⁵ It also problematizes the fact that all Kalends are supposed to be sacred to Juno, an issue that will be explored in the next chapter.

⁷⁴⁶ For the controversy see Barton (1995) 37-44. For other reasons why Augustus wanted to identify with Capricorn see Gee (2000) 138 n. 37.

⁷⁴⁷ See Gee (2000) 139-40 for examples of such coinage for a description of the Gemma Augustea that combines the images of “Capricorn, the cornucopia, and the grown-up Jupiter,” which Gee notes has much in common with our *Fasti* 5 passage.

or never published the month of September, is here conflating Capella, the brightest star in the constellation of Auriga, with the constellation of Capricorn, and thereby once again conflating Jupiter with Augustus.⁷⁴⁸ Gee detects a potential allusion in this passage not only to the shared birth signs of Jupiter and Augustus, but also to their shared rise to power via the mythological account of Capricorn as told by Eratosthenes and Hyginus.⁷⁴⁹ In that myth Capricorn blows on a conch shell, which serves as a means of staving off attackers and protecting Zeus in the war against the Titans, thereby contributing to Zeus' victory and solidifying his supremacy.⁷⁵⁰ Yet, she also acknowledges that the focus of the Capella passage in the *Fasti* is on Jupiter's youth and innocence, with an emphasis on peace over war, such that the young Jupiter may "represent the Princeps in his capacity as Rome's second founder and the author of the new *saeculum* without emphasis on violence."⁷⁵¹ While this may be true, we must not ignore what follows immediately after this brief account of Jupiter's infancy. Ovid segues into a more relevant aspect of the Kalends of the May,⁷⁵² namely the dedication of an altar to the Lares Praestites and their

⁷⁴⁸ Barton (1995) 46 claims that Augustus' Principate also began "when the sun was in Capricorn," citing Jan. 13th 27 B.C. Yet, if we equate the start of the Principate with the day on which Octavian officially received the title Augustus, then it would likely be Jan. 16th rather than Jan. 13th 27 B.C., after which day Ovid tells us that Capricorn gives way to Aquarius (*Fast.* 1.651-2). See Green (2004a) 270 for a summary of the issue.

⁷⁴⁹ Gee (2000) 142. See also Krasne (2016) 135-36 who acknowledges Gee, but also stresses the implications of civil war both with regard to the Titanomachy as well as Augustus' transition into power.

⁷⁵⁰ Gee (2000) 142. This may remind us of Maiaestas and her role in aiding Jupiter's victory over the Giants, as told by Polyhymnia in the proem of book 5 (see discussion above).

⁷⁵¹ Gee (2000) 142. This is in keeping with the reading of the Veiovis passage espoused above where Jupiter is depicted young and unarmed (*inermis*).

⁷⁵² As attested by the extant fragments of the *Fasti* Venusini and Esquilini (see Deggrassi [1963] 452).

connection with Augustus, whose Genius accompanied the twin statues.⁷⁵³ On the surface, the connections elicited between Jupiter and Augustus in these two juxtaposed passages seem positive. Jupiter rewards Amalthea and the she-goat for their services rendered,⁷⁵⁴ while Augustus attaches himself to the Lares as a way of telling the people that he is their guardian and protector. Yet, the origin of the Lares, as we have seen from Ovid's account of Lara on the Feralia, is rooted in violence, which can be traced back to the actions of Jupiter. Thus Ovid presents us with a veneer of peace and protection under which lurks the bigger issue of Augustan power dynamics.

Feeney draws attention to the message inherent in the story of the birth of the *Lares*, a cult synonymous with Augustus, by claiming that the narrative "transforms them [the Lares] into an ever-present warning of the dangers of using your tongue without restraint."⁷⁵⁵ Although Jupiter starts off as helpless and innocent in the Capella narrative, we leave him in a far superior state when he has conquered the heavens and is in a position to catasterize Amalthea, the she-goat, and her broken horn: *ille ubi res caeli tenuit solioque paterno / sedit, et invicto nil Iove maius erat, / sidera...fecit* ("When Jupiter held the realm of the sky and sat on his paternal throne and when nothing was greater than unconquerable Jove, he made [them] stars" 5.125-26). Ovid's use of *invicto* and *maius* deserve attention. Recall that on the Feralia Jupiter was said to be *inmodico Iuturnae victus amore* ("conquered by excessive love for Juturna" 2.585). Ovid now restores his rightful title and he has once again become Jupiter Invictus, or "Unconquered

⁷⁵³ *Fast.* 5.145-6: *mille Lares Geniumque ducis, qui tradidit illos, / urbs habet, et vici numina terna colunt* ("The city has a thousand Lares together with the Genius of our leader, who set them up, and the wards care for the threefold protective divinities").

⁷⁵⁴ Jupiter had earlier in the month of February also catasterized the dolphin for its meritorious actions on behalf of the poet Arion (2.117-18).

⁷⁵⁵ Feeney (1992) 12.

Jupiter.” This passage also follows in the wake of Polyhymnia’s recounting of the Gigantomachy and Jupiter’s illustrious victory, won by the force of his thunderbolt. The *solioque paterno* may remind the reader that Saturn once sat on that throne and that under his reign was the golden age, where Maiestas ensured that justice was evenly dispensed. The question is then posed: is it a good thing that nothing is greater than unconquered Jove?

The word *maius* here also stands out, first because of its connection to Maiestas, but also, as we have seen, because of its connection to Augustus.⁷⁵⁶ On the Ides of January Ovid calls Julius Caesar *maior* with respect to Pompey, only to be eclipsed by the Fabii Maximi and thereafter by Augustus, who is judged on an entirely different level, that of the divine.⁷⁵⁷ On the 12th of May when Ovid provides a new approach to describing the temple of Mars Ultor by having Mars himself perch atop the temple and look down upon the rich tapestry of Augustan iconography, the last thing he notes is the mark of Augustus’ name, tattooed (*praetextum* 5.567), as it were, upon the temple itself. Mars’ reaction is as follows: *et visum lecto Caesare maius opus* (“The work seemed greater upon reading the name Caesar” 5.568). Augustus’ name, like that of Jupiter’s, carries the greatest weight and as Gee puts it, “Augustus is going to prove greater than all the things which were described by the Muses as ‘greater’ superseding all other origins of Rome.”⁷⁵⁸ This comes across in the narrative describing the role of the Lares. Augustus has tethered himself to this most intimate pair of deities, not only figuratively, but also literally by adding a statue of his Genius to their physical representation. What is more, there are not merely a few of these statues, but thousands of them (*mille Lares Geniumque ducis* 5.145) that grace the *compitum* of every *vicus* in Rome, all reminders of who controls Roman religious

⁷⁵⁶ Gee (2000) 146 calls the phrase *nil maius*, “a cliché of Augustan panegyric.”

⁷⁵⁷ *Fast.* 1.603ff.

⁷⁵⁸ Gee (2000) 144.

practices and who is *maior* than all the rest. This concept culminates in the *Tristia*, where Jupiter and Augustus' greatness are one and the same: *iure igitur genitorque deum rectorque vocatur; / iure capax mundus nil Iove maius habet. / tu [Auguste] quoque, cum patriae rector dicare paterque, / utere more dei nomen habentis idem* ("Therefore, he is rightly called the father and ruler of the gods; the spacious world rightly has nothing greater than Jove. You also [Augustus], since you are called the ruler and father of the fatherland, adopt the custom of the god who bears the same name" *Tr.* 2.37-40).⁷⁵⁹ There, Augustus is invited to live up to the regal example set by Jupiter, his celestial doppelganger. In our *Fasti* passage, however, the mention of Jupiter's power, followed by Augustus' appropriation of the Lares cult, however innocuous, reminds us of the aforementioned violence involved in the original creation of the Lares and problematizes what would otherwise be an additional piece of Augustan panegyric.

XVIII. Jupiter's Rescue of the Dioscuri

On the entry for May 20th Ovid calls upon Mercury to provide him with the explanation behind the constellation of Gemini. Mercury obliges and goes on to relate the story of how the Dioscuri raped and kidnapped the two daughters of Leucippus (5.693-720). Such a narrative is very much in keeping with Mercury's own rape of Lara on the Feralia.⁷⁶⁰ Most interesting for us, however, is the way in which the Dioscuri triumph over Idas and Lynceus, the two men who were initially betrothed to the daughters of Leucippus. Just as Idas is about to deliver a critical blow to Pollux, he is struck down by lightning sent by Jove: *vixque est Iovis igne repulsus* ("and he was barely thrust back by the fire of Jove" 5.713). Yet the Dioscuri, apparently considering

⁷⁵⁹ Cf. also Hor. *C.* 1.12.17: *nil maius generatur ipso* ("Nothing is created greater than [Jove] himself").

⁷⁶⁰ Which perhaps explains why Mercury, who is narrating the story, endorses the actions of the Dioscuri, claiming that they had as much right to the Leucippides as Idas and Lynceus: *et ex causa pugnat uterque pari* ("and both parties fight with equal justification" 5.704).

the assistance from Jupiter as a dishonorable method of achieving victory,⁷⁶¹ refuse to acknowledge the role of the lightning in disarming Idas: *tela tamen dextrae fulmine rapta negant* (“Nevertheless they deny that his weapons were stripped from his right hand as a result of the lightning” 5.714).

Ultimately, this narrative boils down to Jupiter using his thunderbolt to give aid to his children, who acted dishonorably themselves by stealing and raping women who were already promised to others.⁷⁶² Recall that on the Nones of February Augustus endorsed laws as opposed to Romulus who resorted to rape (2.141). Here on the 20th of May we do not have Jupiter himself committing another act of rape, but rather endorsing the inappropriate actions of his kin and coming to their rescue. On the one hand, it represents the noble gesture of a father looking out for his sons. But on the other hand, it can be read as Jupiter unfairly influencing events and showing favoritism for his sons, who have committed a shameful act. Not only does Pollux avoid Idas’ attack, but he also negotiates with Jupiter for joint immortality along with his mortal brother, Castor, who had just been slain: *quod mihi das uni caelum, partire duobus; / dimidium toto munere maius erit* (“Allot the sky, which you grant to me alone, to the two (of us); half will be greater than the whole gift” 5.717-18). Once again, the word *maius* appears, this time in order signify that less is more. Pollux’s selfless act of sharing his immortality with his dead brother calls into question the statement on the Kalends of May that “nothing is greater than unconquered Jove” (5.126). For not only does Pollux rebuff Jupiter’s attempt to save him with the thunderbolt, but he also refuses to accept the conditions of immortality as they are offered to

⁷⁶¹ Just as the Dioscuri had thought it dishonorable to escape the pursuing brothers by flight: *sed visum celeri vincere turpe fuga* (“but it seemed base to conquer by swift flight” 5.706).

⁷⁶² For Greek versions of this story see Paschalis (2010) who compares it to Pin. *Nem.* 10 and Theoc. *Id.* 22. Cf. also Apollod. 3.11.2.

him. One is perhaps reminded of Augustus and all of the honors that he turned down, including the privilege of being worshipped as a living god, at least in the west.⁷⁶³ Perhaps it is better to share power, rather than wield it absolutely.⁷⁶⁴

Another event that comes to mind when reading this passage is Augustus' own situation in Cantabria where he was nearly struck by lightning and killed, but was instead saved by an unlucky slave who became the unwitting victim of Jove's wrath. The difference, of course, is that Augustus was grateful for his survival, whereas the Dioscuri, despite being on the brink of death, feel their honor has somehow been sullied by Jove's actions. Another point worth mentioning is the weakness of Jupiter's lightning in this particular circumstance. For the narrator adds that Idas "was barely repulsed by the lightning of Jove" (*vixque est Iovis igne repulsus* 5.713). One may perhaps be tempted to construe *vix* as meaning that Jupiter's lightning barely saved Pollux from getting killed by Idas, but that cannot be so, since Pollux is the immortal brother and impervious to blows. Rather, *vix* here must refer to the miniscule degree to which Idas was wounded and the lack of strength attached to this particular bolt of lightning.⁷⁶⁵ Hejduk's comments on the power of Jupiter's thunderbolt in the *Maiestas* passage also seem applicable to the Dioscuri passage. For she argues that "this little fable serves as an exemplum

⁷⁶³ Pasco-Pranger (2006) 239 discusses the implications of Augustus' turning down these many honors, concluding, "Far from being just a sham or an illusion, these sorts of displays actually function to integrate the emperor's personal *maiestas* into the old order."

⁷⁶⁴ Hejduk (2020) 249-50 sees Jupiter in the *Fasti* as generally prone toward sharing his power. The clearest instance of this is the mention of his temple on the Tiber island, which he shares with his grandson Aesculapius (1.293-94). A more accurate description would be that Jupiter constantly weaves back and forth between an autocratic despot and a fair ruler, a characterization that also jives well with Augustus' model of controlling Rome under the veneer of a free Republic.

⁷⁶⁵ Paschalis (2010) 133 views Ovid as inserting a humorous correction of Theocritus' version by "emphasizing Idas' immense strength and downgrading Zeus' might."

for rulers everywhere, and especially for the kind of ruler Augustus presumably wants to show that he is: because he has the absolute power represented by the thunderbolt, he does not need to use it.”⁷⁶⁶ Here, Jupiter is chastised despite hurling a weaker thunderbolt, and the reader is left to ponder whether certain situations are better resolved without the force of imperial involvement, regardless of how slight that involvement may be. Such a reading is no doubt highly autobiographical and puts Ovid the exile back on center stage.

Throughout Jupiter’s appearances in the *Fasti*, we can also notice an emphasis on dynastic concerns. Jupiter acts here in order to preserve members of his family, secures his empire by violently defeating the Giants (5.35-46), and appears linked with Augustus on the Ides of January (1.587-616), in an entry that closes with a desire for imperial longevity. We also see a glimpse of Jupiter promoting divine stock when he attempts convince his sister Ceres that Pluto would make a fine husband for her daughter Proserpina: *nec gener est nobis ille pudendus ait* (“[Jupiter] said, ‘he is not a son-in-law that we would be ashamed of’” 4.598). Despite the fact that Pluto had, like the Dioscuri, kidnapped and raped Proserpina, Jupiter defends his brother, principally on the grounds that he is of noble stock and that their union would further his divine dominion. Even the exceptionally odd story of theoxeny related on the 11th of May is couched loosely in dynastic terms. There, Jupiter, Neptune, and Mercury visit the house of an old farmer named Hyrieus, who upon providing them with courteous hospitality, is tasked with telling Jupiter his greatest desire. He confesses that he wishes to be a father (*pater esse volo* 5.530). Although Hyrieus’ part in the story ends here, the next several lines describe the birth of his son Orion and the role he adopts as protector of the goddess Diana (called *Delia* 5.537), whose mother Latona ultimately catasterizes him: *Latona nitentibus astris / addidit et ‘meriti praemia’*

⁷⁶⁶ Hejduk (2020) 258.

dixit 'habe' ("Latona added him to the glittering stars and said, 'have this as a reward for your meritorious service'" 5.543-44). Orion's catasterism apes that of Arion's dolphin (2.117-18), that of Callisto and her son (2.189-90), and that of Amalthea and she-goat (5.127-8), all of which were achieved by Jupiter. While the emphasis on *meriti* ("service") aligns Orion's catasterism most closely to the dolphin's altruistic act and Amalthea's service to the infant Jove, the circumstances themselves align it more closely to Callisto and her son, whose final movements are immortalized in the sky, much like Orion facing off against the scorpion. This account of Orion's catasterism, however, is by far the most favorable treatment among extant versions, as it features him performing a selfless act, rather than dying as a victim of Diana herself.⁷⁶⁷ Brookes finds Orion's sacrifice "all the more remarkable, because it is done to save not Diana but Latona."⁷⁶⁸ This sort of devotion that extends not just to the patron deity, but to the extended family of that deity, emphasizes the importance of dynastic longevity that we see elsewhere with respect to Jupiter and the Julian family.

XIX. Conclusions

Throughout the *Fasti* we have encountered depictions of a weaponless Jupiter,⁷⁶⁹ of a disarmed Jupiter,⁷⁷⁰ and of a Jupiter who is armed and actively using his weapons.⁷⁷¹ In addition, he has exhibited a wide range of characteristics that reflect the difficulty in assessing his political relevance. Nor do the examples we have discussed here account for every mention of Jupiter in

⁷⁶⁷ Such as in Hor. *C.* 3.4.70-72.

⁷⁶⁸ Brookes (1992) 248-49.

⁷⁶⁹ The Vediovis passage on the Nones of March (3.429-44) and the Capella passage on the Kalends of May (5.111-28).

⁷⁷⁰ The story of Jupiter Elicius on the Kalends of March (3.285-392).

⁷⁷¹ Giving aid to Castor and Pollux on the 20th of May (5.699-720) and smiting the Giants in the poem to May (5.35-46).

the *Fasti*. Although none of these passages unfold in a chronological manner, when taken as a whole they show the various sides of Jupiter, as if we are looking at him through a prism.⁷⁷² The same can be said of Augustus, whose origins of power and wielding of it are traced alongside Jupiter's throughout the *Fasti*. He acquires the title of Augustus on par with *summus Iuppiter*, he is hailed *pater patriae*, the earthly equivalent of Jupiter, *pater hominum*, he becomes a fixture of the household toast as conveyed by the culminating prayer of the Caristia, and he shares an astrological connection with Jupiter's birth. In addition, the connection between Augustus and Jupiter the thunderer is undeniable and the fact that throughout the *Fasti* Jupiter is so often depicted either holding, not holding, or discharging his thunderbolt is further evidence for a reading that conflates these two figures. Indeed, the *Fasti*'s final example of Jupiter and the thunderbolt is perhaps the most telling.

On the 21st of June we hear of the death of Hippolytus, his subsequent reanimation at the hands of Aesculapius, and then Aesculapius' own demise upon being struck by Jupiter's thunderbolt. Ovid provides the following reason for Jupiter's actions: he feared the precedent (*exemplum veritus* 6.759) of allowing someone to reanimate the dead. Aesculapius is then characterized as one "who had employed the power of his skill excessively" (*qui nimiae moverat artis opem* 6.760). Littlewood, building on Newlands,⁷⁷³ sees in this a passage an allusion to Augustus' banishment of Ovid, who practiced his craft of writing poetry perhaps too skillfully.⁷⁷⁴ Indeed, the image of Jupiter hastily smiting an Aesculapius undeserving of such a fate for the

⁷⁷² The idea of viewing gods in literature as "a multi-sided prism" was initially put forth by Feeney (1990) 127 and reiterated by Miller (1991) 142 who sees Ovid as filtering Rome's religious world "through different prisms."

⁷⁷³ Newlands (1995) 192 who observes, "As a healer, Aesculapius practices an art that is complementary to poetry in its peaceful and beneficial functions."

⁷⁷⁴ Littlewood (2006) 219.

sake of preserving his own power is quite close to Ovid's depiction of his own banishment at the hands of Augustus in the exile poetry. This example can be added to the multitude of others in the *Fasti* that Feeney has argued emphasize the imperial silencing of lesser voices.⁷⁷⁵ At the same time, Aesculapius has to rely on the mercy of Jupiter in order to achieve his catasterism and gain immortality. Ovid, on the other hand, subtly acknowledges that his *ars*, namely his poetry, is sufficient to procure the same for him, a statement made much more explicitly in the conclusion of his *Met.*⁷⁷⁶ As for the scourge of Jupiter's thunderbolt and its power to harm, Ovid inserts an optimistic sentiment through the mouth of Flora: *saepe Iovem vidi, cum iam sua mittere vellet / fulmina, tunc dato sustinuisse manum* ("Often I have seen Jove, at the moment when he is desiring to hurl his thunderbolt, hold back his hand when incense has been offered" 5.302). If we are meant to view the *Fasti* as Ovid's version of incense, intended to appease the wrath of Augustus, then Ovid is acknowledging that beneficence from the Princeps does exist, as he is wont to do in his exile poetry.⁷⁷⁷

Newlands also reads Jupiter's actions against Aesculapius in light of Jupiter's catasterism of Arion's dolphin in *Fasti* 2 (2.79-118). In that episode Jupiter's transformation of the dolphin into a constellation occurs immediately after the following sentiment: *di pia facta vident* ("The gods observe pious actions" 2.117). Newlands thus observes that "Two distinct visions of Jupiter are offered here at the two ends of the *Fasti*: Jupiter the beneficent patron of excellence in the arts and, on the other hand, Jupiter the jealous, unpredictable guardian of his own territory, who

⁷⁷⁵ Feeney (1992).

⁷⁷⁶ *Met.* 15.875-76: *parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis / astra ferar, nomenque erit indelebile nostrum* ("Yet in the better part of me, I will be carried, immortal, beyond the lofty stars and my name will remain fixed forever").

⁷⁷⁷ Such as at *Tr.* 2.512 and 4.4.14 (see discussion above).

destroys his own grandson when cosmic hegemony is threatened by the latter's talents."⁷⁷⁸ It would be too easy to say that the Jupiter who kills Aesculapius is more indicative of Augustus owing to the presence and deployment of the thunderbolt. We must consider that the Arion entry occurs on Feb. 3rd and precedes immediately the *pater patriae* passage, thus giving the reader more reason to associate this benevolent Jupiter with the "positive" description of Augustus and Jupiter that follows. At the same time, we have seen that this association of Jupiter and Augustus is not as unequivocally positive as one might initially think. Hejduk aptly characterizes this phenomenon in relation to the broader treatment of Jupiter within the Augustan corpus:

"Whether we see Jupiter as a father figure or as an Augustus figure (or both), the chief god invariably participates to some extent in the tension between reverence and rebellion that characterizes the human response to power."⁷⁷⁹ Thus what we are ultimately faced with, both here and elsewhere in the *Fasti*, is not a single unifying portrayal of Jupiter inseparable from Augustus. Rather, Ovid has forged a work that must be read as if looking through a kaleidoscope. Every time the mechanism shifts, a new image appears from the same set of crystals. Such is the case with Jupiter, who can be viewed as reflecting both the positive and negative qualities of Augustus, often simultaneously. Ovid was truly a master of his craft and the *Fasti*, despite not being his magnum opus, represents his best effort at melding imperial praise with imperial skepticism to the point where the two are practically indistinguishable. Indeed, Ovid does an excellent job of developing this ambiguity by fronting the work's two direct comparisons between these figures on the Ides of January and the Nones of February and then following each of those episodes of seemingly transparent panegyric with entries that have a noticeably darker tone. This strategy not only invites the reader to reconsider the previous

⁷⁷⁸ Newlands (1995) 196.

⁷⁷⁹ Hejduk (2020) 38.

passage in an altogether new light, but it also serves as a reminder that the various entries in the poem are fluid, as are the characters within them—none more so than the figure of Jupiter himself.

CHAPTER THREE: JUPITER AND JUNO: THE DIVINE PAIR IN OVID'S *FASTI*

The dynamic of presenting Jupiter and Juno as a closely linked pair of literary characters is as old as Homer, who was the first to develop their nuanced personae and capitalize on the drama of their multifaceted relationship.⁷⁸⁰ Indeed, the fact that they are both siblings and spouses, the only such relationship in Ancient Greek or Roman religion, makes them the perfect subject for the simultaneous exploration of affection and rivalry. In one of the more famous episodes of the *Iliad*, known as the *Dios Apate* or the “Deception of Zeus” (*Il.* 14.292-360), Hera stealthily seduces Zeus in order to allow the Greeks to attack the Trojans free of divine support and gain the upper hand in the war. Zeus’ initial passion for Hera, followed by his incredulity at her deceptive tactics, epitomize the polarity of their relationship. One minute he is making love to his wife, whom he claims is more beautiful at that moment than she has ever been (*Il.* 14.327-28), and the next minute he threatens her with punishment and demands that she cease her intrigue (*Il.* 15.1-77). Such is the tumultuous nature of their relationship. This polarizing motif has been explored by countless authors in a myriad of ways. In Hesiod, Hera’s prestigious marriage to Zeus and their happy creation of the children Hebe, Ares, and Eileithyia are immediately set in contrast with Zeus’ birth of Athena and Hera’s parthenogenetic birth of Hephaestus:

λοισθοτάτην δ’ Ἥρην θαλερὴν ποιήσατ’ ἄκοιτιν:
 ἦ δ’ Ἥβην καὶ Ἄρηα καὶ Εἰλείθυιαν ἔτικτε
 μιχθεῖσ’ ἐν φιλότῃ θεῶν βασιλῇ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.
 αὐτὸς δ’ ἐκ κεφαλῆς γλαυκώπιδα Τριτογένειαν
 δεινὴν ἐγρεκύδοιμον ἀγέστρατον Ἀτρυτώνην
 πότνιαν, ἣ κέλαδοί τε ἄδον πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε,
 Ἥρην δ’ Ἥφαιστον κλυτὸν οὐ φιλότῃ μιγεῖσα

⁷⁸⁰ O’Brien (1993) discusses the extent to which Hera’s cult associations do not depend upon her marriage to Zeus, as opposed to her epic portrayal, which is dependent upon it.

γείνατο, καὶ ζαμένησε καὶ ἥρισε ὃ παρακοίτη,
ἐκ πάντων τέχνησι κεκασμένον Οὐρανίωνων.

Last of all he made Hera his blooming wife: she begot Hebe and Ares and Eileithyia, united in love with the king of gods and men. But Zeus himself begot from his head bright-eyed Athena, fierce, stirrer of strife, leader of armies, the unwearied queen for whom clamor, wars, and battles are a delight, while Hera, without uniting in love with anyone, raged at and vied with her consort, and begot noble Hephaestus, who excelled all the heaven-dwellers in cunning. (Hes. *Theog.* 921-29)

This account of Hera's initially happy marriage to Zeus and its near immediate deterioration is interesting on a number of levels. Her union with Zeus (μιχθεῖσ' ἐν φιλότῃτι) that resulted in three legitimate offspring is echoed by her birth of Hephaestus, not only without Zeus, but without any deity, male or female (οὐ φιλότῃτι μιγεῖσα). This follows after Hesiod tells the reader that Zeus had given birth to Athena by himself (αὐτὸς), even though the subsequent passage makes it clear that Metis was Athena's mother (Ἀθηναίης μήτηρ 929o). Regardless of that discrepancy, the presence of the word ἥρισε indicates that Hera is engaging in rivalry with Zeus, who is called merely her "bed-fellow" (παρακοίτη). This sets the stage for the more even nuanced treatment of the pair by the Hellenistic poets.

Apollonius paints a rather complicated picture of the divine couple in his *Argonautica*, praising the marriage of Zeus and Hera in a prayer (4.95-97), yet loosely fashioning their roles in the manner of Athena and Poseidon in the *Odyssey*, with Hera serving as a source of aid for Jason on his journey, while Zeus' wrath occasionally disrupts it.⁷⁸¹ Feeney in his discussion of the epic motifs of the *Argonautica* notes the ubiquity of Hera as a character alongside the complete absence of Jupiter, who is nevertheless regularly cited as her consort.⁷⁸² Indeed,

⁷⁸¹ Hunter (1993) 79-80.

⁷⁸² Feeney (1991) 65.

Apollonius' portrayal of a Hera who praises Thetis for resisting the advances of Zeus (Ap. Rhod. 4.790-97) alongside the mention of Zeus' many sexual escapades are prime examples of Hellenistic experimentation, signifying a departure from the older traditions of Homer, Hesiod, and the classical tragedians.⁷⁸³ Callimachus too, in the fashion of the Hellenistic poets, endowed his portrayal of the divine pair with a high degree of subtlety and nuance. For in his *Hymn to Delos*, Callimachus, in describing Hera's hatred of the women who bore children to Zeus, makes the cheeky remark that she hates Leto the most, since Zeus cherishes Leto's son Apollo more than he does Hera's own son Ares (*H.* 4.55-58). In his *Hymn to Artemis*, Callimachus has Zeus address his daughter Artemis with a snide remark of his own: "When goddesses produce for me such [children as you], I have little regard for jealous Hera being angry [with me]."⁷⁸⁴ Both of these quips are laden with a combination of humor, hyperbole and *recherché* wit that is lacking from classical and pre-classical representations of the pair.

In the world of Roman literature, portrayals of Jupiter and Juno are rooted in those of their Greek predecessors, yet are repackaged in various ways. In his *Annales*, Ennius rekindled the same magisterial depiction of the pair that Homer had provided, but with an Italic underpinning. From a literary standpoint, Juno, who can no longer direct her anger at the Trojans who have long since assimilated with the Latins, initially endorses the Carthaginians against the Romans, who function as a surrogate for Hera's object of hatred in the *Iliad*.⁷⁸⁵ On an even deeper level, one can detect a shift from the generic epithets imposed by Homer, such as "Cloud-gathering Zeus" (νεφεληγερέτα) and "Ox-eyed Hera" (βοῶπις), to epithets that have a more

⁷⁸³ See Feeney (1991) 66-67 who discusses in particular Apollonius' stark departure from the Homeric version of Ganymede's abduction which lacked sexual overtones.

⁷⁸⁴ Call. *H.* 3.29-31: ὅτε μοι τοιαῦτα θέαιναι / τίκτοιεν, τυτθὸν κεν ἐγὼ ζηλήμονος Ἥρης / χωομένης ἀλέγοιμι.

⁷⁸⁵ See Skutsch (1984) 465-66.

specific geographical and cultural significance. Along the same lines, Jay Fisher has argued that Ennius embedded aspects of local Italic cults into several of his Jupiter references.⁷⁸⁶ Thus as much as Ennius likely drew from the Homeric corpus in terms of genre and plot, he also relied heavily upon the Hellenistic poets, Callimachus in particular, in terms of aetiology and depth of expression.⁷⁸⁷ The fragmentary nature of the *Annales* prevents us from making any wide-sweeping claims about his treatment of Jupiter and Juno, but it is clear that Ennius drew from multiple sources and at the same time innovated considerably.

We then jump ahead some one-hundred and fifty years and come to the next great epic treatment of the pair in Vergil's *Aeneid*, a work that owes as much to Ennius as it does to Homer. Although it would be a mistake to see in Vergil's Jupiter the doppelganger of Augustus, there is nevertheless a great amount of political weight attached to his characterization of the chief deity, amidst his many other attributes. For in the *Aeneid*, Jupiter is often portrayed as the dutiful leader, the shrewd negotiator, the sympathetic father, the caring husband, the good brother, and the one who wields the highest amount of controllable power.⁷⁸⁸ And while on the outward surface his actions as a ruler may seem to cast him in a benevolent light, there are countless examples in which the reader may question his decisions and the way in which he conducts himself.⁷⁸⁹ Hejduk in her recent book *The God of Rome: Jupiter and Augustan Poetry* makes the

⁷⁸⁶ Fisher (2014) 7-9 who analyzes the possibility that the reader is meant to view a combination of the Oscan Jupiter Versor and the Roman Jupiter Stator in Ennius' line: *non semper vostra evortit; nunc Iuppiter hac stat* ("[Jupiter] does not always overturn your [plans]; now he stands on this side" Ann. 232 Sk.).

⁷⁸⁷ For Callimachus' influence on Ennius' *Annales* see Fisher (2014) 9-10.

⁷⁸⁸ He admits several times that the Fates are beyond his control (1.257-58, 10.112-13 10.471-72, 12.675).

⁷⁸⁹ One such example is at the very end of the work when Jupiter sends a fury down to earth in the shape of an owl in order to prevent Juturna from providing additional assistance to Turnus.

claim that the presence of Jupiter in the *Aeneid* creates a polarizing effect through which “Virgil intentionally pulls our emotions in opposite directions, creating stark, unresolvable polarities.”⁷⁹⁰ Yet, if we are meant to see hints of Augustus in the *Aeneid*’s Jupiter, there is scarcely any merit in looking for the empress Livia in the poem’s characterization of Juno. For Juno, despite exemplifying many of the characteristics of a powerful woman, is certainly no model. She is driven by her emotions, filled with hatred and bitterness, and bent upon fulfilling her wishes at all costs. Her interactions with Jupiter are seldom endearing, a far cry from the Homeric Hera who at least goes through the trouble of seducing Zeus in order to gain the upper hand. The first of the two passages of the *Aeneid* in which they converse with one another is at the beginning of book 10, where Jupiter mediates between Venus and Juno concerning the outcome of the war between the Trojans and the Rutulians (*Aen.* 10.1-95). While Venus immediately appeals to Jupiter as her father (*o pater* 10.18), Juno does not invoke either of her familial relationships to Jupiter, instead responding directly to the criticisms of Venus.⁷⁹¹

The second passage is the dialogue between Jupiter and Juno that culminates in a resolution for the poem’s overarching plot (*Aen.* 12.791-842). There, Jupiter begins his speech by addressing Juno as his wife (*coniunx* 12.793). She replies to him in a much more formal way, calling him “Great Jupiter” (*magne...Iuppiter* 808-09). She then goes on to stress the sibling relationship between Juturna and Turnus, calling him her “wretched brother” (*misero...fratri*

The scene is exceptionally macabre and may be read as detracting from Jupiter’s magisterial depiction, especially in the wake of his positive negotiations with Juno, in which he secures Rome’s future. Williams (1973) 499 says of the passage, “This is a daemonic scene, terrifying in its weird and supernatural aspect.”

⁷⁹⁰ Hejduk (2020) 59.

⁷⁹¹ See Harrison (1991) 75 where he contrasts Juno’s *ab adversarii perona* with Venus’ *exordium ab iudicis persona*.

12.813). Jupiter in his final reply switches gears and smiling now addresses Juno not as his wife, but rather as his sister and fellow child of Saturn (*es germana Iovis Saturnique altera proles* 12.830). The exchange concludes with Juno assenting and happily changing her mind (*adnuit his Iuno et mentem laetata retorsit* 12.841).⁷⁹² Not once in either speech did Juno ever refer to Jupiter as either her husband or her brother, all the while maintaining a sort of ruthless pragmatism. In book 10 she was wholly immersed in explaining her position and undermining that of Venus' without relying on favoritism from her husband/brother, while in book 12 the nature of her speech is purely transactional, with a *quid pro quo* mentality. Towards that end, Juno acknowledges Jupiter's high status and his role a decision maker, but she does not attempt any sort of seduction or subterfuge for which the Homeric Hera is so famous.

We move now to Ovid's epic treatment of the divine pair. The *Metamorphoses* is a unique epic poem in many ways. Its forward momentum is achieved not by looking toward the resolution of an overarching conflict, but rather by the interconnectivity of its episodes and by the mere passage of time. As such, his representation of recurring characters is in a constant state of fluctuation from one episode to the next, tantamount to the work's very title that promises continuous change. Whereas Juno in the *Aeneid* is the perpetual enemy of Aeneas and Trojans right up until she negotiates the terms of her withdrawal, in the *Met.* she is torn between punishing Jupiter's lovers and continuing her mission of plaguing the Trojans and the Romans (13.623-14.582). Likewise, as we have seen in the previous chapter, Jupiter in the *Met.* is often a politically charged figure, but in many episodes he is also an elegiac figure, constantly on the lookout for his next sexual conquest. But even if the awe-inspiring Jupiter who summons the council of gods in book 1 does not closely resemble the elegiac Jupiter who later rapes Io and

⁷⁹² See chapter 1 p. 52-53 for the various ways of interpreting this line.

Callisto, Brooks Otis is right to differentiate him from his Vergilian counterpart on the premise that “Whereas Virgil did certainly believe in the symbolic reality [of the gods]—their relation to universal forces and ideas—Ovid seems to have humanized them simply.”⁷⁹³ The actions of the authoritarian Jupiter of *Met.* 1 (177-98) are driven not by the fates or by inevitability, as they were in the *Aeneid*, but by a combination of personal hatred (for both Lycaon and the human race) and megalomania. Likewise, Jupiter’s lust for Io and Callisto stems from his visceral reaction to witnessing their beauty and his inability to exercise temperance, both very human qualities. On the other hand, the Juno of the *Met.* exhibits many of the same characteristics as she did in the *Aeneid*, but lacks an overall mission and directs her hatred towards a variety of individuals, divine and human alike, most of whom are in some way linked to Jupiter’s dalliances.⁷⁹⁴

In addition, the fact that Ovid’s *Fasti* is in a true sense a “continuous song,” in that the calendar is cyclical and all of the events described will experience annual renewal, creates an environment that arguably casts an even greater spotlight upon the relationship of Jupiter and Juno than previous works that have a finite beginning and end. For while Ennius’ *Annales*, Vergil’s *Aeneid*, and Ovid’s *Met.* all take as their point of departure the religious significance of the deities that each one portrays, in the *Fasti*, Ovid pushes those limits even further by bringing their literary treatment dangerously close to the actual observance of cult activity. Temples are dedicated, aitiologies are fleshed out, and events are celebrated both within the text itself and on those particular days with sacrifices and remembrances. The Kalends and Ides no longer merely

⁷⁹³ Otis (1966) 125.

⁷⁹⁴ Io (1.601-21), Callisto (2.466-95), Echo (3.359-401), Hercules (9.14-22 and 9.176-81), and Ganymede (10.161).

serve merely as temporal markers, but rather as days on which Juno and Jupiter are owed their sacrifices.

Thus far we have discussed the multidimensional portrayal of Juno as well as the many examples of Augustan resonances of Jupiter in the *Fasti*, but we have yet to address the ways in which the *Fasti* plays Jupiter and Juno off one another, both by intermingling their sacred days and by constantly alternating their characterization throughout the numerous entries. For Jupiter can be the embodiment of the ideal god, a stand-in for Augustus, a petty rapist, a purveyor of fear, or a savior of Rome—and many of these at the same time. So too can Juno occupy multiple realms, although most often she is depicted as an antagonist—to Jupiter, to the Romans, and even to Ovid himself.⁷⁹⁵ It is the goal of this chapter to explore the depth to which Ovid's *Fasti* activates various incongruous aspects of these two gods, particularly in relation to one another.

I. Jupiter and Juno on the Kalends of February

As we have seen in the previous two chapters Juno and Jupiter are first juxtaposed when Ovid lays out the sanctity of days for the reader towards the beginning of the first book: *vindicat Ausonias Iunonis cura Kalendas; / Idibus alba Iovi grandior agna cadit* ("The worship of Juno claims the Ausonian Kalends; a greater white lamb falls to Jupiter on the Ides" 1.55-56). It is worth noting that although Juno and the Kalends occupy the hexameter, the longer of the two lines in an elegiac couplet, Jupiter is said to receive the larger sacrifice (*grandior*), making it appear as if Jupiter is overshadowing Juno. Further, both of the sacred days are juxtaposed (*Kalendas / Idibus*), giving the impression that they are encroaching upon one another. Thus an

⁷⁹⁵ She appears as an antagonist to Ovid in the proem to book 6, where she threatens to renege on her promise to support the Roman cause if Ovid does not acknowledge that the month of June derives its name from her. As we shall see, Ovid's unwillingness to decide in her favor has an impact on the rest of the work, which culminates in the image of Juno's biggest rival, Hercules, twanging his lyre in assent to the words of the Muses.

aspect of competition between the two is already embedded into the fabric of Ovid's poetic calendar before either Juno or Jupiter make their debut.

No sooner does Ovid introduce the Kalends of January than we see a sacrifice taking place, not to Juno, but rather to Jupiter (1.83-88). Even though Ovid is following here the traditional custom that oxen be sacrificed to Jupiter in front of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the day on which the new consuls are inaugurated,⁷⁹⁶ the absence of Juno is nevertheless conspicuous, considering Ovid's explanation of their sacred days a mere 27 lines earlier. Further, Ovid's assessment that Jupiter's view encompasses "nothing un-Roman" (*nil nisi Romanum* 1.86) clashes with our introduction to Juno at 1.265 where she is depicted aiding the Sabines in their attack against Rome. The only time in book 1 where Jupiter and Juno are paired together is at the end of the celebration of Tiberius' temple of Concord where the divine couple function as a metonymy for Augustus and Livia (*sola toro magni digna reperta Iovis* 1.650).⁷⁹⁷ In spite of them sharing a bed together, Livia (here in agreement with *sola*) occupies the very beginning of the line, while Jupiter occupies the end, giving the appearance that they may be sleeping on opposite ends of the same bed.⁷⁹⁸ Further, the force of the word *digna*, whose multiple meanings were addressed in the previous chapter, implies a certain superiority for Jupiter to whom Juno/Livia must be "worthy" in order to share his bed. These few references that bolster Jupiter, while subtly undermining Juno, pave the way for Ovid's treatment of them in the subsequent book, where they are often pitted against one another, both in the form of temples as well as in the form of anthropomorphic mythological figures.

⁷⁹⁶ See Liv. 41.14.7 who qualifies his description of the sacrifice with *uti solet* ("as was the custom").

⁷⁹⁷ See the previous chapter for an extensive analysis of this line.

⁷⁹⁸ The hyperbaton here no doubt also serves to surprise the reader by ending the line with Jupiter instead of the expected Augustus.

It is in book 2, the month of February, devoted to the rites of purification, that Ovid first intermingles the sacred days of Juno and Jupiter. For he begins his entry on the Kalends of February with the unparalleled description of the no longer extant temple of Juno Sospita, only to switch gears just below and make reference to sacrifices occurring at the temple of Jupiter Tonans or “Jupiter the thunderer,” which Augustus himself was responsible for constructing.⁷⁹⁹ The contrast between the long since decrepit temple of Juno Sospita and the relatively new temple of Jupiter Tonans allows Ovid to use topographical markers as a way of facilitating and anticipating the mythological conflict between Jupiter and Juno that will feature in several of the subsequent episodes. Let us examine the entry as a whole:

Principio mensis Phrygiae contermina Matri	
Sospita delubris dicitur aucta novis.	
nunc ubi sunt, illis quae sunt sacrata Kalendis	
templa deae? longa procubuerunt die.	
cetera ne simili caderent labefacta ruina	
cavit sacrati provida cura ducis,	60
sub quo delubris sentitur nulla senectus;	
nec satis est homines, obligat ille deos.	
templorum positor, templorum sancte repostor,	
sit superis opto mutua cura tui.	
dent tibi caelestes, quos tu caelestibus, annos,	65
proque tua maneant in statione domo.	
tum quoque vicini lucus celebratur Alerni,	
qua petit aequoreas advena Thybris aquas.	
ad penetrale Numae Capitolinumque Tonantem	
inque Iovis summa caeditur arce bidens.	70
saepe graves pluvias adopertus nubibus aether	
concitatur, aut posita sub nive terra latet.	

⁷⁹⁹ See n. 522 above.

At the beginning of the month [Juno] Sospita is said to been augmented with a new shrine adjacent to the Phrygian mother. Where now is this temple which was dedicated on those Kalends to the goddess? It collapsed long ago. To ensure that other temples not fall, destroyed by similar destruction is the provident care of our revered leader, under whom no shrine experiences old age. Nor is he content to take on an obligation for men, he does so also for the gods. Builder of temples, holy rebuilder of temples, I pray that there be a mutual care for you on behalf of the gods. May the gods grant you as many years as you have given them, and may they remain on guard in from of your house. At that time also the grove of nearby Alernus is crowded, where the foreign Tiber seeks the waves of the ocean. A two-toothed sheep is sacrificed at the shrine of Numa and at the Capitoline Thunderer and on the highest citadel of Jove. Often the cloud-covered sky drives away heavy rains, or the earth lies hidden buried beneath snow. (*Fast.* 2.55-72)

Ovid begins the entry for the Kalends of February by recounting how on that day a new shrine was built for Juno Sospita adjacent to that of Cybele, called the Phrygian mother (2.55-56). By twice referencing that this temple was built on the first of the month (*principio mensis* 2.55 and *Kalendis* 2.57), Ovid invites the reader to recall from book 1 that this is the day sacred to Juno (1.55). Indeed, the opening couplet of this passage matches perfectly the couplet of book 1 that introduced the contrast between Juno on the Kalends and Jupiter on the Ides (1.55-56). In addition, the use of the word *aucta*, which here agrees with Juno Sospita, offers a connection with the events of the Ides of January, the day of Jupiter's primary sacrifice, and the day on which his title *summus* was likened to the emperor's title *Augustus*, from which *aucta* is derived.⁸⁰⁰ Ovid then expresses his attempt to locate this very temple in his own day (2.57-58).⁸⁰¹ The answer, he tells us, is that it has fallen down (*procubuere* 2.58). Robinson rightly emphasizes the importance attached to the word *procubuere*, which, on the one hand, may mean

⁸⁰⁰ Bömer (1958) 86 makes this observation, remarking, "Hier is nicht ein Mensch *auctus*, *augustus*, *consecratus* (o. I 609), sondern eine Gottheit."

⁸⁰¹ The *Fasti Antiates Maiores* attests to the construction of temples to Juno Sospita and Juno Regina on this day (see Degrassi [1963] 405).

that it had completely disappeared from view by Ovid's time, or, on the other hand, that traces of it still remained visible, calling attention to its unrestored state.⁸⁰² An additional problem is that there is no attestation other than Ovid for a temple to Juno Sospita on the Palatine hill.⁸⁰³

Numerous suggestions have been put forth both in favor of and against the existence of such a temple.⁸⁰⁴ The arguments deftly summarized by Robinson in favor of a temple to Juno Sospita on the Palatine hill—whether still visible or not in Ovid's own time—outweigh the somewhat older account of Richardson that dismisses Ovid's claim, calling such a temple, “unlikely to have actually existed.”⁸⁰⁵

So, proceeding under the belief that Ovid here does direct us toward a temple of Juno Sospita on the Palatine hill, we must acknowledge, as Boyle does, that it stood extremely close to Augustus' own residence.⁸⁰⁶ Ovid's frank admission that this shrine is no longer standing then becomes the springboard for Augustus' rebuilding of other temples (2.59-60). Recall the words Ovid used in book 1 to explain Juno's control of the Kalends: *vindicat Ausonias Iunonis cura Kalendas* (“care of Juno lays claim to the Italian Kalends” 1.55). It is curious then that Ovid

⁸⁰² Robinson (2011) 93 who comments on Herbert-Brown (1994) 42 and her belief that no sign of the temple remained.

⁸⁰³ In terms of temples dedicated to Juno Sospita in Rome, we know only of the one in the Forum Holitorium, whose remains are still extant beneath the temple of San Nicola in Carcere. See Richardson (1992) 217-18.

⁸⁰⁴ See Robinson (2011) 94-96. The most compelling evidence against viewing this temple as that of Juno Sospita in the Forum Holitorium (FH) are the inscriptions that seem to place FH's dedication on July 1st rather than Feb. 1st, the recovery of an archaic antefix of Juno in the vicinity of the Palatine complex, the fact that the temple of *Mater Matuta* (even if Ovid mistook it with that of *Magna Mater*) is not *conterminum* with FH, and, finally, Frazer's speculative yet poignant suggestion that Ovid merely had access to material that proved the existence of the Palatine temple of Juno Sospita.

⁸⁰⁵ Richardson (1992) 217.

⁸⁰⁶ Boyle (2003) 230.

should describe Augustus' *cura* (2.60) as ensuring the longevity of other temples at the expense of the very one which, by Ovid's own admission, belongs to that specific day. The word recurs again a few lines later (*cura* 2.64) in the same *sedes* in order to emphasize the mutually beneficial relationship that exists between Augustus and the gods whose temples he maintains. Yet, this *mutua cura* (2.64) clearly breaks down in light of the absence of the temple of Juno Sospita. In a way then, Augustus' own divine status, underscored by the adjective *sacرات* (2.60) is given precedence over the *sacrata...templa* (2.57-58) of the divinity who is supposed to govern every Kalends and has been conspicuously neglected. A similar phenomenon is at play with the recurrence of *delubris* at 2.61, which contrasts the temples that Augustus will restore with the *delubris...novis* of 2.56 that are no longer extant.⁸⁰⁷

Such an abrupt shift from the missing temple of Juno Sospita to Augustus' restoration of other unspecified temples has not gone unnoticed. Boyle in particular has drawn attention to the apparent contradiction between the temple of Juno Sospita that is no longer extant and the statement by Ovid that "under Augustus no shrine experiences old age" (2.61).⁸⁰⁸ Once again we see Ovid's hermeneutic alibi hard at work.⁸⁰⁹ On the one hand, as Boyle suggests, the mention of this derelict temple casts a shadow upon Augustus' prolific rebuilding program, especially considering its close proximity to Augustus' own residence.⁸¹⁰ An alternative interpretation, however, is that the disappearance of this temple acted as the impetus for Augustus to mobilize

⁸⁰⁷ See Robinson (2011) 99 who notes the same phenomenon with the repeated *templorum* of 2.63 picking up on the absent *templa* of Juno Sospita at 2.57.

⁸⁰⁸ Boyle (2003) 230. Semantically one could argue that the temple of Juno Sospita is exempt from this category since it is not merely old, it is gone. I do not, however, think that is Ovid's intent here.

⁸⁰⁹ For an explanation of what constitutes Ovid's hermeneutic alibi, see introduction n. 24.

⁸¹⁰ Especially if the ruins of the temple are still visible (see Robinson [2011] 93).

his rebuilding effort.⁸¹¹ Yet, the problem remains: why then did Augustus neglect to rebuild the temple of Juno Sospita?⁸¹² Boyle continues to observe some further nuances in this passage, noting the verbal play on *Sospita* (2.56) and *positor...repositor* (2.63) as well as the “(mock?) reverence” of *sancte* (“holy” 2.63) used in reference to Augustus the rebuilder.⁸¹³ His attempt to detect mock reverence in Ovid’s tone is supported by Ovid’s description of Augustus two lines earlier as *sacрати...ducis* (“revered leader” 60).⁸¹⁴ For is it not ironic to call Augustus a *sacратus dux* when he does not protect the *sacрата...templa deae* (2.57-8)? Further, the line *nec satis est homines, obligat ille deos* (2.62) may also be read as mock-reverential. Rather than saying that Augustus merely restored these temples so that the people might have a place to worship their gods, Ovid attempts to elevate Augustus to the status of divine, as he did on the Ides of January by equating Augustus’ name with that of *summus Iuppiter*.⁸¹⁵ Again Ovid makes it seem as if Augustus is operating on a higher level, more concerned with the care of the gods (*deos*) than with the care of the people (*homines*),⁸¹⁶ a fitting characterization for a man who, at least in the *Fasti*, is depicted more like a god than a human.⁸¹⁷

Even the subsequent prayer, in which Ovid asks the gods to grant the Princeps as many years as he gave them (*dent tibi caelestes, quos tu caelestibus, annos* 2.65) is double-edged. For

⁸¹¹ Herbert-Brown (1994) 42.

⁸¹² Robinson (2011) 96 cites the precedent of the temple of Ceres, Liber, and Libera that remained unrestored by Augustus after burning down in 31 B.C.

⁸¹³ Boyle (2003) 230.

⁸¹⁴ At *Met.* 15.864 Ovid uses *sacрата* in reference to the worship of Vesta (*Vesta sacрата*).

⁸¹⁵ See Chapter 2 pp. 43-51.

⁸¹⁶ Robinson (2011) 99 notes that the initial ellipsis of *obligare* “allows the focus to fall on the balance between *homines* and *deos*.”

⁸¹⁷ Evidence for this includes the reference to his deified state at 1.650, the prayers offered to his *genius* at the conclusion of the Caristia (2.637), and his close association with Jupiter throughout.

as Boyle quips, “Precisely how many years did Augustus give Iuno Sospita?”⁸¹⁸ In the second half of this prayer, Ovid subtly turns the focus away from Augustus’ restoration of temples and back onto the temple of Iuno Sospita by wishing that the gods remain standing in front of Augustus’ house for protection (*proque tua maneant in statione domo* 2.66). This takes the reader back to the missing temple of Iuno Sospita, which would have remained in front of Augustus’ house had he restored it. Here the phrase *maneant in statione* (2.66) does double duty. On the one hand, it has the military language of “stand on-guard,”⁸¹⁹ no doubt the more prevalent meaning here, while, on the other hand, it has the more literal sense of “remain in place.”⁸²⁰ The temple of Iuno Sospita fails to meet either qualification and the prosperity of Augustus—the very thing the prayer requests—is called into question. In addition, this prayer is highly reminiscent of the one uttered by Ovid at the conclusion of his entry to the Ides of January where he compared Augustus to Jupiter:

augeat imperium nostri ducis, augeat annos,
protegat et vestras querna corona fores:

And may he [Jupiter] augment the power of our leader, augment his years, and may his
garland of oak protect your door-posts. (*Fast.* 1.613-14)

Both prayers stress the need for the gods to bless Augustus with more years and both focus on the protection of his house. The prayer on the Ides of January, however, calls for Jupiter himself to look after Augustus, while the prayer on the Kalends of February evokes the celestial gods

⁸¹⁸ Boyle (2003) 230.

⁸¹⁹ For the military sense of the phrase see *OLD* s.v. *statio* 5b; cf. Ovid *Met.* 1.627: *Cetera servabant atque in statione manebant*, “the other (eyes of Argus) were keeping watch and were standing on guard.”

⁸²⁰ For the meaning of “The position normally or properly occupied by a thing” see *OLD* s.v. *statio* 2c.

more broadly; but Juno gets left out since her temples are not among those to which the Princeps himself granted years. A central component of the prayer uttered on the Kalends of February is that of reciprocity. Augustus should receive as many years as he has given to the gods. But he has given far more years to some than to others, particularly to Jupiter in the form of the recently constructed temple of Jupiter Tonans.

A similar phenomenon is at play on the Kalends of May when Ovid is unable to locate the statues of the Lares Praestites, which have been erased by time: *bina gemellorum quaerebam signa deorum / viribus annosae facta caduca morae* (“I was searching for the double statues of these twin gods, but they had fallen from the weight of the long passage of time” 5.143-44). The description of the no longer extant temple of Juno Sospita on the Kalends of February was couched in similar terms: *longa procubuere die* (“it collapsed long ago” 2.58). Ovid then directs our attention to the new Augustan version of these ancient Lares, which are clearly intended to mark a change from their traditional representation with the inclusion of Augustus’ own genius: *mille Lares Geniumque ducis, qui tradidit illos, / urbs habet, et vici numina terna colunt* (“The city boasts a thousand Lares along with the *genius* of our leader, who erected them, and the wards pay homage to the three-fold godhead” *Fast.* 5.145-46).⁸²¹ Just as the *Lares Praestites* were overshadowed by the *Lares Augusti*, so too did the fallen temple of Juno Sospita pave the way for other Augustan restoration projects; they are both apparent victims of Augustan neglect.⁸²² Regarding Augustus’ appropriation of the more ancient *Lares Praestites*, Barchiesi

⁸²¹ Flower (2017) 110 states, “[Ovid’s] words inevitably suggest that the *praestites* enjoyed an ancient cult that Augustus has not included in his widespread and much heralded restoration of traditional sanctuaries in Rome.”

⁸²² As Ovid reminded the reader back on the Kalends of February: *cetera ne simili caderent labefacta ruina / cavit sacrati provida cura ducis* (“The provident care of our sacred leader is to ensure that other temples not fall, destroyed by similar destruction” 2.59-60). For further

comments, “Augustan discourse is of a hindrance rather than of help to the reconstruction of the antique, and the paradigm of the day gives rise to tension.”⁸²³ This is the same sort of tension that we observe on the Kalends of February where Jupiter’s new Augustan temple overshadows the dilapidated Republican temple of Juno Sospita.⁸²⁴

Thus far we have noted the subversive reading of Ovid’s account of the fallen/vanished temple of Juno Sospita on the Palatine and of Augustus’ role as *restitutor templorum omnium*, as he was called by Livy.⁸²⁵ Herbert-Brown, however, argues for a positive reading of the Kalends of February. Her reasoning is that if the temple of Juno Sospita did exist in such a poor state, why would Augustus not have restored it? Using this logic and drawing from the didactic nature of the *Fasti*, Herbert-Brown concludes that Ovid’s purpose in combining these two seemingly incongruent elements is to posit a warning for what might have happened had Augustus not come along and undertaken his extensive rebuilding program.⁸²⁶ That is, Augustus arrived on the scene too late to save the Palatine temple of Juno Sospita, but as result of his actions many other temples were restored subsequently. She sees the link between *Sospita* and *positor/repostor* as genuine, arguing that “the motif of ‘preserver’ introduced by Juno’s epithet is transposed and developed by cleverly transforming the subject of the encomium from the goddess to Augustus.”⁸²⁷ Robinson posits a third possibility, focusing on the expiatory rites of the month of

discussion of the implications of the *Lares Praestites* being replaced by the *Lares Augusti* see Pasco-Pranger (2006) 254-55 and Barchiesi (1997a) 106-10.

⁸²³ Barchiesi (1997a) 109.

⁸²⁴ If indeed the reference at 2.69 is to the temple of Jupiter Tonans.

⁸²⁵ Livy 4.20.7 refers to Augustus as *templorum omnium conditorem ac restitorem* (“founder and restorer of all temples”).

⁸²⁶ Herbert-Brown (1994) 42-43.

⁸²⁷ Herbert-Brown (1994) 42-43.

February.⁸²⁸ He refers the reader to the lines just prior to the first of February where Ovid stresses the ancestral emphasis on purification (2.35-36) and the role it can play in expiating impious acts (2.37-38) and absolving sin (*solve nefas* 2.44). Citing Horace C. 3.6.1-4, in which Horace directs the token Roman to atone for the crimes of his ancestors (*delicta maiorum* 3.6.1) by rebuilding the temples and tumbling shrines of the gods (*donec templa refeceris / aedisque labentis deorum* 3.6.2-3), Robinson reasons that Ovid is making a similar claim, which accounts for why he juxtaposes Augustus' failed restoration of the temple of Juno Sospita with Augustus' successful restoration and thus purification of other temples. With his interpretation, Robinson straddles the line between the positive reading of Herbert-Brown and the suspicious reading of Boyle. Indeed, Robinson's hypothesis takes into account the surrounding context and treats the entry as heavily didactic in the manner of Herbert-Brown. Yet, at the same time, he admits that different readers may still interpret the actions of the Princeps differently.⁸²⁹ There is, however, another way of accounting both for the temple's mention as well as its decrepit state.

All attempts to explain the presence of the dilapidated or razed temple of Juno Sospita revolve around Augustus and his program of restoration. On the same day, however, Ovid also describes the sacrifice of a sheep (*bidens* 2.70) in three nearby locations: the inner shrine of Numa (*penetrabile Numa* 2.69),⁸³⁰ the temple of Jupiter Tonans (*Capitolinumque Tonantem* 2.69),⁸³¹ and at the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (*inque Iovis summa...arce* 2.70).

⁸²⁸ Robinson (2011) 93-94.

⁸²⁹ Robinson (2011) 93-94.

⁸³⁰ Likely a reference to the temple of Vesta in the Roman Forum (see Frazer [1929] Vol. II. 301, Boyle [2003] 217 and Robinson [2011] 101-02).

⁸³¹ Both Boyle (2003) 217 and Robinson (2011) 102 agree that *Capitolinum Tonantem* is a reference to the temple of Jupiter Tonans, which stood near the more famous temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus.

Robinson has little to say about the sacrifices themselves, remarking, “nothing, is, however, known about any of these rites.”⁸³² Boyle offers little more than the assumption that “the sacrifice referred to in line 70 on ‘Jove’s high hill’ is probably to Juno, to whom sacrifices were regularly made on the Kalends.”⁸³³ Robinson also points out that in referring to the temple of Jupiter Tonans as *Capitolinus*, Ovid appropriates the title normally reserved for the grander, more famous temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, which was often called *Capitolinus*.⁸³⁴ Augustus himself had built the temple of Jupiter Tonans in 22 B.C. following his near-death experience in Cantabria,⁸³⁵ and had rebuilt or extensively renovated the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, as he records in his *Res Gestae*.⁸³⁶ The focus, then, amidst this miscellany of sacrificial rites, not just on Jupiter, but on temples of Jupiter that Augustus was closely attached to, strikes a contrast once again with the missing/unrestored temple of Juno Sospita, whose sacrificial rites ought to be featured on this particular day. Robinson also sees a potential Augustan resonance in the likely reference to the temple of Vesta with *penetrare Numae* (2.69), which he claims activates a parallel with Augustus’ tethering of Vesta’s house to his own on the Palatine, which would have stood immediately next to the absent temple of Juno Sospita.⁸³⁷ In addition, Numa’s most prominent role in the *Fasti*, other than his expansion of the Romulean

⁸³² Robinson (2011) 100. The epigraphic fasti make no mention of sacrifices to Jupiter on this day (see Degraffi [1963] 405-06).

⁸³³ Boyle (2003) 217.

⁸³⁴ Robinson (2011) 102 who concludes with the cheeky remark, “the thunder of its (the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus) grand title has been stolen.”

⁸³⁵ The temple was vowed by Augustus in 26 B.C. and dedicated on Sept. 1st 22 B.C. (Dio, 54.4.2, *CIL* 1, p. 400), making the sacrifice described here not an ancient ritual, but one implemented by Augustus at some time after the temple’s completion in 22 B.C.

⁸³⁶ Aug. *R.G.* 20: *Capitolium...impensa grandi refeci* (“I rebuilt the Capitoline (temple) at great expense”).

⁸³⁷ Robinson (2011) 102.

calendar, is his appeasement of Jupiter Elicius in book 3,⁸³⁸ that culminates not in a temple dedication, but in a sacrifice to Jupiter (3.375-76). Here on the Kalends of February the sacrificial animal is that of a two-toothed sheep (*bidens* 2.70), which recalls the *grandior agna* of 1.56 that Ovid says was sacrificed to Jupiter on every Ides.⁸³⁹ Recall that *grandior* implies that Jupiter receives a bigger sacrifice than Juno. Here, Ovid exacerbates that scenario by painting a picture in which two of Jupiter's cult titles receive a sacrifice, while Juno Sospita receives none. Thus the presence of the sacrifices here to Jupiter represents the continuation of the aforementioned discrepancy between the unrestored temple of Juno Sospita and the many temples restored by Augustus. The perspective has shifted from the building of temples to the performance of sacrifices at the temples themselves.

Horace Wright views all three sacrifices as honoring, not Juno, but Jupiter in the guise of a weather god,⁸⁴⁰ which we witness in the entry's final couplet with the mention of heavy rains (*graves pluvias* 2.71) or a layer of snow upon the ground (*posita sub nive* 2.72). Indeed, the word *posita* here is a near anagram of *Sospita* above and the fact that the earth lies hidden beneath the snow, the natural result of Jupiter the weather god, may also be a clever way of saying that the temple of Juno Sospita is hidden, perhaps obscured in a way by the grandeur of Jupiter's temples. Although Wright treats the matter as rather definitive,⁸⁴¹ his claim has merit and if true would add another layer of subtlety to an already rich and complex passage. Juno and Jupiter are

⁸³⁸ Ironically Jupiter's thunder, here represented by *Tonantem* is the very thing that Numa attempts to mitigate.

⁸³⁹ The *OLD* defines *agna*¹ as "a ewe lamb" and *bidens*² s.v. 1 as "an animal for sacrifice, esp. a sheep."

⁸⁴⁰ Wright (1917) 28.

⁸⁴¹ Wright (1917) 28 who cavalierly asserts "the offering on the Arx was unquestionably to him (Jup. as a weather god)."

here static topographical markers in the form of temples, yet Ovid breathes life into them by acknowledging the neglect of the former and giving attention to the latter, perhaps as a way of embedding their mythological competition directly into the calendar itself. Indeed, within the *Fasti* we have already witnessed sacrifices made to Capitoline Jupiter on the Kalends of January (1.83-88), a day on which Ovid tells us “When Jupiter looks down upon the entire world from his citadel, he beholds nothing to protect that is not Roman” (*Iuppiter arce sua totum cum spectet in orbem / nil nisi Romanum quod tueatur habet* 1.85-86). But it seems clear that this ritual was performed in order to inaugurate the year’s new magistrates rather than to pay homage to Jupiter as a weather god.⁸⁴² The absence of any mention of the three sacrifices on the Kalends of February in any of the extant epigraphic *Fasti* leads us to wonder whether Ovid was taking certain liberties here, as he is prone to do elsewhere. Yet, regardless of whether these sacrifices on the Kalends of February were actually made to Jupiter, Ovid creates a scenario wherein the celebration of Jupiter’s Ides encroaches upon that of the Kalends of Juno, essentially mapping their mythological conflict onto a topographical setting. By juxtaposing a fallen or no longer extant temple of Juno with two functioning temples of Jupiter, one of which is not only relatively new but also of great importance to the Princeps, Ovid has found a unique way of introducing a familiar theme.⁸⁴³ Further, from a logistical standpoint, placing this entry on the first of the

⁸⁴² Pina Polo (2011) 17-18 and Chrissanthos (2019) 52 both describe the ritual sacrifices performed on the first of the year to Jupiter by the newly inaugurated consuls. See also Green (2004a) 66.

⁸⁴³ Similar is the way in which Ovid emphasizes the “august” nature of temples at *Tr.* 2.287, only to have the female worshiper stand inside the temple of Jupiter and contemplate his many adulterous affairs, and then proceed next door to Juno’s temple and contemplate the wrath she exhibited towards the many women involved in those affairs. As Hejduk (2020) 269 notes, “Ovid’s mischievous take on the Augustan program of rebuilding and religious revival deserves the adjective, ‘subversive’.”

month enables Ovid to establish the theme at the beginning of his second book and develop it throughout the remainder of the book.

As Ovid moves on to other entries in the month of February, Jupiter continues to outmaneuver Juno, who experiences hardships akin to her fallen temple. When Ovid poses the question on the subsequent day (Feb. 2nd) as to what happened to the constellation Lyra, which had been visible yesterday (*ubi est hodie quae Lyra fulsit heri?* 2.76), the reader is perhaps prompted to consider the temple of Juno Sospita that no doubt gleamed (*fulsit*) in the past, but no longer in the present. The story of Arion, told on the entry for Feb. 3rd concludes once again with Jupiter, who is depicted catasterizing the dolphin that aided Arion: *di pia facta vident: astris delphina recepit / Iuppiter et stellas iussit habere novem* (“the gods see pious deeds: he [Jupiter] received the dolphin among the stars and ordered it to have nine stars” 2.117-18). Robinson observes that it is normally Apollo, not Jupiter, who performs the catasterism for the dolphin,⁸⁴⁴ as Arion himself is a poet and under the patronage of Apollo. This then constitutes another example of Jupiter appearing in a place where one would traditionally not expect him. Some scholars have read this entry as semi-autobiographical, since both Arion and Ovid are poets, and experience a similarly harsh treatment.⁸⁴⁵ Newlands sees in Arion several such autobiographical elements and interprets the episode as Ovid showcasing the poet’s ability to triumph over adversity and as a justification for his generic choices.⁸⁴⁶ But what of the novel choice of replacing Apollo with Jupiter as the agent of the catasterism? The transformation of the helpful dolphin into a constellation marks the first catasterism in the *Fasti* officially performed by

⁸⁴⁴ Robinson (2011) 135

⁸⁴⁵ Robinson (2011) 108 remarks, “Here we have a poet, whose great poetic skills are not appreciated by an un-Callimachean *turba* of sailors.”

⁸⁴⁶ Newlands (1995) 178-87, who calls Arion, “a poet of unrivaled skill and mythic dimensions” (180).

Jupiter, but one which Hejduk notes is almost too good to be true. She remarks that “Jupiter’s unwonted benevolence contrasts with the malevolence of an Augustus figure, providing a *positive* exemplum to emulate.”⁸⁴⁷ Interestingly, Jupiter’s next catasterism is performed amidst questionable motives and inflicts much pain upon a Juno who has, in the world of Roman cult, has already experienced an affront to her divine status.

II. Jupiter, Juno, and Callisto

In the previous chapter we discussed the implications of the comparison between Jupiter and Augustus on the Nones of February as it relates to the subsequent Ganymede couplet as well as to the Callisto narrative. Let us now turn away from a political reading of these episodes and focus on the ways in which they engage with the broader literary tradition. It was said in the previous chapter that throughout the *Fasti* Jupiter and Juno are depicted as being distant from one another, to the extent that they seldom interact, and when they do, no resolution is presented. In *Fasti* 6 when Juno attempts to convince Ovid that the month of June should be named after her and realizes that she may not get her wish, she reacts by expressing her potential regret for the aid she had given to Rome in the past (6.41-50). At the top of her list is her willingness to forgive the Trojans for their role in *causa duplex irae* (“the twofold cause of her anger” 6.43), which includes the rape of Ganymede by Jupiter and Paris’ selection of Venus over Juno in the contest of the golden apple.⁸⁴⁸ Therefore, as much as the Ganymede couplet of 2.145-46 can be read as a subtle critique of Augustus, it may also be read as a reflection of one of the original *causae* for Juno’s hatred of the Trojans, brought on not by any fault of Ganymede or the Trojans, but rather by the amorous desires of Jupiter. In that sense, the depiction of the young Ganymede, exposed up to his belly as a celestial constellation and shown pouring water mixed with nectar

⁸⁴⁷ Hejduk (2020) 248.

⁸⁴⁸ Both of which are famously *causae* for Juno’s anger in the *Aeneid* (1.26-28).

for an imagined Jupiter,⁸⁴⁹ sets the tone for Juno's anger in the subsequent Callisto narrative, in spite of Jupiter's minimal narrative presence. For in the *Met.* Ovid showcases Juno's anger, not at Jupiter's abduction and ravishing of the young Trojan prince, but rather at Ganymede's appointment to the position of celestial cup-bearer: *qui nunc quoque pocula miscet / invitaque Iovi nectar Iunone ministrat* ("[Ganymede] who now also mixes the cups and serves nectar to Jove against Juno's wishes" *Met.* 10.160-61). The sandwiching of *nectar* between Jupiter and Juno attests to the wedge that Ganymede has driven between them.

While it is true that the Callisto episode follows on the heels of the *pater patriae* entry, the transition is not immediate.⁸⁵⁰ For the two entries are separated by an interval of seven days, laid out with numerical markers.⁸⁵¹ In the brief astrological entry for February 10th Ovid tells the reader that while Spring may be nigh, there are still many cold days ahead: *ne fallare tamen, restant tibi frigora, restant, / magnaue discedens signa reliquit hiems* ("However, do not be deceived, frigid days still lie ahead for you, they lie ahead, and winter in its departure has left behind unmistakable signs" 2.151-52). The repetition of the verb *restant* is jarring and the mention of winter's lingering signs may remind the reader of the snow-covered earth that concluded the entry on the first of February (2.72). This didactic interjection may also serve to forecast the violent actions of Jupiter in several of the subsequent entries that produce a different

⁸⁴⁹ *Fast.* 2.145-6: *Iam puer Idaeus media tenus eminent alvo, / et liquidas mixto nectare fundit aquas.* ("Already Ida's boy juts out up to the middle of his belly, and pours out pure water mixed with nectar").

⁸⁵⁰ Ovid's penchant for exploiting jarring juxtapositions of episodes in the *Fasti* in order to create tension and bolster his thematic effects has been extensively discussed by scholars: Fantham (1992) 155-72, Newlands (1995), Barchiesi (1997a), and Pasco-Pranger (2006) 11.

⁸⁵¹ *Fast.* 2.149-50: *quintus...lucifer*; *Fast.* 2.153: *tertia nox*. Temporal markers are used in the *Met.* episode only to indicate the time of day at which Jupiter catches sight of Callisto: *ulterius medio spatium sol altus habebat* (*Met.* 2.417).

kind of chill.⁸⁵² After all, the weather, especially harsh weather, is firmly within Jupiter's jurisdiction,⁸⁵³ and the adjective *magnus* is used elsewhere as a stock epithet for Jupiter.⁸⁵⁴ These wintry *signa* thus can be read as a harbinger not just for cold weather, but also for the macabre episodes that lie ahead involving Jupiter.

On the other hand, the Callisto episode in the *Met.* (2.417-530) is accompanied by an extensive introduction. Further, Jupiter plays a much more integral role there than he does in the *Fasti* counterpart. Even before Callisto is introduced, Ovid sets the scene by focusing on a Jupiter who inspects the world, Arcadia in particular, in order to make sure that the damage caused by Phaethon and his rogue chariot is repaired (*Met.* 2.401-08). There, Jupiter, called *pater omnipotens* (*Met.* 2.401), functions as a doppelganger of the Vergilian Jupiter, faithfully looking after the well-being of his earthly constituents. But the tone undergoes an immediate transformation from epic to elegiac, once Jupiter locks his eyes on Callisto.⁸⁵⁵ Whereas Ovid smoothly blends the two related episodes in the *Met.*, facilitating the transition by way of an extensive description of Callisto as a huntress and a member of Diana's troop (*Met.* 2.409-16), he begins the *Fasti* episode by introducing the partially visible constellation of Arctophylax (*Fast.* 2.153-4), which serves as the endpoint of the *Met.* narrative (*Met.* 2.505-07).⁸⁵⁶ Ovid introduces the constellation in a way that may remind us of the Ganymede couplet above: *custodem*

⁸⁵² See *OLD* s.v. *frigus* 3 for the sense "A cold sensation in the body; chilliness."

⁸⁵³ Horace in his *Epodes* (2.29-30) describes Jupiter controlling both snow and hail: *at cum tonantis annus hibernus Iovis / imbris nivisque comparat*, ("But when the wintry season of Jove prepares both hail and snow...").

⁸⁵⁴ *Fast.* 1.587 (*magni...Iovis*), 2.670 (*magno...Iove*), 5.40 (*magnum...Iovem*), 5.248 (*Iovis magni*), 6.196 (*magni...Iovis*). Also, *Fast.* 1.294 (*magno...avo*) where *avo* refers to Jupiter as Aesculapius' grandfather.

⁸⁵⁵ See Heinze (1919) 385-88 for a treatment of the elegiac vs. epic qualities of the two episodes.

⁸⁵⁶ Ovid does not name either constellation explicitly in the *Met.*

protinus Ursae / aspicias geminos exseruisse pedes (“You will see the guardian of the bear to have thrust out its two feet” 2.153-54).⁸⁵⁷ Just as Ganymede “juts out up to the middle of his belly” (*media tenus eminet alvo* 2.145), the bear-guardian sticks out merely his two feet.⁸⁵⁸ This focus on the partial visibility of these two constellations, apart from reflecting their actual state in the sky, may also hint at both Ovid’s hermeneutic alibi as well as the fact that he is about to embark upon a heavily truncated version of the popular Callisto myth.

Robinson in his commentary on *Fasti* 2 provides an extensive summary of the ancient sources that Ovid used in the construction of his two Callisto narratives.⁸⁵⁹ The two primary sources are Eratosthenes, who may have relied on an earlier Hesiodic version, and Callimachus. It should come as a surprise neither that Ovid developed his own blend of the story, nor that he made sure to incorporate Callimachean elements into his own version. One of the key Callimachean elements, and one that is particularly relevant to this study, is the inclusion of Hera/Juno as the one responsible for the metamorphosis of Callisto, rather than Artemis, who performed that role in the Eratosthenic version. There is yet another tradition, in which Jupiter himself initiates Callisto’s metamorphosis in order to hide his affair from Juno.⁸⁶⁰ Ovid rejects this tradition in both of his accounts, likely owing to its close similarity to his Io episode in the *Met.* It is clear then that both of Ovid’s Callisto narratives follow the Callimachean model of pitting Jupiter against Juno. Let us examine them in closer detail, with a particular focus on how Ovid constructs the actions and reactions of Jupiter and Juno.

⁸⁵⁷ In the *Fasti* the Latin name for the constellation *Custodem...Ursae* (2.153) eventually gives way to its Greek name at the entry’s close, *Arctophylax* (2.190).

⁸⁵⁸ Robinson (2011) 165 acknowledges that the bear-guardian’s movements are “a little hard to fathom astronomically.”

⁸⁵⁹ Robinson (2011) 166-68.

⁸⁶⁰ Cf. Apollod. 3.100 and Hyg. *Astr.* 2.1.4.

Ovid adds a more personal touch to the *Met.* version by allowing the reader to be privy to Jupiter's thoughts on his impending rape of Callisto rather than just hearing about his actions from the narrator, as is the case in the *Fasti*. For even before Jupiter instigates his plan of attack, he says to himself, *hoc certe furtum coniunx mea nesciet.../ aut si rescierit, sunt, o sunt iurgia tanti* ("Surely my wife will remain ignorant of this secret love, or if she finds out, the quarrels are worth it, oh they are" *Met.* 2.423-24).⁸⁶¹ Thus Jupiter in the *Met.* hopes for the best, but is aware of the consequences and is somewhat comically prepared to argue vehemently with his wife over the matter.⁸⁶² The repetition of *sunt* both reinforces Jupiter's commitment to raping Callisto and anticipates the actual *iurgia* that will soon arise as a result of Jupiter's actions. The nonchalant back and forth dialogue between Jupiter and Callisto in the *Met.* also distracts the reader from the heinous act that is about to be committed. In the guise of Diana, Jupiter is called greater than himself (*maius Iove* 2.429), a nod to Jupiter's frequent association with *maior/maius*,⁸⁶³ and rather than taking offense at this statement, he proceeds to laugh, an act which in this context seems indicative of the elegiac genre.⁸⁶⁴ All of this contributes to an episode marked by mixed emotions, as opposed to the more somber and distant treatment of the story told in the *Fasti*.⁸⁶⁵

⁸⁶¹ Anderson (1996) 281 comments, "the interjection *o* reveals the god's comically lyrical eagerness for this sexual adventure."

⁸⁶² Otis (1966) 117 discusses the various genres at play here, including epic and tragedy, but concludes that "the story's mood is still, in the main, amatory and comic."

⁸⁶³ See the previous chapter, where Jupiter's association with *maior/maius* is discussed in terms of its Augustan undertones.

⁸⁶⁴ Anderson (1997) 282 comments, "Jupiter plays the comic intriguer, immensely enjoying himself and relishing the irony of this self-comparison." Cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.1.3 for Cupid's laughter upon forcing Ovid to write elegy.

⁸⁶⁵ Johnson (1996) 19 refers to the Callisto passage in the *Fasti* as "a more shocking, an uglier, rendition of this rape story." He then goes on to say (20) "But he [Ovid] doesn't charm us, seems

Interestingly, the rape itself is described in both versions as a *crimen*. In the *Met.* we hear that Jupiter *inpediit amplexu nec se sine crimine prodiit* (“impedes her with his embrace and does not reveal himself without a crime” 2.433). In the *Fasti* the rape is condensed even further: *de Iove crimen habet* (“she derives her crime from Jove” 2.162), resulting in the defocalization of Jupiter and making the act a *crimen* in the eyes of Callisto, which implies a greater sense of guilt on her part. There is no mention of Jupiter’s infatuation with Callisto, his premeditated actions, or any witty banter preceding the rape, just the *crimen*. The word then recurs a few lines later in the *Met.* when Callisto is forced to take off her tunic and bathe with the other nymphs. There, the description of her pregnancy echoes the rape itself: *qua posita nudo patuit cum corpore crimen* (“with her (tunic) put aside, her crime is revealed along with her naked body” *Met.* 2.462). The *crimen* here merely alludes to the rape, calling attention instead to the resulting pregnancy, which is the real *crimen* in the eyes of Diana. With this reading in mind, *Fast.* 2.162 takes on the additional meaning “Callisto derives her pregnancy from Jove,” the very thing that will later prompt Juno to react. Further, the *Fasti*’s parallel scene, in which Callisto is revealed to be pregnant, also reminds the reader of Jove’s actions, not through the repetition of the word *crimen*, but with that of *prodiit*: *uteri manifesta tumore / prodiitur indicio ponderis ipsa suo* (“she, who is clearly with swollen belly, is revealed by the evidence of her weight” *Fast.* 2.171-72). In the *Met.* we heard of Jupiter revealing himself (*se...prodiit*) when he committed the rape. Now, the consequence of the rape itself becomes revealed by the signs of Callisto’s pregnancy, causing Callisto even more shame and pain.

not even to try to...instead of all or any of the Ovidian pleasures we’re used to, what we get is a quick series of unpleasant pictures.” Murgatroyd (2005) 247-49 offers a similar reading, calling it “humourless” and claiming that “the stark and spare narrative...allows the inherent pathos of the events to come across undiluted.”

Thus far, Juno has appeared in the *Met.* as a part of Jupiter's premeditations and in the *Fasti* not at all. But after Jupiter rapes Callisto in the *Met.*, the narrator tries to create some sympathy for her, in part by appealing to Juno:

illa quidem contra, quantum modo femina posset
(adspiceres utinam, Saturnia, mitior esses),
illa quidem pugnat, sed quem superare puella,
quisve Iovem poterat? superum petit aethera victor
Iuppiter.

Indeed, she opposes him, as much as a woman is able (Juno, if only you saw her, you would be more merciful); indeed, she puts up a fight, but whom could a girl defeat, or who could defeat Jove? Jupiter as victor heads for the sky above. (*Met.* 2.434-38)

The narrator's plea that Juno take pity on Callisto is surrounded on both sides by a reminder of Callisto's resistance to Jove (*contra* and *pugnat*) and of the fact that she is a woman (*femina* and *puella*) and thus incapable of staving off any rape, let alone that of mighty Jupiter. Recall that in Apollonius Juno praises Thetis for resisting the advances of Jupiter. But here Callisto, who in fact had no knowledge of Jupiter's presence until the act itself, gets no credit from Juno for putting up a good fight. Jupiter's victorious ascension into the sky is also interesting. Barchiesi notes that although it is normal in Latin elegy for the male victor to celebrate his victory over the conquered female, the presence of *victor* here, alongside the name *Iuppiter*, activates the cult title Jupiter Victor, whom, as we will see, Ovid acknowledges in his *Fasti* on the Ides of April.⁸⁶⁶ This blending of elegy, cult, and calendrical celebration would perhaps seem more appropriate for the *Fasti*, which is devoid of any extended reference to Jupiter or his victory, marking a firm departure from the Jupiter on the Nones of February and his magisterial depiction. Lastly, the

⁸⁶⁶ Barchiesi (2005) 272.

narrator's contrary-to-fact wish that Juno treat Callisto more mercifully clashes with the depiction of Jupiter's triumphant return to the sky as a victor.⁸⁶⁷

In the *Fasti* Ovid blends together the narrator's sympathy for Callisto and Juno's retaliatory actions:

quae fuerat virgo credita, mater erat.
laesa furit Iuno, formam mutatque puellae:
quid facis? invito est pectore passa Iovem.
utque ferae vidit turpes in paelice voltus,
'huius in amplexus, Iuppiter,' inquit 'eas.'⁸⁶⁸

She who had been believed to be a virgin was now a mother. A wounded Juno rages and changes the appearance of the girl: why are you doing (this)? She suffered Jupiter against her will. And when Juno saw the ugly face of a wild beast in her rival, she said, 'Jupiter, go into the embrace of this (animal)!'" (*Fast.* 2.176-80)

As soon as Callisto gives birth, Ovid immediately transitions to Juno's rage without any mention of Jupiter's culpability. In the first chapter we discussed at length the *Fasti*'s focus on Juno as a mother figure.⁸⁶⁹ Here that motif comes through once again. The *de Iove crimen habet* (2.162), which above had focused on the act of rape, now gives way to the more pertinent issue of Callisto's pregnancy. The sympathy that the narrator expresses on Callisto's behalf at *Met.* 2.434-37 now becomes embedded into her punishment and is in effect doubled. While the phrase *invito...pectore* of *Fast.* 2.178 no doubt paints her as helpless against the advances of Jupiter, the *quid facis* acts as a hinge between Callisto's prior suffering at the hands of a lusty Jupiter and her

⁸⁶⁷ Note the enjambment of Jupiter's name at *Met.* 2.438.

⁸⁶⁸ The Teubner (*ad loc.*) notes some manuscripts observe *eat* rather than *eas*, following *Ov. Ars* 1.770.

⁸⁶⁹ Most prominently as the mother of Mars (3.251, 5.258-60, and 6.53-54), but also of Juventas (6.67 and 6.74).

current suffering at the hands of an angry Juno. By delaying any notes of sympathy until the moment of Callisto's metamorphosis, Ovid essentially increases the pathos for Callisto and casts Juno as the principal villain. Indeed, Robinson describes the aftermath of Callisto's metamorphosis in terms highly unfavorable to Juno: "Here we have the rather grim picture of Juno admiring her handiwork."⁸⁷⁰ Yet, Juno's primary motive in transforming Callisto is to punish Jupiter, and it is with this in mind that Ovid calls Callisto a *paelex*, a word that reflects the viewpoint of Juno rather than the narrator.⁸⁷¹ The final apostrophe of Juno to Jupiter represents the culmination of her vengeance, wherein she now not only condones but encourages Jupiter to lay with Callisto in the form of a bear. The use of the deictic *huius* enhances the dramatic effect of Juno's sarcastic remark and the reader can envision Juno pointing at the newly transformed bear as she speaks. A few lines later the narrator reminds us that as a human Callisto once attracted the attention of almighty Jove: *quae fuerat summo nuper amata Iovi* ("she who had recently been loved by highest Jove" *Fast.* 2.182). This comment first serves to exacerbate Callisto's current state as an unattractive bear, enhancing the sarcasm of Juno's desire for Jupiter to lay with her now.⁸⁷² In addition, it emphasizes Callisto's constant state of change, echoing her former transformation from virgin to mother only six lines prior at 2.176. Finally, once Ovid fast-forwards fifteen years, he mentions that Arcas was *furto conceptus* ("conceived from a secret love" 2.183). Recall that in the *Met.* Jupiter had initially told himself that Juno would remain ignorant of his *furtum* with Callisto (*Met.* 2.423). The fact that *furtum* is now used of

⁸⁷⁰ Robinson (2011) 175 who also observes that Καλλιστώ ("the very beautiful") has now become *turpis* ("ugly").

⁸⁷¹ For the dual sense of *paelex* as both "rival" and "mistress" see Robinson (2011) 175. Johnson (1996) 16 emphasizes that "*paelex*, of course, is not the narrator's word, but Juno's, in 'deviant' free indirect style."

⁸⁷² Cf. *Met.* 2.480-81: *laudataque quondam ora Iovi* ("her face previously praised by Jove").

Arcas' birth in the *Fasti* after Juno has transformed Callisto into a bear speaks to the futility of its usage in the *Met.* as a way of keeping the affair hidden from Juno. Let us now examine how Ovid handles the transformation episode in the *Met.*

In the *Met.*, however, Ovid prefaces Juno's angry tirade with the reasons why she did not take action as soon as Callisto's pregnancy was revealed:

Senserat hoc olim magni matrona Tonantis
 distuleratque graves in idonea tempora poenas.
 causa morae nulla est, et iam puer Arcas (id ipsum
 indoluit Iuno) fuerat de paelice natus.
 quo simul obvertit saevam cum lumine mentem,
 'scilicet hoc etiam restabat, adultera' dixit,
 'ut fecunda fores, fieretque iniuria partu
 nota, Iovisque mei testatum dedecus esset.
 haud impune feres: adimam tibi namque figuram,
 qua tibi, quaque places nostro, inportuna, marito.'

The wife of the great thunderer had long ago sensed this, and she had put off the harsh punishment until a suitable time. There is no more cause for delay, and now the boy Arcas had been born from her rival (Juno raged at this very thing). As soon as she turned her savage mind and eyes to him, she said "Evidently this also was remaining, adulteress, that you become pregnant, that my injustice become known from your offspring, and that my Jove's shameful act be evident. You will absolutely not go unpunished: for I will strip you of your beauty, by which you please yourself and my husband, insolent girl."

(*Met.* 2.466-75)

Juno's description as *magni matrona Tonantis* is significant for several reasons. First, the word *matrona* often functions as a designated title for Juno, owing to her status as the matron par excellence.⁸⁷³ Therefore, the presence of *magni...Tonantis* and its sandwiching of *matrona* do

⁸⁷³ OLD s.v. 1b. See also Barchiesi (2005) 274 who emphasizes the solemnity of the expression *matrona Tonantis* and the possibility that it is intended to evoke "il tradizionale formulario 'sposa e sorella di Zeus'."

more than just signal Juno as the subject. The phrase *magni Tonantis* is used in the *Met.* only here and emphasizes the Augustan association with Jupiter and his gravity, embodied in the form of the thunderbolt.⁸⁷⁴ It also serves to tether Juno closely to her husband, enhancing her argument that rumor of Jupiter's infidelity will reflect negatively upon her. The reference to Callisto as a *paelex* mimics its appearance at *Fast.* 2.179, with the exception that in the *Met.* Callisto has not yet undergone her transformation. It becomes immediately apparent that Juno's dialogue is much longer in the *Met.* and far more personalized. She mentions her own injustice (*iniuria* 4.272) and the dishonor (*dedecus* 2.473) levied upon her by the actions of Jupiter,⁸⁷⁵ whom she calls "my Jove" (*Iovisque mei* 2.473) and "our/my husband" (*nostro...marito* 2.475).⁸⁷⁶ Further, although in both instances she is heavily critical of Callisto, in the *Met.* she exhibits the characteristics of a protective wife, almost as if she is trying to clean up Jupiter's mess. The verb *testatum...esset* (2.473) makes it clear that Juno does not want this information to become public knowledge. It is one thing to be aware of Jupiter's dalliances, but it is another thing entirely to flaunt those indiscretions to the outside world. In the *Fasti*, however, Juno directs her anger primarily against Jupiter, apostrophizing him and using Callisto's transformation in order to taunt him.

One other stark difference between the two accounts is that in the *Met.* Jupiter is responsible for catasterizing both Callisto and her son Arcas (*Met.* 2.505-07), whereas in the *Fasti* their joint catasterism is the product of an unspecified agent (*in superas raptus uterque*

⁸⁷⁴ See chapter 1 for Ovid's use of *matrona Tonantis* at *Fast.* 6.33.

⁸⁷⁵ It is interesting that Juno uses *dedecus* of Jupiter's shameful act instead of the *crimen* that the narrator uses both at *Met.* 2.462 and *Fast.* 2.162.

⁸⁷⁶ J.F. Miller has alerted me to the potential irony involved in referring to Jupiter as *nostro...marito*, such that the language could also be read as including Callisto.

domos: “both were whisked away to the homes above” *Fast.* 2.188).⁸⁷⁷ Hejduk remarks that *raptus* here is used in the dual sense that it often bears in relation to Ganymede, namely “ravished” and “snatched away.”⁸⁷⁸ This is especially interesting, considering the star-myth that immediately precedes that of Callisto addresses Ganymede in a way that alludes to Jupiter’s ravishing/snatching away of the young Trojan prince (*Fast.* 2.145-46).⁸⁷⁹ At the same time, their ascension into the heavens in the *Fasti* mimics Jupiter’s own return to the sky immediately after his rape of Callisto in the *Met.*: *superum petit aethera victor / Iuppiter* (“Jupiter the victor heads for the heaven above” *Met.* 2.437-38). Ovid seems to have deliberately left Jupiter’s actions in the *Fasti* vague, leaving only a few clues as to his involvement in the affair. We hear merely that Callisto derived her crime/pregnancy from Jupiter (2.162), that she could not resist Jupiter’s power (2.178), and that Jupiter had recently found her attractive (2.182). None of that information, of course, transcends the lengthy account of the events in the *Met.* In a way then Jupiter is once again the weather god, blowing in as a storm, impregnating Callisto, and vanishing altogether, while the remaining characters are left to wade through the debris left behind in his wake.

Much like the *Met.* (*intumuit Iuno* 2.508), the *Fasti*’s Callisto passage concludes with the admission that Juno still rages (*saevit adhuc...Saturnia* 2.191). This ongoing anger prompts Juno to take one final action against Callisto, who is now a constellation. Juno beseeches Tethys, the wife of Oceanus, to ensure that the bear constellation never sets in the ocean, thus remaining

⁸⁷⁷ Johnson (1996) 17-19 admits that Jupiter is almost certainly the agent of *raptus*, but entertains the possibility that Juno herself performed the catasterism in order to capture the “hellish eternal moment” of a son poised to murder his own mother.

⁸⁷⁸ Hejduk (2020) 177. See also Robinson (2011) 177.

⁸⁷⁹ See discussion above as well as in the previous chapter.

eternally visible in this grotesque pose.⁸⁸⁰ While the pair grant Juno her wish in the *Met.* (*di maris adnuerant* 2.531), in the customary fashion of the *Fasti*, the fulfillment of Juno's wish is there left unanswered. The addition, however, of *adhuc* (2.191) in the *Fasti* implies a longer duration for Juno's anger that may extend to Ovid's own time. On the one hand, *adhuc* merely indicates that Juno still harbors anger over the events that have transpired in the story. Robinson, however, acknowledges the possibility of a subversive political reading, in which the reader once again associates Juno with Livia, with *adhuc* indicating an ongoing issue of infidelity.⁸⁸¹ But the most interesting secondary resonance of *adhuc* concerns Ovid himself. For Hejduk, after examining the many Callisto references in Ovid's corpus, argues that Ovid himself gradually becomes the bear in his exile poetry through a number of personal connections to the Callisto story, such as his harsh treatment at the hands of Augustus/Jupiter, his enforced silence by being relegated to a non-Latin speaking region, and the "universal vision" that reluctantly fell to him as a result of his banishment.⁸⁸² One of the points she makes is that the *saeva adhuc* of *Fasti* 2.191 functions as a recapitulation of the *saeva Iuno* of *Aen.* 1.4, in that Callisto—and by extension Ovid—continue to bear the brunt of divine anger well after their catasterism/banishment, just as was the case for Vergil's Aeneas in the wake of his departure from a burned Troy. Yet, there is another reason why Juno may continue to rage into Ovid's own era. Recall that Robinson had put forth the argument that Ovid is following Horace by implying that temples require purification

⁸⁸⁰ It is interesting that Juno makes the request of Tethys rather than Oceanus. Perhaps the reason is that Tethys, as a female deity, is more apt to identify with Juno's plight than a male deity such as Oceanus. Vergil (*G.* 1.246) also attests to the fact that this constellation never sets: *Arctos Oceani metuentis aequore tingi* ("the bears that fear to be dipped in the water of the Ocean").

⁸⁸¹ Robinson (2011) 177-78.

⁸⁸² Hejduk (2020) 278-88.

by way of restoration.⁸⁸³ Thus if Juno's temple remained unrestored, it reasons that she would, in part, share the fate of Callisto's constellation by lacking purification.⁸⁸⁴ This, in turn, would make her plea to Tethys that Callisto remain unpurified quite ironic. Although the narrator is responsible for the heavily condensed description of Jupiter's actions, those actions nevertheless exert a powerful force from behind the scenes. Juno, on the other hand, (twice?) fails in her attempt at vengeance and in effect wishes the same penalty upon her foe as already exists for her temple.⁸⁸⁵

III. Jupiter and Juno on the Feralia

The Parentalia, which begins on February 18th is also a festival rooted in purification, concluding with the Feralia on Feb. 21st. A number of rituals are performed in order to ensure that the spirits of the dead are appeased. One of the more obscure rituals involves placating an infernal goddess known as *Tacita* (2.572) or *Muta* (2.583). The story Ovid tells regarding the origin of this deity once again brings up Jupiter's promiscuity. Unlike the previously discussed Callisto narrative, in this account the reader is not privy to Juno's response and Jupiter himself plays a much more prominent role. Even though Lara, the loose-lipped nymph, is the one who ultimately becomes associated with Tacita/Muta as a result of her tongue being ripped out by an irate Jupiter, narratively speaking, Juno can also be viewed as Tacita/Muta, since the narrator refuses to grant her a voice. In this episode, Juno is merely a by-stander whose only role is to facilitate the transition from Jupiter's speech to the nymphs to his subsequent punishment of Lara, thereby fulfilling the aetiology that Ovid has set out to explain. While in the Callisto

⁸⁸³ See n. 828 above.

⁸⁸⁴ If, indeed, we can equate the constellation's inability to touch the water with the act of purification (cf. O'Bryhim [1990]). But we must keep in mind that the theme of the month of February is purification (see Robinson [2011] 178).

⁸⁸⁵ Twice if she is the one who orchestrates the catasterism.

narrative Jupiter is portrayed as an aloof figure, solely responsible for Callisto's transgression (*de Iove crimen habet* 2.162), here in the Feralia he is portrayed somewhat sympathetically as a victim of his own excessive passion (*inmodico Iuturnae victus amore* 2.585).⁸⁸⁶ Indeed, later in book 4 when his sister Ceres appeals to him, requesting that he nullify the marriage of her daughter Proserpina who had been forcefully abducted by her uncle Pluto, Jupiter appears to use his own experience as a justification for rape: *Iuppiter hanc lenit, factumque excusat amore* ("Jupiter calms her and excuses the deed as a result of love" 4.597).⁸⁸⁷ His allegedly 'soothing' manner of speech recalls the passage in *Aeneid* 1 (1.254-96) where Jupiter calms (*serenat* 1.255) the concerns of his daughter Venus who worries that Aeneas will never fulfill his destiny. But rather than allaying Ceres' concerns, Jupiter proceeds to justify Pluto's actions on the grounds that Jupiter himself is no better than Pluto (*non ego nobilior* 4.599), eventually telling Ceres that her concerns are moot if Proserpina has broken her fast. Jupiter is able to talk to Ceres this way because, after all, she is a much different character than Juno and is perfectly content not to press charges against Pluto should she get her daughter back: *verum impune ferat, nos haec patiemur inultae* ("but let him go unpunished, I will suffer these things unavenged" *Fast.* 4.595).⁸⁸⁸ But Proserpina is destined to remain in the underworld for half the year, a sentence more lenient than that of Lara, who is destined to remain there forever.

⁸⁸⁶ The comic/mock-epic nature of this scene ought not be overlooked (see Murgatroyd [2005] 77-78), but it also borrows heavily from the image of the forlorn elegiac lover prevalent throughout the *Amores*.

⁸⁸⁷ Hejduk (2020) 266 speaks of a more egalitarian Jupiter than Ovid offers in the equivalent version of the *Met.* where he states, *non hoc iniuria factum, / verum amor est* ("This act is not one of wrongdoing, but rather one of love" *Met.* 5.525-26).

⁸⁸⁸ Compare this to Juno's desire for vengeance against Callisto in the *Met.*: *haud impune ferēs* ("You will absolutely not go unpunished" *Met.* 2.474).

Returning to the Feralia, when Jupiter is thwarted in his attempt to ravish the nymph Juturna, he is understandably upset. Yet his reaction to Lara's tattling is a far cry from the stately Jupiter of the *Aeneid*, who continuously exhibits a levelheaded disposition, even during the most trying of circumstances.⁸⁸⁹ At the same time, perhaps the least stately portrait of Jupiter in the *Aeneid* arises from his encounter with Juturna: *hunc illi rex aetheris altus honorem / Iuppiter erepta pro virginitate sacravit* ("The lofty king of the sky bestowed this honor upon her in exchange for her stolen virginity" *Aen.* 12.140-41). Thus, even in the world of Vergil's *Aeneid* where Jupiter is a constant reminder of the dutiful leader and the equanimous ruler, the Juturna incident portrays him at his most base, ravishing a young nymph and then elevating her in the celestial pecking order.⁸⁹⁰ Juno also plays a significant part in this *Aen.* episode, as the revelation regarding Juturna's rape and her current status as chief goddess of rivers occurs in the midst of Juno's address to her (12.134-41). Oddly enough, however, Juno does not hold Juturna's rape at the hands of Jupiter against her. On the contrary, Juno claims that of all the women/nymphs Jupiter slept with, Juturna is most dear to her: *scis ut te cunctis unam, quaecumque Latinae / magnanimi Iovis ingratum ascendere cubile, / praetulerim* ("You know that I have preferred you alone to all the Latin girls who have begrudgingly mounted the bed of great-hearted Jove" *Aen.* 12.143-45). This sort of positive treatment of a victim or would-be-victim of Jove may remind us of Apollonius, where Hera praises Thetis for her ability to resist Jove's advances (*Ap. Rhod.* 4.790-97). Vergil, however, goes a step beyond Apollonius by having Juno speak

⁸⁸⁹ Especially in his final conversation with Juno during which he gives in to all of her demands and appeases her (*Aen.* 12.829-40).

⁸⁹⁰ The circumstances of Juturna's rape and reward in the *Aen.* closely resembles those of Ganymede, who was likewise raped by Jupiter and rewarded both with catasterism and with the role of royal cup-bearer.

positively about a nymph who did actually lay with Jupiter.⁸⁹¹ Yet, he achieves this in a clever way, so as not to detract from the characterization of Juno that he has spent twelve books cultivating.⁸⁹² If we look closely, we see that Juno does not endorse Juturna's rape, but rather puts her first among a generally hated group. Tarrant reads *magnanimi Iovis* as likely sarcastic, owing in part to its juxtaposition with *ingratum* and the general clunkiness of the line.⁸⁹³ We can also perhaps see Ovid reworking this line at *Fast.* 1.650 (*sola toro magni digna reperta Iovis*). While all of these other women may have mounted Jove's bed reluctantly (*ingratum*), Livia was the one woman (*unam // sola*) who was worthy (*digna*) of Augustus' bed.⁸⁹⁴ Feigned concern is also indicative of Juno's character throughout the *Aeneid*, as she is prone to lying, cheating, and saying whatever she needs to in order to get what she wants.⁸⁹⁵ Thus, although Juno's behavior here in *Aen.* 12 may on the surface seem to speak to a more sympathetic characterization, it can just as easily be read as yet another example of realpolitik at the hands of a master manipulator.

Paul Murgatroyd reads Ovid's version of this episode as "an erotic and irreverent 'prequel' ... of the imposing and tragic helper of Turnus found in Virgil."⁸⁹⁶ Indeed, Ovid's story is in many ways the inverse of Vergil's. One key difference that Murgatroyd seems to leave out is the issue of focalization, with the *Fasti* episode being told through the eyes of Jupiter rather than Juno. This is an important distinction, especially in light of the recent Callisto narrative in which Jupiter lacked a voice of his own. Whereas in the *Aen.* Juturna was said to preside over

⁸⁹¹ Tarrant (2012) 128 emphasizes how unorthodox such an approach is for Juno: "Juno's tone is so different from her usual attitude toward Jupiter's mistresses that it begs for an explanation."

⁸⁹² Tarrant (2012) 125 draws attention to "Juno's duplicity in manipulating her [Juturna]."

⁸⁹³ Tarrant (2012) 128.

⁸⁹⁴ See the previous chapter for extensive discussion concerning this line.

⁸⁹⁵ Tarrant (2012) 125 notes, "Juno's feigned sympathy for Juturna quickly disappears when the latter's distress at the thought of Turnus' death threatens to hinder her plan."

⁸⁹⁶ Murgatroyd (2005) 89-90.

lakes and rivers (12.139-40), Ovid's narrative as a prequel of sorts describes a Juturna who does not yet rule over those realms, but rather "goes into hiding from a randy pursuer, lurking in thickets and water."⁸⁹⁷ In response to such elusive maneuvers, Jupiter gathers the troop of nymphs and explains to them that it would be profitable for Juturna "to join her limbs to the highest god" (*summo iungere membra deo* 2.592).⁸⁹⁸ The surrounding of Juturna's *membra* by *summo...deo* is perhaps meant to anticipate the sexual union that Jupiter believes is inevitable, but which in fact will not come to fruition—at least not within Ovid's universe.⁸⁹⁹ Jupiter then attempts to solicit the nymphs' compliance by stressing the twofold benefit of the situation: great pleasure for him (*mea magna voluptas* 2.593) and great utility for Juturna (*utilitas vestrae magna sororis* 2.594).⁹⁰⁰ The chiasmus of *magna voluptas, utilitas...magna* may further emphasize the quid pro quo mentality that Jupiter is here stressing. The repeated presence of *magna* also follows neatly after the *summo* of the previous line, all of which underscore the greatness of Jupiter, thus making his impending failure all the greater.⁹⁰¹ Finally, the precocious reader may connect this undefined *magna utilitas* with the rewards bestowed upon Juturna by Jupiter as described in *Aen.* 12, namely jurisdiction over lakes and rivers, creating a further connection with the Vergilian universe.

⁸⁹⁷ Murgatroyd (2005) 77. Such a description seems more fitting for Priapus and his attempts to rape Lotis at *Fast.* 1.391-440.

⁸⁹⁸ His gathering of nymphs (*convocat hic nymphas*) is no doubt a comic reformulation of the epic *concilium deorum*. There is an alternative manuscript tradition of *concubuisse* in place of *iungere membra* (see Robinson [2011] 382).

⁸⁹⁹ The act of "joining" something to *summo deo* may remind us of the Ides of January and the fact that Augustus' name was joined to that of *summus Iuppiter* in a different sense.

⁹⁰⁰ Just above Jupiter had made a similar point that it was in Juturna's best interests to capitulate to him: *vitatque quod expedit illi / vestra soror*: "Your sister avoids that which is expedient for her" (*Fast.* 2.591).

⁹⁰¹ Cf. *magnanimi Iovis* of *Aen.* 12.144.

An allusion to the potential purification of Juturna can also be found. When Jupiter gathers together the nymphs in the hope of catching Juturna and forcing her to sleep with him, he tells them to hold her on the river bank *ne sua flumine corpora mergat aqua* “lest she submerge her body in the water of the river” *Fast.* 2.596). If Juturna were able to submerge herself, she would escape Jupiter’s advances and remain pure, both literally and figuratively.⁹⁰² Thus in keeping with the theme of the month of February, the issue of purification is once again at hand. Jupiter wants to keep Juturna out of the water and thus unpurified in a way that loosely parallels Juno’s desire to keep Callisto’s constellation from setting in the water and thus allowing her to be purified.

Jupiter’s argument, although tenuous at best,⁹⁰³ proves successful and the nymphs nod their heads in assent (*adnuerant* 2.597). Earlier in the month of February, Jupiter himself is depicted as nodding assent in a more solemn context. On the Quirinalia (Feb. 17th) Mars pleads with Jupiter to deify Romulus and reunite him with his father and the response is *Iuppiter adnuerat* (2.489). There, Jupiter keeps his word and the ensuing passage is devoted to Romulus’ sudden disappearance amidst a thunderstorm (2.491-512). In the current passage, however, not all of the nymphs keep their word and Jupiter’s plan fails. Jupiter’s inability to successfully rape Juturna is contrasted with the subsequent display of his omnipotence and his harsh treatment of the traitor Lara. He who had a moment ago been portrayed somewhat sympathetically as a love-struck god—albeit still *summus deus*—now exercises his regal power and inflicts a severe penalty upon the nymph who wronged him.⁹⁰⁴ His reaction very much resembles that of Juno in the

⁹⁰² That is, her virginity would remain intact and the water would act as a cleansing agent.

⁹⁰³ Robinson (2011) 381 says of the speech, “Jupiter speaks like some disreputable orator, attempting to dress up the base nature of his request with cheap clichés.”

⁹⁰⁴ For the contrast between the whimsical attempted rape of Juturna and the grim punishment of Lara see Murgatroyd (2011) 76-77.

Callisto narrative. For just as Juno raged at the birth of the illegitimate son of Callisto earlier in book 2 (*furit Iuno* 2.177), so too does Jupiter lose his temper and swell up with rage here (*Iuppiter intumuit* 2.607).⁹⁰⁵ He decides that a fitting punishment for Lara is to rip out the instrument by which she betrayed him, namely her tongue. Yet the language and word order are crafted in such a way as to delay the true purpose of his actions until the latest possible moment: *quaque est non usa modeste / eripit huic linguam, Mercuriumque vocat* (“and that which she used without restraint, he removes from her, namely her tongue, and then he summons Mercury” 2.608-9). By delaying the actual punishment, Ovid makes it seem as if Jupiter may just snatch away Lara as he did Ganymede (*rapti Ganymedis*, *Aen.* 1.28), making her the latest victim of his ongoing amorous bender. Or perhaps we are meant to bring Juturna back into the equation and envision Jupiter snatching away Lara’s virginity as he did hers at *Aen.* 12.141 (*erepta pro virginitate*). Instead, Ovid proceeds to shock his reader by revealing that Jupiter did not rape Lara, as he is accustomed to do with other nymphs, but rather cut out her tongue. The phrase *non usa modeste* ought to be read in light of Jupiter’s infatuation with Juturna expressed as *inmodico Iuturnae victus amore* (2.585).⁹⁰⁶ Jupiter, who had just recently been seized by an unrestrained love for Juturna, is now punishing Lara for having an unrestrained mouth. The deliberate

⁹⁰⁵ In addition, Juno’s emotional state when she witnessed the catasterism of her rival Callisto in the *Met.* is couched in identical terms: *intumuit Iuno* (*Met.* 2.508). Further, the expression *intumuit Iuno* is used again by Ovid at *Fast.* 6.487 when Juno witnesses Ino rearing the baby Dionysus after the death of Semele (see below for a discussion of that episode).

⁹⁰⁶ Robinson (2011) 377 draws our attention to an additional parallel phrase illustrating Tereus’ passion for his sister-in-law Philomela in the *Met.*: *effreno captus amore* (“captured by an unbridled passion” *Met.* 6.465). This is especially relevant considering the similar elements shared by the two stories and the subsequent mention of Tereus as the type of person who should be excluded from the *Caristia* on account of being *impius* (*Fast.* 2.629). See also Feldherr (2010) 225-6.

placement of *vocat* two words after the word *linguam* rubs salt in the wound by drawing attention to Lara's now mute state.⁹⁰⁷

The Lara episode is not Ovid's only story involving the act of silencing in relation to Jupiter's promiscuity and Juno's awareness of that promiscuity. Although the story of Lara does not have a counterpart in Ovid's epic,⁹⁰⁸ the *Met.* does offer a useful comparison with its brief description of Echo and her punishment at the hands of Juno (*Met.* 3.359-69). Echo is similar to Lara in that both are nymphs who use their naturally endowed loquacity in an attempt to assist particular gods—Echo Jupiter and Lara Juno.⁹⁰⁹ The circumstances of the aid they attempt to provide, however, have been inverted. Lara blatantly disregards both Jupiter's mandate and her father's stern warning, alerting Juturna and informing Juno of her husband's intentions. Echo, on the other hand, serves as lookout for Jupiter while he engages in affairs with a variety of nymphs. Juno, ever suspicious of her husband's activities, decides to investigate and it is Echo's job to intercept her and delay her in a long conversation while the nymphs make their escape. Juno's response to Echo's treachery resembles Jupiter's response to Lara's treachery in the *Fasti*: *postquam hoc Saturnia sensit, / "huius" ait "linguae, qua sum delusa, potestas / parva tibi dabitur vocisque brevissimus usus"* ("After Juno realized this, she said 'I will grant you less power over this tongue of yours, by which I have been deluded, and the briefest ability of speech'" *Met.* 3.365-67). In both cases the deception of a nymph is discovered and punishment is immediately doled out. Even more telling is that both deities exact their punishment against the

⁹⁰⁷ See also Robinson (2011) 386 who mentions that some manuscripts have *monet* instead of the preferred *vocat*.

⁹⁰⁸ Ovid's *Fasti* is the sole extant account of Lara, her punishment, and her subsequent birthing of the *Lares*.

⁹⁰⁹ Robinson (2011) 385 calls Lara "the mirror image of Echo."

lingua of the perpetrator.⁹¹⁰ Clearly these two punishments are not equivalent, nor is the manner in which they are given. Jupiter's actions are coldly described by the narrator in a way reminiscent of his rape of Callisto earlier in the *Fasti*. Juno, however, takes it upon herself to speak directly to Echo and explain both the nature of and reason for her punishment, as she herself did to Callisto in the *Met*. In case the reader should be left uncertain as to whether or not Juno might actually deliver such a punishment, Ovid adds, *reque minas firmat* ("[Juno] backs up her threats with action" *Met*. 3.368). Neither Jupiter's punishment of Lara nor his subsequent orders to Mercury require any such qualification. While Echo is allowed to retain her status as a nymph as well as a more primitive version of her ability to speak, Lara is permanently silenced, banished, and subjected to brutal rape without any additional explanation. In a way then, Jupiter's punishment of Lara in the *Fasti* is much more severe than Juno's punishment of Echo in the *Met*.⁹¹¹

Considering the many shared elements between these two episodes, one could view them in tandem as a cross generic example of Jupiter and Juno engaging in counter-retaliations. Ovid has not only elegized the epic treatment of Echo and de-elegized the unparalleled story of Lara,⁹¹² but he has manufactured two disparate yet thematically-linked stories that pit Juno and Jupiter against one another, allowing each of the two to vent their anger upon a lower-level divinity. Echo's condition leads her to suffer further sorrows when she falls in love with

⁹¹⁰ Ov. *Fast*. 2.608: *linguam*; Ov. *Met*. 3.366: *linguae*.

⁹¹¹ A further connection between Lara and Echo is that Lara's original name was 'Lala' (*Fast*. 2.599-600), which itself constitutes an echo of the same syllable.

⁹¹² The preceding Juturna episode is very light in tone and has many comic and elegiac elements (see n. 886 above), making it much closer in tone to the Echo episode of the *Met*. The Lara story, however, is full of violence and macabre imagery, marking a noticeable change in tone (see Robinson [2011] 383).

Narcissus and is unable to convey her feelings. Similarly, Lara's condition prevents her from crying out and possibly avoiding rape at the hands of Mercury. The Echo episode also confirms that Juno does not require an informant. She is perfectly capable of detecting foul play and dispensing punishments on her own. In this light, Lara's actions, although arguably well-intentioned, are shown to be unwarranted. The similarity of punishments and the ease with which those punishments are inflicted underscore the inevitability of anguish for nymphs who involve themselves in the affairs of deities as powerful as Jupiter and Juno, regardless of whose side they take. For Jupiter, as much as Juno, is concerned with maintaining the status quo, even if that means doing so at the expense of the other's ally.⁹¹³

In the opening lines of the poem, Ovid pledges to tell of the risings and fallings of constellations (*lapsaque sub terras orta que signa canam* 1.2). As we have seen, many of these constellations are the result of catasterisms performed by Jupiter.⁹¹⁴ What we have in the episode of the Feralia is the inversion of that premise. Rather than elevating Lara to the stars like the dolphin and Callisto, Jupiter instead casts her down into the underworld where she is to become "a nymph, but a nymph of the infernal swamp" (*nympha, sed infernae nympha paludis* 2.610).⁹¹⁵ We can also read this as an inversion of Juturna's treatment in the *Aeneid*. There, she was rewarded with the honor of presiding over lakes and rivers (*stagnis...fluminibusque* 12.139) in exchange for Jupiter taking her virginity. Even Juno refers to her there in this capacity,

⁹¹³ It would be a stretch to call Echo's motives altruistic, but Lara certainly seems to have acted out of legitimate concern, as indicated above by the phrase *miserataque nuptas* (*Fast.* 2.605).

⁹¹⁴ In book 2 alone we have already seen Jupiter transform the dolphin that gave aid to Arion into a constellation (2.117-18) as well as Callisto and her son (2.188-90), if indeed Jupiter is the unspecified agent of that catasterism.

⁹¹⁵ The repetition of *nympha...nympha* further aligns Lara with Echo, who can only repeat what has already been said.

addressing Juturna as “honor of rivers” (*decus fluviorum* 12.142). Therefore, when Jupiter punishes Lara in the *Fasti* both for preventing his rape of Juturna and for going to Juno with this information, he punishes her in precisely the opposite way that he rewards Juturna in the *Aeneid*. Instead of becoming the chief nymph of lakes and rivers on earth, as Juturna does in this alternative tradition, Lara instead retains her status as a nymph and is relegated to the unpleasant realm of the underworld swamps.⁹¹⁶

In alerting Juturna of Jupiter’s plan, Lara not only refuses to heed the commands of Jupiter, but she also ostracizes herself from her fellow nymphs who do abide by Jupiter’s decree.⁹¹⁷ When Lara approaches *Iuturnae stagna sororis* (“the lake of her sister Juturna” 2.603), perhaps we are meant to think of the *stagnis* of *Aen.* 12.139 that Jupiter grants her in the aftermath of the rape. In addition, Ovid tells us that Lara *dicta refertque Iovis* (“returns the words of Jove” 2.604), which creates an additional connection with Echo, since Lara seems to merely regurgitate the words of Jupiter spoken above, as if she is echoing him. These actions alone would no doubt elicit a harsh response from omnipotent Jupiter, but Lara takes things a step further by going to Juno. Unsurprisingly, the queen of the gods—perhaps in no mood to reward such information—offers Lara no immunity from Jupiter’s retaliatory response.⁹¹⁸ Again, the *Aeneid*’s Juturna episode is at play, since there Juno not only takes mercy upon Juturna for sleeping with Jupiter, but holds her in high esteem—albeit with an ulterior motive for doing so.

⁹¹⁶ Robinson (2011) 387 sees Lara’s descent into the underworld as the ironic fulfillment of Juturna’s mournful wish at *Aen.* 12.877-84 that she herself go there in order to end her immortal existence and no longer grieve for her brother Turnus’ impending death.

⁹¹⁷ Chiu (2016) 128 n. 119 makes this point.

⁹¹⁸ Lara herself could have very well received punishment directly from Juno. This sort of shoot-the-messenger mentality was related immediately following the Callisto narrative in the *Met.* where the raven eagerly delivers bad news to Apollo, expecting a reward, and instead receives a punishment (*Met.* 2.534-632).

Here in the *Fasti* Lara, who has not slept with Jupiter and even prevented another nymph from sleeping with Jupiter, receives no special treatment from Juno. Instead, she is entirely at the mercy of a vengeful Jupiter. Not even Juturna, who exits the episode after her escape, comes to Lara's aid. In fact, the whole passage functions as a clear condemnation of Lara's actions. She acted incorrectly by disobeying Jupiter. She had been warned by her own father about this behavior (2.601-02), and despite that warning she went ahead and told not only Juturna, but Juno as well. The pretext the narrator provides for Lara going to Juno is that she "pitied brides" (*miserataque nuptas* 2.605). Whether or not Robinson is correct in saying that Lara feigns pity as a typical disseminator of gossip,⁹¹⁹ the phrase *miserata nuptas* may anticipate the words of Mars on the Matronalia at the beginning of book 3: *mater amat nuptas* ("my mother [Juno] loves brides" *Fast.* 3.251), making it appear that Lara is acting in accordance with Juno's wishes. Yet, Lara, who pities brides, comes with the news that Jupiter loves (*amat* 2.606) another, an inversion of the proper love between husband and wife that Juno is said to endorse on the Matronalia.⁹²⁰ Interestingly, *amat* will in fact be Lara's final word, as her punishment follows immediately and she is stripped of her ability to speak. There is a certain amount of irony in Lara's need to report this information to Juno, who, as other narratives have indicated, is generally aware of her husband's indiscretions without the presence of an informant.⁹²¹ And even if Lara really did pity brides, this is a very poor way of demonstrating that belief. Such blatant disregard for the delicate nature of the situation warrants a harsh response, and as Chiu observes,

⁹¹⁹ Robinson (2011) 385.

⁹²⁰ And as Chiu (2016) 129 n. 121 notes, "In all likelihood Juno's wrath would have been directed against Juturna not Jupiter, resulting in absolutely no gain for Lara."

⁹²¹ Such as with Callisto (2.177-80) and in book 5 with the birth of Athena (5.231-32).

“in the notion of discretion, self-policing, and self-censorship lies the clear implication that words spoken thoughtlessly can bring undesirable consequences.”⁹²²

Both Juno’s implicit and Lara’s forced silence attest to the ultimate superiority of Jupiter, who has the power not only to reward, but also to punish.⁹²³ The implications made by this episode regarding the rule of Augustus have been laid out in the previous chapter. I would add here that Ovid is clearly emphasizing male domination over the female. Both Jupiter and Mercury have their way with Lara,⁹²⁴ and despite the promising outcome vis-à-vis the birth of the Lares, who will act as protectors for Romans both privately and publicly, the method of their conception overshadows any shred of positivity. As for the way the events themselves transpire, the similarities between the Callisto narrative and the Feralia narrative are inescapable. In both cases Jupiter targets a nymph for the purpose of sexual gratification. In the case of Callisto, he succeeds, gets reprimanded by Juno, and rewards his female victim with catasterization. In the case of Juturna, he fails (temporarily at least if we factor in the events of *Aen.* 12), Juno becomes aware of his desires, and Jupiter punishes the nymph who twice wronged him, relegating her to the underworld in total silence. Both narratives showcase the wrath of Jupiter and Juno and the absence of pity or mercy. Beyond the scope of the punishment levied upon Callisto and Lara is the underlying possibility for purification. Juno concludes the Callisto narrative by appealing to Oceanus and Tethys, lest they allow Callisto’s constellation to set in the water and be purified.

⁹²² Chiu (2016) 128.

⁹²³ Feeney (1992) extrapolates from the Lara episode and views it as indicative of the rest of the *Fasti*, in that it exemplifies the triumph of the strong over the weak and the enforcement of silence by the former over the latter.

⁹²⁴ Littlewood (2006) 923 notes the irony of Jupiter being enraged at her chattiness and Mercury being smitten by her silence.

Jupiter goes a step further by banishing Lara to the nether regions where no form of purification exists.

IV. Jupiter, Juno, and Flora

Thus far we have discussed episodes in the *Fasti* that involve Jupiter and Juno alongside one another, either in the form of temples or as part of a narrative sequence. It is important to note, however, that the placement of episodes in the *Fasti* is no less significant than the content within those episodes.⁹²⁵ Further, just because references may be separated by days or even months does not mean that they cannot be read in light of one another or affect the reader's perception of what has come or what will come. Two episodes that occur on adjacent days and almost certainly interact with one other are the upbringing of Jupiter on the Kalends of May (5.111-128) and Juno's parthenogenetic birthing of Mars on the second of May (5.229-60). Further, each of these episodes activates associations with other mentions of Jupiter and Juno throughout the *Fasti*, thereby shedding more light on how Ovid plays the one against the other.

In the previous chapter we discussed the implications of beginning the Kalends of May with the phrase *ab Iove surgat opus* (5.111). There, the focus was on political ramifications and the connection of this passage to the subsequent treatment of Augustus and the Lares. Now it behooves us to discuss how this episode relates to Ovid's treatment of Jupiter and Juno. We find ourselves once again on the Kalends, the day sacred to Juno, yet the focus is squarely upon Jupiter. Our only epigraphic evidence for this day comes from the Fasti Esquilini and the Fasti Venusini, both highly fragmentary, noting that the day was devoted to the celebration of the Lares.⁹²⁶ Why then does the work arise from Jupiter? Pasco-Pranger connects the phrase *ab Iove* with several works of Hellenistic authors and cites Gee's conclusion that Roman poets "used it

⁹²⁵ As Barchiesi (1997a) continuously argues.

⁹²⁶ Degrassi (1963) 452.

particularly as an ‘Aratean signature’.”⁹²⁷ Yet, Pasco-Pranger also draws attention to its unique formulation with the inclusion of *opus* and its similarity to a Romulean expression at the end of *Fasti* 4, uttered as a prayer for the longevity of his future city: *auspicibus vobis, hoc mihi surgat opus, / longa sit huic aetas...* (“Let this work of mine rise under your auspices. Let it experience a long life...” 4.830).⁹²⁸ She goes on to stress the intentional similarity between the foundation of a city and the beginning of a poem. Yet, I believe one could take this a step further. The addressees of that prayer include the triad of Jupiter, Mars, and Vesta, without any mention of Juno: *condenti, Iuppiter, urbem, / et genitor Mavors Vestaque mater, ades* (“May you, Jupiter, be present for the founding of our city, along with father Mars and mother Vesta” 4.827-28). The inclusion of *Vestaque mater* alongside *Iuppiter* and *genitor Mavors* in Romulus’ prayer (4.827-28) not only replaces Juno as a member of the Capitoline triad, but also transfers her primary association with motherhood to the virgin goddess Vesta. For even though *mater* is an epithet that can be used for Vesta in relation to her role within the agricultural cycle, she is not a mother in the traditional sense.⁹²⁹ The reader may very well have expected *Iunoque mater*, especially considering that Mars himself had recognized Juno as his mother on the Matronalia (3.251), making her Romulus’ grandmother. Romulus’ apparent ignorance of this fact allows Ovid to ‘rewrite’ the prehistory of Rome on the Floralia by indicating that, while both Rome and his

⁹²⁷ Pasco-Pranger (2006) 80-81 n. 13.

⁹²⁸ Pasco-Pranger (2006) 80-81. A parallel also noted by Barchiesi (1997a) 69.

⁹²⁹ The phrase *genitor Mavors* no doubt signifies Mars as the father of Romulus, the one who is uttering the prayer, since *genitor* in the more general sense of “father of mankind” is normally reserved for Jupiter. In book 6 on the Vestalia Ovid stresses Juno’s status as a parent and Vesta’s virginity (6.285-88).

poetic *Fasti* both rise with Jupiter, Juno is also an essential component, without whom neither Rome nor the *Fasti* would exist.⁹³⁰

The phrase *ab Iove surgat opus* (5.111) also has other Roman literary parallels that shed some light on its appearance here on the Kalends of May. Ovid himself had employed similar language in the *Met.* when introducing the song of Orpheus: *ab Iove, Musa parens, (cedunt Iovis omnia regno) / carmina nostra move!* (“From Jove, mother Muse, (all things yield to the kingdom of Jove) begin my song” *Met.* 10.148-49). But as Ovid/Orpheus soon reveals, the subject matter is not Jupiter’s greatness nor the power of his thunderbolt, but rather his amorous trysts: *nunc opus est leviores lyra, puerosque canamus / dilectos superis* (“now there is need of a more tender lyre and I sing of boys loved by gods...” *Met.* 10.152-53). One of the episodes alluded to is Jupiter’s rape of Ganymede, which Orpheus immediately goes on to relate, along with Juno’s anticipated displeasure at her husband’s actions (*Met.* 10.155-61). The circumstances are thus vastly different from the birth and magisterial upbringing of the god that we witness on the Kalends of May.

We see another parallel in Damoetas’ invocation of Jupiter in Vergil’s third Eclogue: *ab Iove principium Musae: Iovis omnia plena* (“From Jupiter (derives) the beginning of the Muse; everything is full of Jupiter” *Verg. Ecl.* 3.60).⁹³¹ This line is nearly identical both in diction and meaning to *Met.* 10.148, with a similar focus on Jupiter as a god of origin and on his omnipotence. Yet, Hejduk draws our attention to the fact that *principium Musae*, in addition to meaning the beginning of the poem, reminds the reader of Jupiter’s role as the father of the

⁹³⁰ For the concept of ‘rewriting’ the origins of Rome see Barchiesi (1997a) 110-12.

⁹³¹ *Musae* here is sometimes taken as a vocative, as Servius himself notes (see Hejduk [2020] 43).

Muses, who were born to him not by Juno but by the goddess Mnemosyne.⁹³² Our phrase in the *Fasti*, though it lacks any mention of the Muses or parentage, has a surrounding context that puts great emphasis on childhood and birth, albeit Jupiter's own. Indeed, even the rising of the constellation Capella is couched in terms of a birth (*nascitur* 5.113). It reasons that there are multiple considerations for Ovid beginning the day with *ab Iove surgat opus* (5.111). It simultaneously heralds positive auspices, serves as an allusion to Aratus, engages with Juno's absence from Romulus' prayer in *Fasti* 4, reminds the reader of Jove's power and his dalliances, showcases the magnitude of Ovid's poetic endeavor, and anticipates succeeding episodes on the subject of birth.⁹³³ For surely it is not a coincidence that we hear about Jupiter's birth and his rise to greatness just before Ovid tells a similar story about Mars, albeit from the focal point of Juno and Flora.

On the next day, the Floralia arrives (or technically continues, as it began in April) and the goddess Flora becomes Ovid's new interlocutor. Her tone is very light and casual, befitting the nature of her festival that involves prostitutes and general merry-making. Soon after describing her transformation into the flower goddess and all of the new flowers she has created, Flora tells the story of how she assisted Juno in Mars' birth (5.229-60). Juno was upset that Jupiter had given birth to Minerva on his own, an event that can be traced back to the passage of Hesiod's *Theogony* discussed earlier in this chapter. Juno wishes to accomplish the same feat and Flora, who is initially reluctant to help, owing to fear of retaliation from Jupiter, eventually acquiesces when Juno promises to keep her involvement a secret. Being a goddess of flowers, Flora procures a particularly special flower, which, when touched by Juno, renders her

⁹³² Hejduk (2020) 44.

⁹³³ Boyd (2000) 75 points out that both the story of Jupiter's upbringing on Crete and the story of Juno giving birth without a male partner can be traced back to Hesiod.

immediately pregnant with Mars. The story ends with Mars acknowledging Flora's role in his birth and granting her a place in the future city of Rome.

The character of Flora actually shares much in common with that of Lara, whose story was told on the Feralia in February. Just as Lara is a nymph whose name underwent transformation from the Greek λαλεῖν ("to prattle"), so too was Flora formerly called by the Greek name Χλωρίς. Their stories are unique to the *Fasti* and both offer assistance to Juno upon learning of the ways in which Jupiter has wronged her.⁹³⁴ The primary difference is that Lara deliberately disobeys Jupiter and reports information to Juno that will cause her further pain, while Juno herself actively seeks out Flora (*restitit ad nostras...fores* 5.234) and ultimately benefits from Flora's expertise. Flora's behavior is such that she seems aware of the dire consequences suffered earlier by Lara at the hands of an angry Jupiter. This is especially true given the language Ovid uses. For Flora says *ter volui promittere opem, ter lingua retenta est; / ira Iovis magni causa timoris erat* ("Thrice I wanted to promise help, but thrice I held back my tongue; the anger of great Jove was the cause of my fear" 5.247-8). The fact that Flora initially "held back her tongue" can be read as a direct consequence of Lara losing her tongue after using it immoderately (*non usa modeste* 2.608).⁹³⁵ Such an interpretation is further enhanced by the fact that Flora immediately cites Jupiter's wrath as the reason for her fear, the very thing we witnessed immediately before he cuts out Lara's tongue (*Iuppiter intumuit* 2.607).

The Callisto narrative too bears much in common with Flora's account of the birth of Mars. Recall Juno's anger upon learning about the illegitimate birth of Callisto's son Arcas by Jupiter (2.175-192). The tale of Mars' birth stems from Juno's anger at a similarly unplanned and

⁹³⁴ Lara's motives are, of course, questionable (see discussion above).

⁹³⁵ Lara's father even instructs her to hold her tongue (*tene linguam* 2.602), which is precisely the language that Flora uses here (*lingua retenta est*).

even more unorthodox birth, namely that of Minerva from Jupiter. In telling of Mars' birth and her own role in it, Flora essentially validates her place within the Roman calendar. Yet, she does so admittedly at the risk of angering Jupiter: *Mars quoque, si nescis, per nostras editus artes: / Iuppiter hoc, ut adhuc, nesciat usque, precor* ("Mars also, if you don't know, was born by my arts; I pray that Jupiter still remains ignorant of this, up to the present" 5.229-30). While Flora is addressing Ovid, to whom *si nescis* is directed, she also wishes that Jupiter continue to remain ignorant (*nesciat*) of this very same information, an impossibility, as we saw with his immediate knowledge of Lara's actions on the Feralia.⁹³⁶ Ironically *editus* here carries both the primary meaning of "being born,"⁹³⁷ but also the secondary meaning of "be made known/declare."⁹³⁸ While Flora tells a potentially ignorant Ovid that Mars was long ago born through her arts, Mars himself is essentially being born again through the art of Flora's words, as his story is being told for the very first time—at least for Ovid and the reader.⁹³⁹ Lastly, the presence of *ut adhuc* may remind the reader of Juno who *saevit adhuc* (2.191), even after Callisto and her son became constellations.⁹⁴⁰ This speaks to the ineffectual nature of the passage of time on the emotional status of Jupiter and Juno. The implication is that Jupiter would still be upset if he heard this story all these years later. The same phenomenon is apparent in book 6 when Juno cites a list of

⁹³⁶ Murgatroyd (2005) 52 views Flora's fear as feigned, perhaps in a similar manner to Lara's concern for Juno on the Feralia. He comments, "if Flora was really so frightened of retribution, why would she tell the story to Ovid for him to make it public?"

⁹³⁷ *OLD* s.v. *edo* 2.

⁹³⁸ *OLD* s.v. *edo* 7.

⁹³⁹ For a similar interpretation see Boyd (2000) 77.

⁹⁴⁰ It is perhaps no coincidence that Juno makes her request regarding the purification of Callisto's constellation to Tethys and Oceanus (although Oceanus is left out of the *Fasti* version) and is once again seeking out Oceanus for aid (5.233) when Flora encounters her. Hera is first shown seeking help from the pair in Homer (*Il.* 14.198-210).

prior grievances that she has tried to put behind her, yet which she still remembers (6.41-48). Time may pass for the reader and for Rome itself, but Rome's gods remain timeless.

Flora's account of how Mars was conceived by Juno alone is without parallel in antiquity, yet is strongly reminiscent of the Hesiodic tradition that Hera begot Hephaestus in the same fashion.⁹⁴¹ It follows that Ovid here is deliberately bending the traditional mythology in order to suit his poetic purpose, for a story about Flora aiding Juno in the parthenogenetic birth of Vulcan would have no connection to Rome or the calendar.⁹⁴² Instead, Ovid takes poetic license to tell a story never told before—or at least one that has not found its way into extant compendia of ancient myths. The beginning of the story treads upon familiar ground. Juno is upset by the actions of her husband, but not in the traditional sense. Her anger stems not from Jupiter's typical pursuit of another love interest or from the child that he has produced, but from the fact that he has produced a child alone, thus depriving her of her maternal role and her affiliation with motherhood: *sancta Iovem Iuno nata sine matre Minerva / officio doluit non eguisse suo* ("When Minerva was born without a mother, holy Juno lamented the fact that Jove did not need her service" 5.231-2).⁹⁴³ On the Ides of January Ovid has the Roman senators equate august things with sacred things (*sancta vocant augusta patres* 1.609) and in February he twice uses the word *sanctus* of Augustus (*templorum sancte repositus* 2.63 and *sancte pater*

⁹⁴¹ Hes. *Theog.* 927: οὐ φιλότῃτι μιγείσα.

⁹⁴² Newlands (1995) 105 n. 73 points out that Vulcan may have been an important figure for the month of May. She argues that he has been suppressed both in this instance and especially on the first of May when Maia would have received an offering from the *flamen Volcanalis*. This may be true, but Juno is much more prominently associated with the Kalends of each month, as shown elsewhere in Ovid's *Fasti*, and the replacing of Hephaestus/Vulcan with Ares/Mars here on the Floralia appears to be more of a practical decision than an intentional suppression of Vulcan.

⁹⁴³ Flora's detail that Minerva was born *sine matre* echoes Hesiod's *Theogony* which initially says that Zeus himself (αὐτὸς *Theog.* 924) begot Athena, before bringing Metis into the mix.

patriae 2.127). This instance, however, is the only time in the *Fasti* that it applies to Juno.⁹⁴⁴ Yet, at the same time, the name of Jupiter separates Juno from the adjective, which is quite fitting, considering Jupiter's actions have once again put Juno at a disadvantage. It is interesting that Flora focuses not on the fact that Minerva was born solely from Jupiter, but rather that she was born without a mother (*sine matre* 5.231).⁹⁴⁵ The meaning of *officium* in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* that most closely matches our usage here is defined as "what one has to do to fulfil one's role, a person's function or job."⁹⁴⁶ An even more fitting definition is culled from Seneca the Younger's *de beneficiis*, where he defines *officium* as that which is "characteristic of a son, or a wife, or those roles, which kinship stirs up and compels them to bear aid."⁹⁴⁷ The precise meaning of *officium* here must be the traditional primary duty of a wife to a husband, namely to bear his children.

In phrasing her dilemma, Juno reiterates that motherhood and its accompanying significance have been usurped by Jupiter: *si pater est factus neglecto coniugis usu / Iuppiter, et solus nomen utrumque tenet, / cur ego desperem fieri sine coniuge mater, / et parere intacto, dummodo casta, viro?* ("If Jupiter has become a father without the aid of a wife, and alone holds both names, why then should I refrain from becoming a mother without a husband, and from

⁹⁴⁴ *Sanctus* elsewhere in the *Fasti* only modifies the deity Terminus (*Terminē sancte* 2.658) and is otherwise most often used as a reference to sacred flames (*sanctos...focos* 4.296 and *sancti...ignes* 6.339). Some perhaps may read *sancta* here as mock-reverential, owing to Juno's previous vindictive behavior.

⁹⁴⁵ Just below Juno will stress both issues, with *neglecto coniugis usu* (5.239) referring her deprived role and *solus nomen utrumque tenet* (5.240) referring to Jupiter's double roles.

⁹⁴⁶ *OLD* s.v. 4a.

⁹⁴⁷ Sen. *Ben.* 3.18.1: *officium esse filii, uxoris, earum personarum, quas necessitudo suscitāt et ferre opem iubet.*

giving birth untouched by man, provided that I remain chaste” 5.239-42).⁹⁴⁸ The act of being a mother not only relates to Juno, the goddess of motherhood, but extends to Flora herself,⁹⁴⁹ whom Ovid introduces as *mater...florum* (“mother of flowers” 5.183), thus making her more sympathetic to Juno’s plight, despite the fact that none of the mythology concerning Flora ever speaks of her as having actual children.⁹⁵⁰ This is not the first time in the *Fasti* that Juno has become upset as result of being deprived of the role of mother to Jupiter’s child. In the Callisto episode Juno’s anger is the immediate effect of learning that Callisto has become a mother: *quae fuerat virgo credita, mater erat; / laesa furit Iuno* (“She who had been believed to be a virgin was a mother; a wounded Juno rages” 2.176-77).⁹⁵¹ The meaning of *laedo* here goes beyond the general definition of “injure” or “vex” and should be construed more specifically as “harm done to one’s interests or reputation.”⁹⁵² That is why in the Flora passage Juno is so insistent on becoming a sole parent while remaining chaste (*dummodo casta* 5.242). This persona of Juno is in keeping with her epithet Lucina, goddess of childbirth, introduced initially as an independent deity (2.449-52), but then associated directly with Juno at the conclusion of the celebration of the

⁹⁴⁸ Note the careful balance between the beginning of the first hexameter (*si pater*) and the end of the second hexameter (*mater*) as well as the juxtaposition of paradoxical terminology.

⁹⁴⁹ The irony should not be lost that Mars’ two mothers represent opposite ends of the Roman social spectrum, with Juno as the stately matron and Flora as a fun-loving free spirit.

⁹⁵⁰ Pasco-Pranger (2006) 168 also connects this focus on motherhood in the Flora episode to the prevalence of that theme in book 4, noting especially the introduction of Venus at the book’s very beginning where she called *alma...geminorum mater amorum* (“kindly mother of twin loves” 4.1). Another prominent maternal figure in book 4 who mourns the loss of her child is Ceres, called *maesta parens* (4.610).

⁹⁵¹ Robinson (2010) 112 n. 77 sees Juno’s anger at Callisto’s motherhood as also influencing her role as Juno Lucina at 2.449-52.

⁹⁵² *OLD* s.v. 3c.

Matronalia (3.253-58).⁹⁵³ Here, however, Ovid presents us with the anthropomorphic Juno Lucina who takes actions that have a palpable effect on the future of Rome and thus also on the Roman calendar. Her solution is to instigate a gender reversal of sorts and to adopt the role of *pater*, much as Jupiter had adopted the role of *mater* in the birth of Minerva.⁹⁵⁴ And in order to achieve this goal, Juno is willing to go to any lengths and to try *omnia...medicamina* (“any drug” 5.243),⁹⁵⁵ provided that she not sacrifice her chastity. In her complaint we can detect vestiges of other versions of Jupiter, beyond that of the philanderer who is typically associated with illegitimate birth. The emphasis on him as *pater* with the enjambment of his formal name reminds the reader of the *pater patriae* passage on the Nones of February (2.131-32), the only other passage in the *Fasti* that explicitly mentions Jupiter’s role as a father.⁹⁵⁶ Further, the mention that Jupiter alone holds both names (*solus nomen utrumque tenet*) may remind the reader of the Ides of January where Augustus alone is said to share his name with greatest Jupiter (1.609), endowing him with a different sort of duality, namely that of a human and a divine figure.

As much as this story serves as a way of explaining Flora’s connection to Rome through one of its primary tutelary deities, it can also be read as a reaction of Juno to her absence on the

⁹⁵³ And reinforced in the proem of book 6 (6.39).

⁹⁵⁴ Reminiscent also of Jupiter’s role as mother in the birth of Bacchus from his thigh, which Ovid alludes to earlier in the *Fasti*: *nec, puer ut posses maturo tempore nasci, / expletum patrio corpore matris opus* (“Nor [will I pass over] how you [Bacchus] were able to be born as a boy at the proper time, the work of a mother filled by the body of the father.” 3.717-18).

⁹⁵⁵ Perhaps just the sort of thing that the goddess of flowers and herbs might prescribe.

⁹⁵⁶ A frequent occurrence in Vergil’s *Aeneid*. His paternal role is mentioned four times in the *Fasti* with other modes of expression: with Hercules (*Iove natus* 1.559), Mercury (*edidit Arcadiis Pleias una Iovi* 5.664), Bacchus (*patria raptus ab igne manu* 3.504), and Apollo (*parenti* 6.761). Although Jupiter is clearly also the father of Arcas, no explicit mention is made of his fatherhood, apart from the act of catasterizing him to prevent him from killing his mother.

Kalends of May, which is instead devoted to an *aetion* of the star *Capella*, alongside the story of Jupiter's upbringing on the Crete. We have already discussed the implications of beginning the Kalends of May with the programmatic statement, *ab Iove surgat opus* (5.111). Yet, there are several similarities between the story of Jupiter's rearing and that of the birth of Mars on the next day. For example, the *medicamina* (5.243) Juno seeks closely resembles the cornucopia, described as filled *recentibus herbis* ("with fresh herbs" 5.123), given to baby Jupiter by the naiad Amalthea, whose role as a *nutrix* (5.120) evokes Juno's association with motherhood. Moreover, the goat whose horn becomes the cornucopia is called Olenian (*Oleniae...Capellae* 5.113), while the flower that Flora gives to Juno is said to come from the fields of Olenus (*Oleniis...ab arvis* 5.251).⁹⁵⁷ Even though these two Olenian references likely refer to two separate things,⁹⁵⁸ Ovid has fashioned Juno's revenge such that it mimics the language of the *aetion* for Jupiter's upbringing on the Kalends. This connection provides Juno with even more incentive for undertaking the parthenogenetic birth. By doing so, she can make her belated mark on her sacred day, while at the same time reestablish her association with motherhood. Thus Juno's desire to reclaim her motherly status and become the sole parent of Mars extends beyond the immediate context of the birth of Minerva, granting her a permanent position in the pantheon of Roman deities and securing her equal footing with Jupiter, from whom both the Roman calendar and the city of Rome are said to rise.

⁹⁵⁷ A feature also observed by Boyd (2000) 77-78 who at n. 48 lists other occurrences of the word in Ovid, of which there are only two: *Met.* 3.594 and *Her.* 18.188.

⁹⁵⁸ The first being a reference to Olenus, the son of Hephaestus whose daughters, according to Hyginus (*Astr.* 2.13) nursed the infant Zeus, while the second probably refers to the town of Olenus in Achaea, named after the son of Zeus and Anaxithea and known for having a sanctuary dedicated to the healing god Aesculapius (see Bömer [1958] 308).

The method Juno uses in order to procure Flora's aid is quite different from her typical coercive techniques. At the moment when Juno first arrives at Flora's door, Flora tells us that she was *fessa labore* ("tired as a result of her labor" 5.234). In light of what Flora has already told both Ovid and the reader, one could also read this phrase as Juno being "tired as a result of her search to be in labor,"⁹⁵⁹ which, after all, is the reason she is seeking Flora's help. After Flora attempts to allay Juno's concerns with friendly words (*verbis...amicis*), Juno, summarily dismisses the gesture, claiming that words will not solve her problem: '*non*' inquit '*verbis cura levanda mea est*' ("My pain', she says, 'cannot be lightened by words'" 5.238). Although the *cura* here primarily refers to Juno's predicament, as it relates to Jupiter's sole birthing of Minerva and her desire to give birth without a male figure, it may also harken back to the initial explanation of sacred days laid out by Ovid in book 1: *vindicat Ausonias Iunonis cura Kalendas* (1.55). In that sense, Jupiter has both usurped Juno's role as mother of his children and her rightful position on the Kalends of the month. But Juno's response to Flora's unhelpful words are words themselves, intended to make the pliable deity sympathetic to her cause. This presents us with a new side to Juno, emphasizing her role as a persuader and foreshadowing the speech she will give in the proem of book 6. We are told that Juno is in the midst of outlining her case when Flora expresses a look of doubt: *vox erat in cursu: voltum dubitantis habebam* ("As she [Juno] continued to speak, my [Flora's] expression was showing my uncertainty" 5.245). Juno picks up on this look and preemptively asks Flora if she has any solution: '*nescioquid, nymphe, posse videris*' ait ("You seem, nymph, to be able to do something [for me]" 5.246). By addressing Flora as a nymph rather than a goddess, Juno reminds her of the magnitude of her own divinity. The term *nymphe* again reminds us of both Callisto and Lara, two nymphs who contributed to

⁹⁵⁹ See *OLD* s.v. *labor*² 6b.

Juno's suffering. One interpretation is to see Juno trying to override those negative situations, both of which involved Jupiter, by herself benefitting from the actions of a nymph, albeit in a different way than as her husband benefitted. Yet, as we discussed above, Flora is hesitant and admits that her reluctance to help stems from her fear of reprisal at the hands of Jupiter—a legitimate fear in the wake of the episodes we have discussed thus far.⁹⁶⁰ Juno then sets her mind at ease by promising to keep Flora's role a secret (5.248-49). Such a promise is hardly realistic, considering Jupiter's omniscience, evidenced earlier by his immediate awareness of Lara's treachery (2.607).⁹⁶¹ Yet, the fact that Juno begs Flora for help (*precor* 5.249) and even swears an oath on the river Styx to keep silent (*Stygiae numen testificatur aquae* 5.250) is enough to convince Flora to offer her services.⁹⁶² The success Juno achieves here marks a change in her methodology and prepares us for the longer rhetorical battle in the proem of book 6 where Juno will compete in a rhetorical battle against Juventas and Concordia over the etymology of June. There, however, the outcome is far more ambivalent and ultimately not in her favor.

It is worth exploring Newlands' point that this unorthodox story of Mars' birth at the hands of two females "destabilizes the Romans' strong sense of their masculine identity,"⁹⁶³ which is wrapped up in the art of war. That Juno seeks to give birth to Mars without the aid of a male figure is strange enough, but to insert another female figure into the mix gives the reader pause. Not only does this myth create a parallel universe in which Juno becomes the primary genitor of the Roman race, but it also makes Flora its co-parent. The contemporary celebration of

⁹⁶⁰ See above for the connections of these lines with the Lara episode.

⁹⁶¹ Chiu (2016) 158-72 argues for a reading that signals the elegiac disarmament of Jupiter, reducing his epic grandeur.

⁹⁶² Swearing on the river Styx is the most solemn oath a god can give (cf. *Aen.* 12.816-17, where Jupiter swears on the river Styx and explains its significance).

⁹⁶³ Newlands (1995) 106.

her festival may be characterized by lewd and lascivious acts, as Ovid notes, but the goddess herself displays an acute concern for the well-being of her domain and only reluctantly neglects her duties when her festival is threatened (5.312-30). The fact that she concerns herself with “scattering new seeds across countless nations” (*prima per immensas sparsi nova semina gentes* 5.221), and that without her attention, olives, crops, and vines all wither (5.321-24), points to her close connection with fertility and motherhood. She represents the kinder, more gentle side of motherhood, while Juno embodies the more stern and matronly side. Indeed, we have seen the extent of Juno’s wrath and her general lack of sympathy, even for innocent victims, such as Callisto. On the contrary, Flora is portrayed as a sympathetic deity, who does not want to cause any harm: *nec volui fieri nec sum crudelis in ira* (“I did not want these (bad things) to happen nor am I cruel in my wrath” 5.325). Together they form an attractive alternative to the brusque force often exhibited by Jupiter throughout the *Fasti*.⁹⁶⁴ In this way they share the title of *mater* over Mars and, by extension, over Rome itself, each contributing their own aspects of motherhood without the need for any male figure, let alone Jupiter.⁹⁶⁵

⁹⁶⁴ Both in terms of his frequent use of the thunderbolt and the punishments levied upon his victims, several of whom are clearly undeserving of such treatment. The use of the delicate flower to solve Juno’s problem is thus set in contrast with the much more standard symbol of Jupiter’s power vis-à-vis the thunderbolt.

⁹⁶⁵ Their relationship can be likened to that of Ceres and Tellus, who as two female deities are called *matres frugum* (“mothers of crops” *Fast.* 1.671). Ovid describes them as partners in labor: *officium commune Ceres et Terra tuentur; / haec praebet causam frugibus, illa locum* (“Ceres and Terra share a common duty; the former provides the cause for crops, while the latter provides the location” *Fast.* 1.673-74). So too does Flora supply the *causa* for the birth of Mars vis-à-vis the *flos*, while Juno supplies the *locum*, her womb.

V. Looking Forward to June

At the conclusion of book 5 Ovid heralds the coming of the month of June by referencing the rise of the constellation Aquila, which he describes as “the beak of the tawny bird pleasing to Jove” (*grata Iovi fulvae rostra...avis* 5.732). Although this may appear to be an innocuous reference, it can be construed as foreshadowing Jupiter’s prevalence in the following a month, a month which Juno claims belongs to her. As it happens, the presence of the constellation occurs again at the end of the Kalends of June (6.195-96), a few lines after the consecration of the temple of Juno Moneta, which, as we shall, see focuses more on Jupiter than Juno. In addition, we must consider this reference in relation to the Aquarius couplets found in books 1 (1.651-52) and 2 (2.145-46), whose political resonances were discussed in the previous chapter. After all, the eagle is the very animal that Zeus transformed into when he ravished the Trojan prince Ganymede, the symbol for Aquarius. On the one hand, the mention of the rise of Aquila on May 25th is in keeping with the traditional timing for the astrological sign; nor is its placement adjacent to any other episode involving Jupiter, as was the case for both aforementioned Aquarius couplets. On the other hand, it does serve as a fulcrum of sorts between books 5 and 6, is set to reappear on a day celebrating another of Juno’s temples, and may even put Jove the adulterer back in the minds of the reader at the moment before Juno pleads her case.

Book 6 of the *Fasti* is arguably the most interesting for the treatment of Jupiter and Juno in the work at large. For one, the month itself may derive its name from Juno,⁹⁶⁶ an argument waged vociferously by Juno herself in the book’s opening lines (6.21-64). Yet, despite being the only legitimate contender for the month’s true etymology—for surely neither Juventas nor

⁹⁶⁶ See n. 265 above.

Concordia are responsible for the month's name—⁹⁶⁷ Ovid as arbiter refuses to grant her that privilege. Instead, as is often the case with competing aetiologies in the *Fasti*, Ovid opts to leave the matter open to the reader.⁹⁶⁸ That decision, however, has ramifications for the rest of the book and does more than simply deny Juno the month of June. I aim to show that the proem has the effect of marginalizing Juno's Romanness in subsequent episodes to the extent that Ovid steers the reader away from identifying Juno as a Roman cult deity and instead emphasizes her association with the Greek goddess Hera or with the antagonistic Juno of the *Aeneid*.

Christopher Nappa recently made the argument that Ovid's refusal to endorse an etymology for June in the proem of book 6 can be viewed as a refusal to endorse the foundational history of Rome and thus foreshadows the abrupt end of his poetic calendar before it enters the imperial months named for Julius Caesar and Augustus.⁹⁶⁹ For Nappa, Ovid's uncertainty regarding June's true etymology is a reflection of Ovid's view of the "unstable nature of certainty in Augustus' Rome."⁹⁷⁰ My argument targets Ovid's specific denial of Juno's preferred etymology and the effect that Ovid's non-decision has on Juno's subsequent representation.⁹⁷¹ For Ovid's dismissal gives her cause to rekindle her hatred for Rome and Rome's ancestors, a threat she verbalizes in her speech (6.41-50). Juno, who in the previous

⁹⁶⁷ See n. 267 above for Ovid as the first to propose a connection between the month's name and the goddess Juventas. Concordia claims the month through her connection with the Latin *iungo*, which is not etymologically linked to her name in any way.

⁹⁶⁸ A few prominent cases of this include the etymology of the month of May debated by the Muses in the proem of book 5 and the etymology of the Agonalia on Jan. 9th, which he derives either from *agatne* (1.323), *agantur* (1.324), *Agnalia* (1.325), the Greek ἀγών (1.329-30), or *agonia* (1.331).

⁹⁶⁹ Nappa (2020).

⁹⁷⁰ Nappa (2020) 440.

⁹⁷¹ Boyd (2000) 64 argues that the disharmony of the Muses in the proem of *Fasti* 5 has similar ramifications for "the character and shape of the stories narrated in the remainder of *Fasti* 5."

book was shown embracing her affinity with Rome by giving birth to Mars and receiving her place within the Roman pantheon (5.259-60), is ultimately denied her place in the Roman calendar with Ovid's non-decision. Beyond the proem, Juno is mentioned only three other times throughout the month of June, none of which bolster her role as a Roman deity. Further, as we shall see, she is entirely absent from the episode recounting the Gallic sack of Rome, the only major Roman deity so neglected. The role of savior played by Juno's sacred Geese in Livy's account of this episode (5.47) is replaced in Ovid by the obscure story of Jupiter Pistor. In addition, the only extended episode in book 6 involving Juno falls on the Matralia, where she is depicted as a vengeful goddess, futilely attempting to punish two future Roman deities. By the end of the work, any trace of the Roman Juno has vanished and we are left merely with the vestiges of a defeated and recalcitrant Juno who has no voice of her own.

On the contrary, we shed nearly all images of Jove the philanderer and instead view him as a purely Roman god. Beyond the many Roman aspects of his domain cited by Juno in the proem, we are witness to his role as a helper in the aforementioned episode of the Gallic siege of the Capitoline hill. There, in the manner of the Vergilian Jupiter, he summons a council whose directive is to find a way to extricate Rome from a precarious situation. The solution, namely throwing bread at the enemy, is no doubt intended to be comic, but the episode also has an epic ring to it with Jupiter behaving magnanimously and providing much needed aid to his people. Ovid also informs the reader of the dedication of two separate temples to Jupiter, that of Jupiter Invictus on the Ides (6.549-50), the day sacred to Jupiter, and that of Jupiter Stator on the 27th (6.793-94). In both the *Fasti Venusini* and the *Fasti Tusculani* the Ides of June are marked for Jupiter,⁹⁷² a familiar occurrence, given that all the Ides were sacred to Jupiter. No mention is

⁹⁷² Degrassi (1963) 470.

made, however, of a temple dedication and Degrassi believes that Ovid may have conflated the dedication of this temple with that of Jupiter Victor on the Ides of April.⁹⁷³ Nevertheless the title *Invictus* evokes the unconquerability of the Romans in a month that is teeming with military victories.⁹⁷⁴ Further, the title offers a correction from the Feralia episode where Jupiter was said to be *inmodico Iuturnae victus amore* (“conquered by an immoderate love for Juturna” 2.585). There, his elegiac persona was highlighted, but on the Ides of June the mention of him as *Invictus* shows him as a stately figure to be contrasted with the subsequent description of the Lesser Quinquatrus, a festival rife with frivolity and flute-playing. Mention of the temple of Jupiter Stator on June 27th, alongside its original dedication by Romulus, evokes the role played by Jupiter in the legendary battle of the Lacus Curtius, the final conflict between the Romans and the Sabines.⁹⁷⁵ This takes us back to the role Juno played in aiding Titus Tatius and the Sabines, as they attempted to infiltrate Rome by passing through the gates of Janus (1.260-76). Fulfilling the opposite role that Juno held in book 1, Jupiter Stator is invoked by Romulus, and the Romans then stand their ground and win a great victory. The mention of Romulus here is significant as the temple was not actually built until 294 B.C. by Marcus Atilius Regulus.⁹⁷⁶ This harkens the reader back to that first episode in book 1 and activates a dichotomy between the anti-Roman Juno there and the pro-Roman Jupiter here. Barchiesi, Littlewood and Hejduk all interpret the adjacent mention of the Lares shrine “replete with garlands from a learned hand” (*docta multa*

⁹⁷³ Degrassi (1963) 471.

⁹⁷⁴ See Littlewood (2006) lv.

⁹⁷⁵ The story is told by Livy at 1.12.3-6

⁹⁷⁶ See Littlewood (2006) 228.

corona manu 6.792) as heralding the poem's grandiloquent conclusion, yet another testament to the distinctly Roman association of Jupiter in book 6.⁹⁷⁷

VI. Jupiter from the Perspective of Juno

Let us look now at how Ovid transitions into the contest between Juno, Juventas, and Concordia at the beginning of June. As one might expect from the poet who consistently defies expectations, Ovid the narrator begins not by revealing the deities involved in the contest, but rather the goddesses that are not. First, he confesses that they are not the Muses that appeared to Hesiod (6.13-14)—perhaps a reminder to the reader that three of the Muses had already engaged in a similar contest at the beginning of May (5.7-106). He then states that they are also not “those that the son of Priam judged in the valleys of watery Ida” (*nec quas Priamides in aquosae vallibus Idae / contulit* 6.15-6). That is, they are not Venus, Minerva, and Juno. Yet no sooner has Ovid made this statement than he corrects himself, confessing that one of the goddesses from the judgment of Paris is indeed present. As mentioned in chapter one, the identification of Juno is then couched exclusively in terms of her brother/husband Jupiter: *ex illis sed tamen una fuit, / ex illis fuit una, sui germana mariti; / haec erat, agnovi, quae stat in arce Iovis* (“But there was nevertheless one from those [goddesses involved in the judgment of Paris], one from them, namely the sister of her own husband; it was she I recognized, who stands on the citadel of Jove” 6.16-18). The mention of Jove's citadel, namely the Capitoline hill, establishes the Roman setting for Juno's appearance and anticipates the entry on the Kalends of June where the temple of Juno Moneta also occupies a piece of Jove's citadel (*arce quoque in summa* 6.183).

⁹⁷⁷ Barchiesi (1997a) 201 notes that the *corona* of 6.792 picks up on the name of the god Coronides at 6.746 as well as the *coronatae...lintres* of 6.779. Littlewood (2006) 228 and Hejduk (2020) 261 also speak about the closural nature of this line.

Despite Ovid's apparent identification of Juno via Jupiter, throughout Juno's speech the reader is privy to a Junonian perspective of Jove that for the most part steers clear of malice and instead focuses on her familial relationship to him as well as the proximity of their temples. In addition to stressing his role as both her brother and husband,⁹⁷⁸ as Ovid himself had done (6.17), Juno refers to herself as *matrona Tonantis* ("wife of the Thunderer" 6.33), a phrase that emphasizes their divine stations within a wholly Roman context.⁹⁷⁹ At the same time, the mention of Jupiter the Thunderer can also function as a geographical marker, as evidenced by its appearance at the beginning of the episode of the Gallic siege of the Capitoline hill later in the month of June, where its primary function is likely to indicate the proximity of the altar of Jupiter Pistor to the sanctuary of Jupiter Tonans.⁹⁸⁰ It does, however, point to Jupiter as a wholly Roman deity, both through its connection to the Augustan cult of Jupiter Tonans and the reference in the next line to one of Jupiter's temples on the Capitoline (*Tarpeio...Iovi*).⁹⁸¹ Juno's

⁹⁷⁸ *Fast.* 6.27-28: *est aliquid nupsisse Iovi, Iovis esse sororem: / fratre magis dubito gloriari anne viro* ("It is something to have married Jove and to be Jove's sister: I am uncertain as to whether I take more pride in having him as a brother or as a husband"). For analysis of this couplet see chapter 1 pp. 100-01, esp. n. 264.

⁹⁷⁹ See Littlewood (2006) 17, although I disagree with her assessment that the juxtaposition of *matrona* and *Tonantis* is "humorously incongruous." By calling him "the Thunderer" and referring to herself as "matron," Juno is merely emphasizing their primary functions as husband and wife. That is, Jupiter's primary function is as a weather god and her primary function is to facilitate birth, oversee weddings, and support mothers. Those two things are by no means mutually exclusive.

⁹⁸⁰ *Fast.* 6.349: *Nomine quam pretio celebratior arce Tonantis / dicam Pistoris quid velit ara Iovis* ("I will relate what the altar of Jupiter Pistor signifies on the citadel of the Thunderer, an altar more famous for its name than its price"). See Littlewood (2006) 113. In addition, Ceres refers to Jupiter as 'Thunderer' in book 4 (*Tonantem* 4.585), when she approaches him regarding Pluto's abduction of Proserpina. There, it likely emphasizes his gravitas and his role as the paterfamilias.

⁹⁸¹ For *Tarpeio* = *Capitolino*, see Littlewood (2006) 17.

self-identification as *matrona* emphasizes that unlike her husband she is *univira*, a woman devoted to only one man. Indeed, Juno was represented as the epitome of an *univira* in Flora's story of Mars' birth, where Juno sought to become a sole parent to Mars, "provided that she remain chaste" (*dummodo casta* 5.242). Juno also reminds the reader of her Roman affiliations by evoking her epithet *Lucina* (6.39), as a goddess of childbirth, and by again taking credit for the birth of Mars (6.53-54, 64). The remaining references to Jupiter in Juno's speech relate exclusively to his temples on the Capitoline, which she emphasizes are adjacent to and shared by her own. In the first instance, the placement Juno's temple forms a chiasmus with Jupiter's temple(s), which surround her own: *iunctaque Tarpeio sunt mea templa Iovi* ("my temple is joined to that of Tarpeian Jove" 6.34). The two hemiepes of the pentameter end with emphasis not on Juno, but rather on Jupiter: *Tarpeio...Iovi*. In the second instance, Juno uses a possessive adjective not to modify her own temple, but to lay claim to Jupiter himself in the hopes of using his influence to convince Ovid: *hic colar, hic teneam cum Iove templa meo* ("Here let me be worshipped, here let me have a temple with my Jove" 6.52). The focus here is even more squarely on Jove, as the optative subjunctive makes it appear as if Juno is asking permission for her temple to exist alongside the prominent temple of her husband.⁹⁸² At the same time, the repetition of *hic*, draws attention to Juno's almost desperate desire to be identified as a wholly Roman deity and can be read as both "here in Ovid's poetic calendar" as well as "here in Rome." Both of these references to temples on the Capitoline likely reflect back on Ovid's initial identification of Juno and the fact that her cult image "stood on the citadel of Jove" (6.18). We may recall the earlier discrepancy on the Kalends of February between the no longer extant temple of Juno Sospita and the sacrifices that were said to be taking place either in the temple of

⁹⁸² Littlewood (2006) 20 observes that Ovid has reused and reordered the very same pentameter ending that we saw at 6.34 (*mea templa Iovi*).

Jupiter Tonans or in that of Jupiter Capitolinus (2.55-72). It would appear that Juno is making her best attempt to harmonize and to overlook past mistreatments of her at the hands of the Trojans, Jupiter, and Ovid himself. Although she does allude to Jove's promiscuity vis-à-vis the mention of Ganymede (6.43) and her *paelex* Maia (6.35-36),⁹⁸³ she is much more concerned about her Romanness and her place within the Roman calendar. Yet, Juno's arguments ultimately fall on deaf ears, as Ovid prefers to keep his aetiological inquiries open and to sustain the prevalent literary and mythological persona of Juno, which he would have to forgo if he sided in her favor.

Ovid employs the rhetorical device of apophasis in a new and interesting way by initially denying that the contenders for June were the same as those that were judged by Paris, and then recanting that statement in part by admitting that Juno belongs to both parties. Indeed, as we discussed in chapter one, many scholars have expounded on the fact that the entire contest over the etymology of June is framed around the judgment of Paris. Yet, this decision on Ovid's part does not amount to a zero-sum game. Rather it is especially suggestive, as it alludes both to Juno's failure in the contest over the golden apple as well as to her role in the destruction of Troy and, by extension, her subsequent vendetta against Aeneas, the Trojans, and ultimately the foundation of Rome. For at the beginning of the *Aeneid*, the judgment of Paris was listed as one of the two *causae* for Juno's anger: *manet alta mente repostum / iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae* ("The judgment of Paris and the insult to her scorned beauty remain fixed deep in her mind" *Aen.* 1.26-27). It would appear that despite the lapse in time, the Juno of Ovid's *Fasti* has not forgotten the insult; for she alludes directly to that section of the *Aeneid*: *causa duplex irae: rapto Ganymede dolebam, / forma quoque Idaeo iudice victa mea est* ("The cause of my

⁹⁸³ Maia is her *paelex* both because she slept with Jupiter and produced Mercury and because she, like Juno for June, has a claim to the etymology for the month of May.

anger was two-fold: I was pained when Ganymede was snatched away, and also when my beauty was refuted by that arbiter of Ida” 6.43-4). The irony of course, is that she is about to relive that disgrace in part by failing to adequately convince a *Romanus iudex*, namely Ovid, who in making his decision once again reminds the reader of his similarity to Paris. For once Ovid has heard all three speeches, he confesses: *at vos ignoscite, divae: res est arbitrio non dirimenda meo. / ite pares a me. perierunt iudice formae / Pergama: plus laedunt, quam iuvat una, duae* (“But forgive me, goddesses: this issue must not be settled by my judgment. Depart from me as equals. Troy perished as a result of the judge of beauty: two goddesses harm more than one helps” 6.97-98). In the first chapter we analyzed these lines in relation to their counterpart at the end of the proem to book 5, where Ovid similarly dismisses the Muses without endorsing a particular etymology for the month of May. It is worth pointing out, however, that Ovid’s decision to abstain from choosing a victor for the etymology of June is couched in terms that are not only highly personal for Juno, but which also direct the reader back a few lines earlier to her self-expressed hatred of Troy and, by extension, her threat to disavow the Romans. For when Ovid alludes to the contest of Paris with the words *iudice formae*, the reader is reminded of Juno’s words from above: *forma quoque Idaeo iudice victa mea est* (6.44). Thus when Ovid equates his non-decision with the perils that resulted from the outcome of the contest of Paris, he can be seen as rubbing salt in Juno’s wound. Lastly, neither the Muses of book 5 nor Juventas, nor Concordia make any appearances in the work beyond their respective etymological arguments. Juno, on the other hand, continues to be represented throughout the month of June, where she is subjected to even further failure and neglect, almost exclusively under the guise of her Greek counterpart, Hera.

VII. The Kalends of June and the Gallic Siege of the Capitoline Hill: Juno Moneta and Jupiter Pistor

The first chapter of this study devoted a section to the Kalends of June, where the focus was on the dichotomy between Juno and Janus. Here I intend to show that the brief mention of the temple of Juno Moneta, followed by a concluding allusion to the magnificence of Jupiter's eagle, anticipates the episode of the Gallic siege of the Capitoline hill told on the Vestalia, a mere eight days later. For when Ovid finally arrives at the dedication of the temple of Juno Moneta after devoting the majority of the Kalends of June to Carna and Janus, he lingers for a mere a couplet: *arce quoque in summa Iunoni templa Monetae / ex voto memorant facta, Camille, tuo* ("They also say that at the top of the Capitoline citadel a temple was built to Juno Moneta as a result of your vow, Camillus" 6.183-84).⁹⁸⁴ Although her temple is said to be located on the summit of the Capitoline (*arce...in summa*), it is, however, not *summa templa* ("the chief temple"), the position of which is reserved for *summus Iuppiter* in the form of the nearby temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. A reference to Juno Moneta was made back in book 1 (*alta Moneta* 1.638), as a geographical marker in order help locate the temple of Concord, which was the focus of that entry. In both cases it was Camillus who made the initial vow that led to the construction of these two temples (*Furius...voverat* 1.641-42 and *ex voto...Camille* 6.184). Yet, in book 1 Camillus' reason for vowing to build a temple of Concord is immediately overshadowed by Tiberius' better vow (*causa recens melior* 1.645), which is then celebrated by the entire imperial household. On the Kalends of June, however, Camillus' vow is not proceeded by an occasion that warrants celebration, but by the recollection of the earlier polarizing events concerning Marcus Manlius. Therefore, what could have been a celebratory occasion based on

⁹⁸⁴ Macr. *Sat.* 1.12.30 also mentions the construction of a temple of Juno Moneta on this day, as does the *Fasti Venusini* (see Degrassi [1963] 463).

the temple's original action instead becomes a warning that Ovid directs at his readers.⁹⁸⁵ Instead of telling the remarkable story of how Juno's sacred geese alerted the Romans to the presence of the Gauls, who were secretly ascending the Capitoline hill, as Livy does,⁹⁸⁶ Ovid transitions immediately to Manlius, briefly mentioning his role in the Capitoline's defense, before emphasizing his subsequent treachery and execution.⁹⁸⁷ The juxtaposition of a triumphant moment in Roman history with the unfortunate aftermath of Manlius' alleged grasp at kingship casts a palpable shadow upon both Camillus' reputation as well as the positive role the temple of Juno Moneta played in helping the Romans avert the crisis of the Gallic invasion. Indeed, the endings of both the hexameter and the pentameter draw attention to these two figures: *templa Monetae* (6.183) and *Camille, tuo* (6.184).

Further, the fact that Manlius is said to have "repelled Gallic arms from Capitoline Jove" (*a Capitolino...Iove* 6.186) and is called "defender of your throne, mighty Jupiter" (*defensor solii, Iuppiter alte, tui* 6.188) anticipates the lengthy narrative concerning the Gallic sack of Rome that will take place on June 9th, as a part of the Vestalia. After all, the epithet *Capitolinus* does not just point to the Capitoline hill, but singles out the cult title of Jupiter Capitolinus, a name that gets transferred to Manlius in the aftermath of his deeds. The mention of Jupiter's throne is also interesting, first because it speaks to Jupiter as the patron deity of Rome, whose kingdom is inextricably connected to Rome's survival. Second, because it makes Manlius' fall

⁹⁸⁵ The connection between Juno Moneta and the Mnemosyne, goddess of memory, is no doubt in play here (see Littlewood [2006] 57-58).

⁹⁸⁶ Liv. 5.47.

⁹⁸⁷ McDonough (1997) 337 also takes issue with the absence of Juno's geese, rightly remarking, "No Roman could think of this temple—as indeed, no classicist can—without recalling the tale of the sacred geese whose honking woke the sleeping citizens during the Gaul's invasion *circa* 390 B.C.E (Liv. 5.47.3f.)."

from grace all the more ironic, since he, who had earlier risked his life defending Jupiter's throne, subsequently loses his life for grasping at kingship (*crimine regni* 6.189). The longer account of the Gallic siege of Rome, as told on the Vestalia, makes no mention either of Manlius or of Juno Moneta, preferring instead to focus on the obscure etymology of Jupiter Pistor or Jupiter the Baker. It is, however, a story of success and celebration, akin to that of the temple of Concord on the 16th of January and at odds with the entry for the temple of Juno Moneta here on the Kalends of June.

The Kalends of June concludes with yet another Jovian reference by way of an allusion to the rise of Aquila, the constellation of the Eagle, which, as we noted above, was mentioned at the end of book 5. There it acts as an anticipatory *signum*, heralding the arrival of the actual constellation with the ambivalent reference to its "pleasing beak:" *grata Iovi fulvae rostra videbis avis* ("You will see the beak of the tawny bird pleasing to Jove" 5.732). Here on the Kalends of June the constellation is finally visible and the focus is on its prominence in the sky: *si quaeritis astra, / tunc oritur magni praepes adunca Iovis* ("If you seek stars, at that time the clawed bird of great Jove rises" 6.195-96). The word *praepes*, which in this context the *OLD* translates merely as "bird,"⁹⁸⁸ can also indicate a propitious omen.⁹⁸⁹ Thus the rise of the constellation Aquila may also anticipate the rise of propitious Jove, who in the form of Jupiter Pistor will absorb the function traditionally reserved for Juno Moneta and act as a tutelary deity for Rome.

The story of Jupiter Pistor on the Vestalia develops from the preceding account of Vesta's devotion to the donkey (6.319-48), which on this day receives respite from the onerous

⁹⁸⁸ *Praepes*² s.v. 2.

⁹⁸⁹ *Praepes*¹ s.v. 1 and *Praepes*² s.v. 1.

task of churning the millstone to grind grain. Ovid then begins the action of Jupiter Pistor as follows:

Nomine quam pretio celebratior arce Tonantis
 dicam Pistoris quid velit ara Iovis. 350
 cincta premebantur trucibus Capitolia Gallis:
 fecerat obsidio iam diuturna famem.
 Iuppiter, ad solium superis regale vocatis,
 'incipere' ait Marti;

I will relate what the altar of Jupiter Pistor signifies on the citadel of the Thunderer, an altar more famous for its name than its price. The Capitoline is overwhelmed, surrounded by fierce Gauls: the prolonged siege had already created a famine. Jupiter, having summoned the gods to his royal throne, said to Mars, 'begin.' (*Fast.* 6.349-54)

We find ourselves once again on the Capitoline hill during the Gallic siege of Rome, both the geographical and historical setting for the foundation of the temple of Juno Moneta. Although Jupiter's epithet Pistor is only attested elsewhere in the third century early Christian author Lactantius (*Inst.* 1.20.33) and has been argued away as a corruption of his more well-known epithets Tutor or Soter,⁹⁹⁰ Littlewood nevertheless believes that it may be genuine and even goes so far as to link it to the epithet Tonans, also found here.⁹⁹¹ The setting for this episode is a gathering of the gods in Olympus, a clear nod to Jupiter's gathering of the Olympians in *Met.* 1 (167ff.) and to the *concilium deorum* in *Aeneid* 10 (1-117), where Venus and Juno present contrary opinions as to how the gods should react to the war between the Trojans and the Latins.

⁹⁹⁰ Porte (1985) 366-68.

⁹⁹¹ Littlewood (2006) 113-14 offers a possible link between Jupiter's epithet of Pistor with that of Tonans by way of Varro's derivation of the former from *pinsere*, "to grind" (*GRF* 204). Littlewood reasons that the "sense of pounding in the word *pinsere*" may relate to the grinding/cracking sound of thunder embedded in the epithet Tonans, a connection made by Wissowa and further expounded upon by Frazer (see Newlands [1995] 133 n. 43).

As one would expect, Jupiter runs the meeting, having summoned the gods to his royal throne (*ad solium superis regale vocatis*). The use of the word *solium* as a stand-in for Olympus harkens back to the Kalends of June where Gaius Manlius was said to be a “defender of your throne, high Jupiter” (*defensor solii, Iuppiter alte, tui* 6.188). In order to fulfill that function, Manlius is shown repelling the Gauls and their weapons away from the Capitoline hill, referred to as Capitoline Jove: *qui Gallica quondam / a Capitolino reppulit arma Iove* (6.185-86). Here on the Vestalia, however, the onus falls on the gods rather than the Romans to devise a way to stave off the Gallic attack.

As Mars begins to wonder whether the Romans will emerge from their quagmire, we can detect resonances of Jupiter’s prophecy to Venus in *Aeneid* 1, a speech also issued in response to serious doubts about the future Roman hegemony. In that speech Jupiter promises Venus that the Romans will be “masters of the world” (*Romanos rerum dominos* 1.282), a phrase that is echoed by Mars’ statement in the *Fasti* that Jupiter promised that Rome would hold power over the world (*promissa potentia rerum* 6.359) and that he would place them in charge of the earth (*hanc terris impositurus* 6.360). As the narrative continues, Venus, Quirinus, and Vesta all contribute many words on behalf of Latium’s survival (6.375-76), but Juno, who had earlier cited her devotion to Latium, is conspicuously absent.⁹⁹² In the one of the prominent examples of the *concilium deorum* in Latin literature, that of *Aen.* 10.1-95, Juno and Venus argue with one another in front of Jupiter over the fate of Aeneas, the Trojans, and Rome’s future. Here, however, Juno is cut out of the conversation entirely. Turning to another prominent example of

⁹⁹² In her speech that began the book Juno asserted: *et veterem Latio subposuisse Samon* (“[Should I regret that I] also made ancient Samos subservient to Latium”). Thus when Littlewood (2006) 120 makes the statement, “This group of deities, bound to Rome with family ties, support Mars with lengthy pleas *pro Latio suo*,” Juno should no doubt be included, especially given her role within the *Fasti* as the mother of Mars.

the *concilium deorum* motif, we witness an inversion of the events surrounding the council of the gods in *Met.* 1, where Jupiter's harsh words produce a unanimous verdict from the obsequious audience (199-200). Here in the *Fasti* Jupiter is shown heeding the concerns of the others and conducts himself much like Neptune in *Aeneid* 1 when he solicits the help of his minions in quelling the ferocious storm (*Aen.* 1.142-56). With the assistance of Vesta, he succeeds in cooking up (or baking!) a solution that will turn the tide of the war for the Romans. Amidst the obviously comedic image of the gods baking bread together lies the more respectable notion of teamwork and resiliency. Indeed, Jupiter issues the stern order that Vesta man her post no matter what: *nec sedes desere, Vesta, tuas* ("And do not abandon your post, Vesta" 6.380). He is the quarterback calling the play, a far cry from the totalitarian Jupiter in *Met.* 1; and the other gods, Vesta in particular, follow his lead: *iusserat, et fratris virgo Saturnia iussis adnuit* ("He had made his command, and the virgin Vesta, daughter of Saturn, nodded assent at the commands of her brother" 6.383-84). The reference to Vesta as *virgo Saturnia* draws attention to the absence of Juno, often herself referred to as Saturnia, especially in epic contexts such as these.⁹⁹³ Recall that similar language was used on the Feralia to describe how Mercury acquiescingly carried out Jupiter's orders to lead Lara down to the underworld: *iussa Iovis fiunt* ("the orders of Jove are fulfilled" 2.611). Both serve as a testament to the unquestionable power and clout that Jupiter wields, for good and for bad. Ovid, who opened the book by telling the reader that it is especially proper for him to view the gods because he is a *vates* or because he sings of sacred things (6.7-8), even fashions Jupiter after himself by granting him a sacred mouth and using him as a didactic tool: *increpat illos / Iuppiter et sacro quid velit ore docet* ("Jupiter scolds them and teaches them what he wants with his sacred voice" 6.385-86).

⁹⁹³ See chapter 1 for a discussion of Juno as Saturnia. Littlewood (2006) 121 describes the moniker *virgo Saturnia* as "an epic style periphrasis."

Although the story is told on the Vestalia and features Vesta in the role of assistant baker through her association with the mill, Jupiter is the chief figure and the one who is honored with an altar. Livy, however, in his account of the same episode does not specify where the idea of throwing bread behind enemy lines originated, opting to ground the statement with *dicitur* (5.48.4), as he often does for actions of spurious veracity or authenticity. Further, in Livy it is immediately apparent that this tactic fails when the Gauls realize that the Romans are in fact suffering from famine: *postremo spe quoque iam non solum cibo deficiente* (“At last not only food, but also hope is now lacking for [the Romans]” 5.48.7). Ovid reverses this very statement in the *Fasti* by concluding his account with the following: *posse fame vinci spes excidit* (“[Gallic] hope that they [the Romans] could be conquered by famine disappears” 6.393). In Livy, the only saving grace for the Romans is the squawking of Juno’s sacred geese, which Livy describes as “the event which provided them with safety” (*quae res saluti fuit* 5.47.4). The trick of throwing bread at the enemy in the hope that they appear stronger than they are backfires and soon they are forced to make a treaty of disproportionate benefit with the Gallic chieftain Brennus. To sum up, in his account of the Gallic siege of the Capitoline, Ovid eschews any mention of the sacred geese associated with the temple of Juno that will subsequently give her the name Moneta, transfers her divine support to Jupiter and his retinue of other gods, and forges an alternate past wherein the Romans successfully defeat the Gauls instead of eventually capitulating and being forced to pay a hefty fine, as they do in Livy’s version.

What we seem to have here is a combination of reasons for Juno’s absence. From a literary standpoint, Ovid is embracing Juno’s role in the *Aeneid* as the main antagonist of the Trojans and thus not fit to collaborate with the other gods in defense of Rome. It can also be argued that her absence from the council implies that she is aiding the enemy, something we witnessed her doing back in book one when she supported the Sabine contingent led by Titus

Tatius. Indeed, the defeat of the Sabines and the routing of the Gauls are couched in similar terms with *pulsis...sabinis* (1.273) used to describe the former and *hoste repulso* (6.393) the latter. One can further draw a parallel between the white altar erected on behalf of Jupiter Pistor, (*candida Pistori ponitur ara Iovi*, 6.394) and the altar erected to Janus, which burns grain and spelt in its flames, (*ara mihi posita est parvo coniuncta sacello: / haec adolet flammis cum strue farra suis* 1.275-6). From an historical standpoint, Jupiter takes over the role traditionally assigned to Juno as the deity chiefly responsible for saving the Romans from the Gallic invasion of the Capitoline hill. Indeed, Janus and Jupiter Pistor both secure victory through peaceful and bloodless measures, prompting Hejduk to associate Jupiter Pistor with “the gentler aspect of the god of Rome”⁹⁹⁴ In the proem to book 6 Juno had listed several ways in which she had aided the Romans in past, asserting that she would regret having done so if the month of June were not officially declared hers. Although aiding the Romans during the Gallic siege is not among these threats, one might still be apt to view her absence from the siege narrative as a consequence of Ovid’s refusal to acknowledge her claim to the month.

VIII. Juno’s Hostility on the Matralia

Let us now turn to the Matralia on June 11th, where the predominant theme is Juno’s persecution of Ino and her son Melicertes. This is a story told in much greater detail in book four of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (4.416-542). There, Ovid weaves the suffering of Ino into his Theban section and emphasizes Juno’s desire to destroy the entire house of Cadmus (*Met.* 4.469-71), giving the entire episode a grim and macabre texture. Here in the *Fasti*, however, a celebration is at hand and Ovid begins the episode by instructing mothers to honor the goddess Mater Matuta: *ite, bonae matres (vestrum Matralia festum), / flavaque Thebae reddite liba deae* (“Go, good

⁹⁹⁴ Hejduk (2020) 262.

mothers (the Matralia is your festival), and bestow golden cakes upon the Theban goddess” *Fast.* 6.475-6). The focus on mothers and motherhood is not subtle, as the festival is called the Matralia and is held in honor of Mater Matuta. The irony is that while this festival is said to celebrate mothers, the story of Mater Matuta’s conception is framed around the anti-maternal figure of Juno, who elsewhere in the *Fasti* exemplifies the highest regard for motherhood in her capacity as the Roman goddess of mothers and marriage.⁹⁹⁵ In fact, we may interpret the action of Mater Matuta as the precise inversion of the earlier Matronalia. There, Mars is the interlocutor and does not hesitate to invoke his familial relationship with Juno, to whom the day actually belongs, twice referring to her as his mother (*mater...matris* 3.251). Although Ovid does not supply an interlocutor for the action of the Matralia, he nevertheless calls upon Bacchus, son of Zeus/Jupiter and Semele, to direct the poet’s account: *Bacche racemiferos hedera distincte capillos, / si domus illa tua est, derige vatis opus* (“Bacchus, whose cluster-bearing head is adorned with ivy, if that house belongs to you, then direct the work of the poet” 6.483-4). The story then begins with Jupiter’s reluctant incineration of Semele and with Juno displacing her anger onto Semele’s sister Ino:

arserat obsequio Semele Iovis: accipit Ino
te, puer, et summa sedula nutrit ope.
intumuit Ino, raptum quod paelice natum
educet: at sanguis ille sororis erat.

Semele had burned as a result of the compliance of Jove: Ino takes you in, child, and nurses you with most diligent care. Juno becomes enraged at the fact that Ino rears the son snatched from her rival; but that boy was of her sister’s blood. (*Fast.* 6.485-88)

⁹⁹⁵ Especially on the Matronalia (*Fast.* 3.229-58) and on the Floralia (*Fast.* 5.229-60). Note that these two episodes occupy nearly identical line numbers within their respective books.

By emphasizing Semele's death, Ovid shifts the focus away from Jupiter's tryst with Semele and onto Semele's hubris.⁹⁹⁶ Jupiter, who elsewhere in the *Fasti* generally exhibits the qualities of leadership—whether for good or for bad—is here shown acquiescing to the desires of a mortal woman.⁹⁹⁷ Ovid also inverts the expected elegiac meaning of *ardeo*, “burn with love,”⁹⁹⁸ by exploiting its literal sense of “scorch/incinerate.”⁹⁹⁹ No doubt *ardeo* in the sense of ‘passion’ would have also applied to Semele's initial encounter with Jupiter. But here Ovid explicitly avoids any mention of sex or physical desire, making Juno's resulting anger appear all the more unwarranted. Indeed, Juno's former anger at Semele is transferred onto her sister Ino for no reason other than that she is looking after the son of Juno's *paelex*. We encountered that word from the mouth of Juno herself back in the proem of book six where it was used in reference to the goddess Maia and her claim to the month of May (6.35). Ovid's alliterative *sanguis...sororis* (6.488) emphasizes Ino's innocence by underscoring her familial relationship with Bacchus,

⁹⁹⁶ Hejduk (2020) 262 concurs, commenting that “Ovid's treatment of Semele in the *Fasti* shows Jupiter in a positive light, ignoring the fact that her death was his fault.” The story, of course, began with Jupiter being smitten with Semele and then impregnating her, in a manner very similar to the Callisto story. In the *Met.* it is Juno in the guise of Semele's nurse Beroe who convinces Semele to see Jupiter in his true form, resulting in her untimely demise (*Met.* 3.262-86).

⁹⁹⁷ On the Feralia he gathers together a council of Nymphs, gives them orders, and then commands Mercury (*Fast.* 2.585-610). On the Vestalia he summons a council of gods and directs them to bake bread, and then tells the Roman soldiers in their dreams how to proceed (*Fast.* 6.353-88).

⁹⁹⁸ The word is used by Ovid of Jupiter's passion for Ganymede at *Met.* 10.155-56: *Rex superum Phrygii quondam Ganymedis amore / arsit* (“The king of the gods formerly burned with love for the Trojan Ganymede”); note its enjambed position. In our *Fasti* it is fronted for emphasis.

⁹⁹⁹ Propertius had played with the word *combuero* in a similar fashion, reversing the role of the one inflamed: *ut Semela est combustus* (“how he [Jupiter] was inflamed by Semele” *Prop.* 2.30.29).

while the equally alliterative *summa sedula* (6.486) just above testifies to the fact that Ino is a good step-mother, contrary to the ancient perception of that figure.¹⁰⁰⁰ Indeed, she takes in (*accipit* 6.485) the child Bacchus and nurses (*nutrit* 6.486) him with the utmost care. These circumstances recall the Kalends of May, where Ovid tells the story of Jupiter's infancy on Crete and how the Naiad Amalthea kept him safe and served as his nurse (*nutrix* 5.120).

That Ino ought to be considered a "good mother" is evident from the grief she expresses in response to the murder of her son Learchus, epitomized by Ovid again through the use of alliteration: *maesta...mater...miseris* (6.491-92). In a state of madness Ino proceeds to leap off a cliff clutching little Melicertes in her arms and it is here that the *Met.* story finds its end. Venus and Neptune intervene and Ino and Melicertes are transformed into the respective deities Leucothea and Palaemon (*Met.* 4.531-43).¹⁰⁰¹ Not so for Ovid's *Fasti*, which treads on new ground. Once Ino and Melicertes arrive on the outskirts of Pallanteum, Juno, whose role in causing Athamas' madness and Learchus' death Ovid has suppressed,¹⁰⁰² emerges once again to finish the job: *dissimulata deam Latias Saturnia Bacchas / instimulat fictis insidiosa sonis* ("Insidious Saturnia having concealed her godhead goads the Bacchantes of Latium with fictitious words" 6.507-08). These two lines are reminiscent of the Juno described as aiding Titus Tatius and Sabines back in book one: *et iam contigerat portam, Saturnia cuius / dempserat oppositas invidiosa seras* ("and [Tatius] had reached the gate, whose opposing bars hateful/jealous Saturnia

¹⁰⁰⁰ For a treatment of the wicked step-mother in the Ancient Roman literature and history see Gray-Fow (1988). Note also that Ovid alludes to Juno as a negative exemplum for the proverbial "evil step-mother" at *Fast.* 6.800.

¹⁰⁰¹ The traditional mythological story of Ino appears to conclude with her leaping off the cliff (Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.4.3). For a summary of how the myth of Ino unfolds in Apollodorus see Parker (1999) 337.

¹⁰⁰² In the *Met.* Juno's role in the summoning of the fury Tisiphone is made clear (*Met.* 4.447-80).

had removed” 1.265-66). Her description as *Saturnia...insidiosa* (6.507-08) is no doubt intended to reflect the earlier *Saturnia...invidiosa*.¹⁰⁰³ Indeed, her epithet *Saturnia* and its accompanying adjectives are located in the exact same *sedes*. In addition, the stealth with which Juno removes the bars of the temple gate in the earlier scenario is aped by the disguise she dons in order to instigate a frenzy among a group of maenads. Further, the preponderance of *s* sounds amplifies the sinister nature of Juno’s deception,¹⁰⁰⁴ while at the same time reminding the reader of the role played by the snake-haired fury Tisiphone in the *Met.* version of the story (*Met.* 4.474-75). The irony should not be lost that Juno is calling upon worshippers of her hated nephew to take vengeance upon the very woman who cared for him. As she designates Ino’s son as the primary target for the maenads, her wrath culminates in an eruption of *p* sounds: *quo possit poenas pendere pignus habet* (“She has a child by which she can pay the penalty” 6.512). Her speech imbues the bacchantes with a sense of entitlement as they attempt to lay their hands upon Melicertes and to lay claim to his person, both of which are accomplished by the phrase *iniciunt manus* (6.515).¹⁰⁰⁵ Ino reacts by praying for help from anyone who will listen: *quos ignorat adhuc, invocat illa deos: / 'dique virique loci, miserae succurrite matri.'* (“She calls upon gods whom she does not yet know: ‘gods and men of this place, give aid to a wretched mother’” 6.516-17).

It is no coincidence that Hercules, another nemesis of Juno (as he himself admits), should come to her rescue. As quickly as Juno’s words had riled up the Bacchantes to violence (6.509-

¹⁰⁰³ There are even manuscripts that have *insidiosa* at both *Fast.* 1.266 and 6.508 (see n. 133 above).

¹⁰⁰⁴ See Littlewood (2006) 60 who also says, “The two words chosen to describe Juno, *dissimulata* and *insidiosa*, suggest the destructive nature of this dangerous goddess.”

¹⁰⁰⁵ For the legal usage of this phrase with meaning “lay claim to one’s person,” see *OLD* s.v. *inicio* 6b.

14), so too does Hercules' mere presence immediately put them to flight: *Herculis adventu quae vim modo ferre parabant / turpia femineae terga dedere fugae* ("Upon the arrival of Hercules, those who were just now preparing to engage in violence gave their backs to disgraceful, womanly flight" 6.521-22). Hercules, who is known for initiating violence and who earlier in book one defeated the monster Cacus in a gory contest (1.543-86), uncharacteristically diffuses a potentially violent situation without the use of force. This also marks the end of Juno's violence against Ino, as we next see her find her way to Carmenta's house and undergo transformation into a goddess. Littlewood has observed that Hercules here is called *Oetaeus*, an anachronistic nod to his future state of deification, both within his own mythical arc and within the world of Ovid's *Fasti*, which closes with the very image of Hercules' apotheosis.¹⁰⁰⁶ Hercules is entirely absent from the *Met.* version of this story and his presence here no doubt serves to further humiliate Juno, who hates him for the same reason she hates Semele and, by extension, Ino. Once the maenads are routed, Hercules goes on to address Ino as *matertera Bacchi* (6.523), a reference to her role as Bacchus' biological aunt, but with the secondary meaning of being a *mater altera*, that is a second mother, to Bacchus, thus alluding to the theme of good motherhood, which the Matralia celebrates. Hercules then surmises that they are both the victims of a malevolent Juno: *an numen, quod me, te quoque vexat?' ait* ("Or does the god, who torments me, also torment you,' he said" 6.524). Concern for the well-being of young Melicertes prevents Ino from telling Hercules too much: *illa docet partim, partim praesentia nati / continet et furiis in scelus isse pudet* ("She tells him part of her story, but the presence of her son restrains (her from telling) other parts, and she feels shame at being driven to wickedness by madness" 6.525-26). As Littlewood observes, the Ino in the *Fasti* who provides a proper burial for the dead

¹⁰⁰⁶ Littlewood (2006) xlv and 160.

Learchus and who expresses the utmost concern for the well-being for the young Melicertes is a far cry from the raving and unbalanced Ino depicted in the *Met.*¹⁰⁰⁷ As a caring surrogate mother for her nephew Bacchus, as a mother who mourns the untimely death of her son Learchus, and as a mother who prays for the well-being of her sole surviving son, Melicertes by beseeching the gods, “Give aid to a wretched mother” (*miserae succurrite matri* 6.517), Ino is the very epitome of those *bonae matres*, whom Ovid had invited to celebrate the festival at the action’s beginning (6.475).¹⁰⁰⁸

The reader is thus forced to reconcile how a festival that celebrates Mater Matuta and *bonae matres* can derive from an action that exemplifies the hostile and anti-maternal characteristics of Juno, herself a goddess of mothers who is often conflated directly with Mater Matuta.¹⁰⁰⁹ It is important to note that although the action is set in the world of Greek mythology, the preface (6.475-84) to the festival is entirely Roman. Indeed, Ovid makes every attempt to Romanize what is otherwise a firmly Greek story. He uses the Roman names of Jupiter (*Iovis* 6.485) and Juno (*Iuno* 6.487), transfers the geographical setting from Greece to the shores of the Tiber (*Thybridis ora* 6.502), calls the maenads Ausonian/Italian (*Ausonias* 6.504), and when Ino undergoes her transformation into the Greek goddess Leucothea, adds that Romans will call her Matuta (*Matuta vocabere nostris* 6.545). In actuality, Mater Matuta was almost certainly a native Italic deity whose features overlap considerably with the wholly Greek Leucothea.¹⁰¹⁰

¹⁰⁰⁷ Littlewood (2006) 163.

¹⁰⁰⁸ This portrayal of Ino as the ‘good mother’ is at odds with her appearance earlier in the *Fasti* on the Tubilustrium (3.853ff.), where she tries to convince Athamas to sacrifice her step-children Phryxus and Helle.

¹⁰⁰⁹ In the form of Juno Lucina. See Warde Fowler (1899) 156, Dumézil (1973) 137, and Bispham and Smith (2000) 143.

¹⁰¹⁰ Warde Fowler (1899) 154-55, although Parker (1999) 339 n. 7 makes note of their conflation by the Romans.

While the *mater* portion of her name explains her association with mothers, the *matuta* portion, according to Verrius Flaccus by way of Paulus Festus, derives from a root meaning ‘good.’¹⁰¹¹ This is precisely why Ovid calls upon *bonae matres* (6.475) to celebrate the festival and why he reframes Ino as ‘the good mother.’ The Juno we see in the story, however, does not shed her Greek overtones, even when she enters Italy, nor does she embrace her Roman association with the protection of mothers. Rather, in Hera-like fashion she is characterized by her anger (*intumuit* 6.487), her insidiousness (*insidiosa* 6.508), and her role as the story’s antagonist, acting against the interests of a future Roman deity, who will serve in a capacity much like that of the Roman Juno.¹⁰¹² All aspects of Juno’s Romanness, as stated in her speech that opened the book, have faded into the background and she is once again an entirely foreign goddess, as she was in *Fasti* 1 when she aided Titus Tatius and the Sabines in their attack against a fledgling Rome.

Of interest also to the characterization of Juno on the Matralia is the role played by Carmenta, the goddess of prophesy and childbirth who foretells the deification of the exiled pair and then fulfills it (6.535-50), acting as a foil to Juno. We had learned of Carmenta’s story at length back in *Fasti* 1 on the Carmentalia where she guides her son Evander on their journey from Arcadia to the shores of Latium (1.497-542), a similar voyage to that of Ino and her son here on the Matralia. There, much attention was lavished upon Carmenta’s care for her son, consoling him after their joint exile and predicting a new beginning for them both (1.479-96). She concludes her prophecy by looking even further into the future to the contemporary

¹⁰¹¹ Paul. Fest. 109.4: *Matrem Matatam antiqui ob bonitatem appellabant* (“The ancients were calling (the deity) Mater Matuta on account of her goodness”). For extensive bibliography on the origins of Mater Matuta see Parker (1999) 337 n. 3.

¹⁰¹² Parker (1999) argues that the episode is fashioned in the manner of the *Aeneid* with Ino experiencing hardships similar to those of Aeneas in the slow crawl toward the future of Rome. In that sense, Juno is merely replicating her Hera-like role from the *Aeneid*.

Augustan period at a time when her worship as a Roman goddess has become pervasive: *utque ego perpetuis olim sacrabor in aris*, (“as I will one day be worshipped on eternal altars” 1.535). Juno, in her speech on the proem of June, similarly attests to the fact that she is worshipped as a Roman goddess on numerous altars: *centum celebramur in aris* (6.55). Thus Carmenta’s appearance on the Matralia and the fact that she here undermines Juno’s desires attest both to the fulfillment of her earlier prophecy and to the fact that she has been integrated into the Roman Calendar more seamlessly than Juno, who has not yet wholly shed her Greek identity.

Carmenta is even given the special privilege of creating new Roman deities as she converts Ino and Melicertes into Leucothea and Portunus. The ease with which she does this is highlighted by her declaration of the end of their struggles, *gaude, defuncta laboribus Ino* (“Rejoice, Ino, at the completion of your toils” 6.541), which immediately becomes realized upon the conclusion of her speech, *posuere labores* (“They put aside their toils” 6.549). One can also read into Carmenta’s warning that Ino now look favorably upon her new country: *et huic populo prospera semper ades* (“and always be favorable toward this people” 6.542). Not only does it cast Ino as a perpetual Roman tutelary deity, but it also serves to remind the reader that Juno’s hostility was not only directed at Ino and the descendants of Bacchus, but rather against the entire Roman race, as the extension of the Trojan dynasty.¹⁰¹³ Carmenta reiterates this same sentiment at the conclusion of her speech: *ite, precor, nostris aequus uterque locis* (“Go, I pray, and both be favorable toward this place of ours” 6.548). Carmenta’s desire that Ino and Melicertes fully commit to their new roles as Roman deities is resolute. Ino obliges and they

¹⁰¹³ This furthers the argument of Parker (1999) 339 ff. that Ino here is fashioned in the likeness of Vergil’s Aeneas. Thus, just as Juno’s hatred throughout the *Aeneid* is as much against the future Romans as it is against Aeneas and the Trojans, so too does her hatred of Ino have the same extended effect.

undergo transformation: *adnuerat, promissa fides; posuere labores, / nomina mutarunt: hic deus, illa dea est*. (“She nodded approval, and the pledge was made; they put aside they toils and changed their names: he is a god, she a goddess” 6.549-50). Juno’s account of her own transformation into a Roman goddess is not altogether different and similarly depends upon the actions of another, namely her son Mars: *dicta fides sequitur: centum celebramur in aris* (“Faith follows the words [of Mars], and I am worshipped at a hundred altars” 6.55). In this way, Carmenta, in her capacity as *vates* (6.535 and 6.537) adopts the role of Ovid the *vates* and bolsters two minor Roman deities, putting them on par with Juno’s own characterization of herself, while simultaneously undermining her authority as the originator of the month’s etymology.

Recall that no other ancient account of this story has Ino arriving in Italy.¹⁰¹⁴ Likewise, no other ancient account involves Hercules in the trials and tribulations of Ino. It is the ultimate irony and an additional insult to Juno that Hercules, of all heroes, should come to Ino’s rescue. For Hercules himself admits, he too is tormented by Juno’s cruelty (6.524). Although references to Hercules in the *Fasti* abound,¹⁰¹⁵ his only appearance in book 6 was as the wife of Juventas, who competed against Juno for the etymology of June. There, Juventas is twice identified as the “wife of Hercules” (6.65 and 6.78) in subtle defiance of her mother Juno’s claim over the month’s naming rights and as a reminder that the Romans owe Hercules a debt, as he slew the evil monster Cacus and pacified the region (6.79-82). That debt is then compounded by his subsequent rescue of Ino and her son on the Matralia, a selfless act that results in another positive

¹⁰¹⁴ See also Parker (1999) 338 n. 5.

¹⁰¹⁵ Most conspicuously on the Carmentalia in the action of the *ara Maxima* (1.543-84), as an attendant of Omphale where they humorously swap clothing (2.303-58), as a mourner in the accidental death of his mentor Chiron (5.379-414), and as the one who substitutes straw effigies for the old men who were traditionally hurled off the Pons Sublicius (5.621-62).

contribution toward Rome's future greatness. Indeed, a similar set of circumstances alerts Hercules' to the distressed state of both his cows and of Ino and her son.¹⁰¹⁶ For when his cows were stolen it was their lowing that initially drew his attention: '*accipio revocamen' ait, vocemque secutus / impia per silvas ultor ad antra venit* ("I acknowledge the recall,' he said, and having followed the voice, he came as an avenger through the forests to the wicked lair" 1.561-62). In the case of Ino and her son, it is similarly their cries that catch Hercules' attention: *clamor Aventini saxa propinqua ferit. / adpulerat ripae vaccas Oetaeus Hiberas; / audit, et ad vocem concitus urget iter*: ("Their shout strikes the nearby rocks of the Aventine. The Oetaean hero had driven his Spanish cows to the river bank; he hears [their cries], and disturbed he presses his course toward their voice." 6.518-20). The presence of his cattle here on the Matralia (*vaccas...Hiberas*) make it appear as if Hercules is rescuing Ino and her son immediately after defeating Cacus and recovering his stolen cattle. The earlier title of *ultor* thus takes on a new meaning here, as Hercules' actions can be viewed as thwarting the will of Juno, who was responsible for making him suffer in the first place. His heroism not only lessens the strength of Juno's authority, but it also acts as a further endorsement of Juventas, whose identity was expressed to a great extent in terms of Hercules' glory, which will reach full capacity at the poem's conclusion.

IX. Final Glimpses of Jupiter and Juno in the *Fasti*

We now come to the final appearances of Jupiter and Juno in the extant version of Ovid's *Fasti*. On the entry for June 21st we witness a Jupiter who is an amalgamation of the many versions of Jupiter Ovid has presented throughout the poem, in what comprises "the last narrative section of the poem:"¹⁰¹⁷

¹⁰¹⁶ A feature also acknowledged by Littlewood (2006) 162.

¹⁰¹⁷ Barchiesi (1997b) 201.

Iuppiter, exemplum veritus, derexit in ipsum
 fulmina qui nimiae moverat artis opem.
 Phoebus, querebaris: deus est, placare parenti;
 propter te, fieri quod vetat, ipse facit.

Jupiter, having feared the precedent [of restoring Hippolytus to life], directed his thunderbolt at the one who had employed the power of excessive art. Phoebus, you were complaining: [Aesculapius] is a god, placate your father; on account of you [Apollo], [Jupiter] himself does the very thing which he forbids from happening.

(*Fast.* 6.759-62)

Here Jupiter's wrath is cloaked in an act of necessity and followed up by a conciliatory demonstration of benevolence. At first glance, we are made to think of Jupiter's killing of Phaethon, another son of Apollo, at *Met.* 2.301-28. There, Jupiter qualifies his actions by telling the other gods, Apollo in particular, that if he does not step in and destroy Phaethon, then the world is doomed (*Met.* 2.304-06). Here, however, Jupiter takes action without any preliminary consultation, not because the world might end, but rather because he did not like what he saw.¹⁰¹⁸ The explanation that follows, namely that Aesculapius exhibited power beyond his station, is couched in vague terms and does little to justify Jupiter's actions. But the tone shifts when Apollo immediately laments the death of his son, plunging the reader into the world of elegy, where the verb *queror* is often used of lovers who are denied access to the house of their mistress.¹⁰¹⁹ Apollo is instructed to cheer up, for Aesculapius has become a god and Jupiter, after all, is Apollo's father. The episode ends not with the image of a totalitarian Jove or with a

¹⁰¹⁸ Once again Ovid has cloaked the expression *exemplum veritus* (6.759) in his hermeneutic alibi. Jupiter may be viewed as fearful that Aesculapius' power might outstrip his own and pose a threat to his celestial hegemony. Or he may be viewed fearful that Aesculapius is unable to handle such awesome power, as was the case with Phaethon, marking a much more altruistic motive than the latter scenario.

¹⁰¹⁹ Hejduk (2020) 255 who cites Hinds (1987) 103-07.

grieving Apollo, but with the poet prompting Apollo to be grateful, owing to the fact that Jupiter bent the rules on his account. But what rules are these? We have seen Jove catasterize several figures throughout the poem, from Arion's dolphin to Callisto to his nurse Amalthea. If anything, it is Aesculapius who broke the rules by reanimating Hippolytus without consideration of the consequences. At once Jove exemplifies the characteristics of the good leader and the dutiful father/grandfather. Indeed, as Pasco-Pranger points out, Jupiter and Aesculapius were earlier in the *Fasti* said to share both a temple on the Tiber island and a calendrical entry (1.293-94).¹⁰²⁰ This notice serves as the conclusion to Ovid's very first entry on the Kalends of January, and as Barchiesi has observed, takes us on a journey similar to that of the *Met.* "from chaos to the regenerated (and regenerating) Asclepius."¹⁰²¹ Hejduk, on the other hand, sees this earlier entry as a part of a paradigm shift from the Jupiter of the *Met.* who rules from a pedestal and looks down upon the gods below him to a Jupiter who is willing to share power with his subordinates.¹⁰²² At the same time, perhaps the most salient interpretation of the passage is one that views Aesculapius as a stand-in for Ovid himself, who was struck down by the thunderbolt of Augustus for excessive poetic license and forced to seek some sort of redemption, wherever it could be found.¹⁰²³ Whatever one chooses to take away from Jupiter's actions here toward the end of both the book and the poem, it is clear that the poet has embedded an emotional trigger into Jupiter's decision-making process, first with Jupiter's fear of Aesculapius' reanimation and then with Jupiter's desire to ease the pain of his grieving son, Apollo. Juno, on the other hand, is

¹⁰²⁰ Pasco-Pranger (2006) 289 who emphasizes that Aesculapius' punishment is overridden by his dual reconciliation with his grandfather Jupiter.

¹⁰²¹ Barchiesi (1997b) 201.

¹⁰²² Hejduk (2020) 249-50

¹⁰²³ See Newlands (1995) 175-208 and Littlewood (2006) 219-20.

a non-entity and will be seen only once more in a submissive state that takes the reader back to her role on the Matralia and summarily dismisses her.

The celebration of the shrine of the Lares alongside the temple of Jupiter Stator on June 27th (6.791-94) recalls the entry for the 1st of May that tracked Jupiter's rise to power (5.111-28) and emphasized the importance of the Lares Praestites, who stand guard over all things (5.129-46).¹⁰²⁴ Indeed, the duties of both Jupiter Stator and the Lares, albeit the newly instituted Augustan version, carry with them the idea of stability and vigilance, and their pairing here again speaks to Hejduk's argument about the extent to which Jupiter in the *Fasti* engages in the act of sharing—at least with certain divinities. On the other hand, only the dedication of the Lares' temple is mentioned in any of the extant epigraphic calendars for June 27th, making it appear as though Ovid artificially engineered this pairing.¹⁰²⁵ What is more, the actual construction of the temple of Jupiter Stator was undertaken much later by Marcus Atilius Regulus in the year 294 B.C. after his victory in a battle over the Samnites, causing Deglassi to doubt the legitimacy of Ovid's June 27th dedicatory date.¹⁰²⁶ Three possible reasons for this addition come to mind. First, as mentioned just above, it makes for nice parallelism with the earlier festival of the Lares on May 1st, which was also juxtaposed with an episode devoted to Jupiter. Second, Romulus' earlier vow concerning the temple of Jupiter Stator creates a smooth transition into the next entry that will address the dedication of the temple of Quirinus, whom earlier in the *Fasti* Ovid identifies as

¹⁰²⁴ This temple, however, is that of the *Lares Augusti* and one which Augustus claims to have rebuilt (*RG* 19). Curiously, Ovid makes no mention of this, attributing its (re)construction to an unspecified plural subject (*tulerunt* 6.791). The recovered base of the statue bears the inscription *laribus publicis* (*C.I.L.* 6.456). For its location and history see Richardson (1990) 232, who places it near the arch of Titus in the Forum, and Littlewood (2006) 227-8.

¹⁰²⁵ Deglassi (1963) 474, citing the *Fasti Antiates Maiores* as saying *Lar(ibus)*.

¹⁰²⁶ Deglassi (1963) 474. See also Richardson (1990) 224 for the construction of the temple of Jupiter Stator.

the deified Romulus (2.475-76). Finally, the epithet Stator or “Stayer” emphasizes Jupiter’s role as a protective Roman god whose roots run deep.¹⁰²⁷ Even as Ovid’s poetic calendar is about to run its course, it is comforting to see Jupiter Stator and be reminded of his eternal presence.

The poem’s final extant entry on June 30th is laden with closural motifs and Barchiesi, Newlands, and Littlewood discuss the many ways in which Ovid provides resolution out of previous instances of disharmony.¹⁰²⁸ The one of greatest interest to us here is the capitulation of Juno to Hercules. We have already seen in the month’s proem that Juventas, Juno’s daughter and adversary for the month’s naming rights, self-identifies as the wife of Hercules (6.65 and 6.78). Further, Hercules again thwarts Juno’s plans on the Matralia, where his mere presence saves Ino and Melicertes from being mauled by a group of angry Bacchants, who were incensed by the words of a disguised Juno (6.507-24). In this final entry Ovid pays homage to the temple of Hercules and Muses, another conspicuous example of divine sharing, and Juno is forced to step aside in favor of divine harmony: *dicite, Pierides, quis vos addixerit isti / cui dedit invitas victa noverca manus* (“Tell (me), O Muses, who placed you alongside that one whose conquered step-mother unwillingly surrendered?” 6.799-800). The poem’s final mention of Juno problematizes her identity by referring to her solely as Hercules’ step-mother, which serves as a reformulation of Juventas’ earlier desire to view herself principally as Hercules’ wife.¹⁰²⁹ At the same time, the mention of Hercules and his (wicked) stepmother Juno reminds the reader of their joint presence

¹⁰²⁷ Cf. Cic. *Cat.* 1.10-11 where Cicero simultaneously tells Catiline to leave the city posthaste, while paying homage “to Jupiter Stator, the most ancient protector of this city” (*Iovi Statori, antiquissimo custodi huius urbis*).

¹⁰²⁸ Barchiesi (1997b) 203-07, Newlands (1995) 212-24, Littlewood (2006) 232-33.

¹⁰²⁹ Cf. Barchiesi (1997b) 205 n. 47 who also notes the parallelism with Prop. 4.9.71-72: *sancte pater salve, cui iam fauet aspera Iuno: / sancte, uelis libro dexter inesse meo* (“Hail, sacred father, to whom bitter Juno now shows favor; sacred one, may you be favorable towards this book of mine”).

on the Matralia and Hercules' defense of the 'good' step-mother Ino, thereby further shifting the balance in Hercules' favor. Of course, being referred to as Hercules' step-mother is something that Juno herself would never endorse and the manner of her capitulation to Hercules is thus itself couched in reluctant terms. She is described as *victa* ("conquered" 6.800), the same word Juno uses in the proem to describe her loss in the contest of beauty (*forma...victa mea est* 6.44). In addition, the fact that she is *victa* creates a polarization between her and Jupiter *invictus*, whose temple dedication had been celebrated earlier on the Ides of June (6.650). She is also referred to as reluctantly (*invitas* 6.800) yielding to Hercules, which again takes us back to the proem of book 6, where Juventas claims that she would not remain in the celestial realm against her mother's wishes (*invita matre* 6.68). The irony is that Hercules here is depicted as a divine figure, worshipped alongside the Muses, having earned for himself a place in the Roman pantheon.¹⁰³⁰

The presence of Juno's *invitas...manus* at 6.800 also brings the reader back to April 20th, the day on which the constellation of Taurus comes into view. There, Ovid is unsure of whether the image in the sky is that of Io as a cow (*vacca* 4.717), the shape into which Jupiter had transformed her in order to conceal his affair from Juno,¹⁰³¹ or that of the bull (*taurus* 4.717), into which Jupiter had transformed himself when he abducted Europa.¹⁰³² Either way, as Ovid tells us, the constellation reminds Juno of Jupiter's affairs: *seu tamen est taurus sive est hoc femina signum / Iunone invita munus amoris habet* ("However, whether this constellation is the bull or the female (cow), it designates the gift of love against Juno's will" 4.719-20). The completely spondaic form of *Iunone invita*, which comprises the entire first half of the

¹⁰³⁰ For Hercules as a figure of Roman cult see Wissowa (1912) 271-84.

¹⁰³¹ See *Met.* 1.588-746.

¹⁰³² See *Met.* 2.836-75.

pentameter, emphasizes Juno's opposition to the existence of this perpetual reminder of Jupiter's infidelity.¹⁰³³ At the same time, the bull is even further tethered to Jupiter when we are told that it consists of a more substantial sacrifice than the aforementioned ram: *egresso victima maior adest* ("A greater sacrificial victim is present once [the ram] has departed" 4.716). This may remind us yet again of the initial couplet that describes Juno's control over the Kalends and Jupiter's over the Ides (1.55-56). For there the pentameter reads: *Idibus alba Iovi grandior agna cadit* ("A greater white lamb falls to Jove on the Ides" 1.56). Although the rising of the constellation Taurus does not occur on the Ides, we are perhaps meant to associate the sacrifice of this larger bull with Jupiter, implying that the lesser sacrifice is thus reserved for Juno.¹⁰³⁴

The story of Jupiter's abduction of Europa is told in more detail on the day before the Ides of May (5.603-20). Although Ovid there expresses a similar uncertainty as to whether the constellation represents Io the cow or Jupiter as a bull (5.620), he treats it rather definitively as the latter, assigning the aforementioned uncertainty to a group of others (*alii* 5.619). According to Ovid, the bull arrives in the sky at precisely the moment when Jupiter resumes his anthropomorphic form and proceeds to rape Europa (5.616-17), indelibly melding the two events. Although Juno is not mentioned in the telling of this story, the earlier phrase *Iunone invita* now takes on a clearer meaning, given the simultaneity of the bull's catasterism and

¹⁰³³ The *invitas* of 6.800 has a similar force, as it concludes the first half of the pentameter with three consecutive spondees.

¹⁰³⁴ Fantham (1998) 226 notes, "the bull was the most important victim in the Roman sacrificial code." Hercules sacrifices a bull to Jupiter earlier on the Carmentalia (1.579).

Jupiter's penetration of Europa: *taurus init caelum: te, Sidoni, Iuppiter implet* ("The bull enters into the sky: Jupiter fills you, Sidonian [girl]" 5.617).¹⁰³⁵

Returning to *Fasti* 6, the final image of Juno's acquiescence in the form of Hercules' stepmother recalls language used at the end of Propertius book 4, the so-called "Roman" book of elegies, which served as a model for Ovid's *Fasti*:¹⁰³⁶ *sederit et nostro cauta nouerca toro, / coniugium, pueri, laudate et ferte paternum: / capta dabit uestris moribus illa manus* ("and [if] a wary stepmother sits on the bed that was mine, then, boys, praise and accept your father's marriage: won over, she will surrender to your niceties" Prop. 4.11.86-88).¹⁰³⁷ Although the scenarios are vastly different, the verbal parallels are numerous. In both cases a *noverca* is depicted in a state of surrendering (*dare...manus*). One could also connect Ovid's *victa* ("conquered") to Propertius' *capta* ("captured"), as both are aspects of military language.¹⁰³⁸ The irony is that the stepmother in Propertius is surrendering in a positive way, having been praised and accepted by her step-children and captivated by their good nature. That is clearly not the case with Juno, who only reluctantly relents to a figure, who a few days prior was depicted as again undermining her authority. Transitioning for a moment from the world of elegy to that of epic, we are reminded also of the deal struck between Jupiter and Juno in *Aen.* 12, wherein Jupiter makes the promise that the Trojans will mix their customs with the Latins, thereby prompting Juno to cease her anger once and for all (*Aen.* 12.791-842). But there she is shown

¹⁰³⁵ Murgatroyd (2005) 242 comments on the unusual expression *taurus init caelum*, stating, "now that Jupiter is obviously in the process of assaulting the heroine, *taurus init* ('the bull enters') might well have *puellam* 'the girl' as its object."

¹⁰³⁶ Barchiesi (1997b) 204.

¹⁰³⁷ Richardson (1977) 488-9 views *cauta* as straddling the line between the typical *saeva* stepmother and the typical *pudica* bride.

¹⁰³⁸ So too is the expression *dare manus* for the act of surrendering (*OLD* s.v. *manus* 9d).

nodding assent and happily changing her mind (*adnuit his Iuno et mentem laetata retorsit* 12.841). In the *Fasti*, however, it is Hercules and not Juno who nods assent (*adnuit Hercules* 6.812),¹⁰³⁹ and this image, coupled with his twanging of a lyre (*increpuitque lyram* 6.812), marks the final touch of the extant portion of Ovid's calendrical poem.¹⁰⁴⁰

Despite the closing harmony of the Muses, no mention is made of any reconciliation between the three goddesses who sought to attach their name to the month of June. No redemption is offered to Juno, who spent the majority of the month either in obscurity or failure. Perhaps Ovid really did believe his original assessment that the month of June derived its name from the *iuniores* or perhaps he saw an opportunity to exploit the inherently negative literary characterization of Juno. Another possibility is that a positive portrayal of Juno would not have furthered Ovid's Augustan agenda. Although no holidays associated with the Princeps are explicitly celebrated in book 6, the presence of Concordia in the proem, the attention lavished upon the Vestalia, and the signposting of Julius Caesar's Kalends all indicate a desire to embrace Augustan themes. Since Ovid himself tells us back in book 2 that Augustus did not restore the temple of Juno Sospita, it is only fitting that he downplay Juno's role in her own month. Jupiter, on the other hand, sheds nearly all aspects of his formerly mentioned improprieties and becomes

¹⁰³⁹ Barchiesi (1997b) 205 views this phrase as harkening back to the opening lines of the poem, where Ovid seeks the approval of Germanicus (*adnue conanti* 1.15), claiming, "the parallelism is a further tribute to the new prince."

¹⁰⁴⁰ For the employment of *increpuit* as closural motif that signifies divine guidance/approval see Littlewood (2006) 235. Barchiesi (1997b) 205-06 discusses the parallel poetic endings involving the lyre at Ov. *Am.* 3.15.17 and Hor. *C.* 4.15.1-2, saying of the *Fasti*'s conclusion, "Ovid ends on a note of quiet approval."

a bona fide Roman god,¹⁰⁴¹ eager to assist the Romans in their final stand against the Gauls, and elsewhere sporting the stately titles of *Invictus* and *Stator*.

X. Looking forward to September

Although Ovid confesses from exile that he had written books for all twelve months of his *Fasti* (*sex ego Fastorum scripsi totidemque libellos*, *Tr.* 2.549), no trace of the other six months has ever been found.¹⁰⁴² Pasco-Pranger in her book *Founding the Year: Ovid's Fasti and the Poetics of the Roman Calendar* devotes a chapter to speculating about what Ovid might have inserted into the month of July. Indeed, the *Fasti Antiates Maiores* and the *Fasti Antiates Minores* both record honors paid to Juno Felicitas on the Kalends of July, a celebration about which nothing further is known.¹⁰⁴³ Although readers of Ovid's *Fasti* no doubt long for all of the entries from the missing six months of July through December, two days in particular come to mind in relation to the figures of Jupiter and Juno. The first is the Kalends of September, on which day three temples were dedicated, one to Juno Regina, one to Jupiter Libertas, and one to Jupiter Tonans.¹⁰⁴⁴ A more ancient temple of Juno Regina, which had been originally dedicated

¹⁰⁴¹ The one exception being the allusion to his affair with Semele on the Matralia (6.485).

Recall, however, that the focus is not on their love affair, but rather on Semele's tragic death as the result of Jupiter's reluctant granting of her wish to see him in his true form.

¹⁰⁴² Barchiesi (1997b) 198 is adamant that *sex...totidemque* can only mean that he composed 12 books.

¹⁰⁴³ Degrassi (1963) 475 offers the following remarks, citing Wissowa's conclusion that this celebration acts as a placeholder of sorts for Juno who is worshipped on every Kalends: "Nihil de hoc sacro Iunonis aliunde comperimus. Supplementum autem, Wissowa (*Hermes*, LVIII, 1923, p. 387 sq.) proposuit, eo commendatur quod cadit in Kalendas, Iunonis sacras."

¹⁰⁴⁴ Degrassi (1963) 504. The dedication of the temple of Juno Regina on the Aventine is also mentioned by Augustus in his *Res Gestae* (19). See also Richardson (1990) 215-16. For the temple of Jupiter Libertas, which was stood near that of Juno Regina on the Aventine, see Richardson (1990) 221. For the temple of Jupiter Tonans on the Capitoline, see Richardson (1990) 226-27.

on that day by Marcus Furius Camillus, was restored and rededicated by Augustus on that very same day.¹⁰⁴⁵ We witnessed a similar situation on Jan. 16th in the *Fasti* with regard to the temple of Concord, which Camillus had originally dedicated and which Ovid tells us Tiberius and his mother Livia rededicated on January 16th in the wake of Tiberius' conquests in Germania (*Fast.* 1.640-46). Of greater interest, however, is how Ovid would have reconciled Augustus' restoration of the ancient temple of Juno Regina on the Kalends of September with his statement on the Kalends of February that Augustus left the temple of Juno Sospita unrestored. Would Ovid have passed over this event entirely in favor of the two more prominent dedications to Jupiter? Surely the bulk of the entry would have been devoted to the cult of Jupiter Tonans, which we have seen was of particular interest to Augustus, and is evoked with frequency throughout the *Fasti*.¹⁰⁴⁶ One could scarcely conjure up a more provocative or arresting episode than Ovid's version of Augustus' experience in Cantabria when he was nearly struck by Jupiter's thunderbolt, which instead smote an adjacent slave, and thereafter devoted himself to this new cult.¹⁰⁴⁷ The significance of such an entry would carry even more weight, considering that Ovid would have written it from exile at a time when he conflated his own punishment with being struck by Augustus' thunderbolt. Alas, either Ovid's false truths or the ravages of time and chance have stripped us of such an entry.

September would have also been a very special month for Ovid's *Fasti* since it was the month in which Augustus was born. The date of his birth on Sept. 23rd most famously coincides with the rededication of the temple of Apollo Sosianus adjacent to the theatre of Marcellus.

¹⁰⁴⁵ Pasco-Pranger (2006) 180.

¹⁰⁴⁶ At least 4 times: 2.69, 4.585, 6.33, 6.349. With many additional mentions of Jove using his thunderbolt.

¹⁰⁴⁷ This story survives principally from Suetonius (*Aug.* 29).

However, as the epigraphic *Fasti* tell us, several other temples were also dedicated on this day in the early years of Augustus' Principate. Among these are temples of Jupiter Stator and Juno Regina, which were rededicated in the Porticus Octaviae in honor of Augustus' sister and her son Marcellus, whose tragic death prevented him from fulfilling his role as Augustus' heir.¹⁰⁴⁸ One might envision on this day an overwhelmed Ovid paying homage to the sheer multitude of deities whose temples had been rededicated under Augustus' auspices,¹⁰⁴⁹ perhaps similar in part to the way he begins the celebration of the Nones of the February, the day on which Augustus received the title *pater patriae*.¹⁰⁵⁰ At the same time, the juxtaposition of these temples at the site of the Porticus Octaviae might have provided Ovid with the incentive to once again compare Augustus and Livia to Jupiter and Juno, much as he had done on the entry for Jan. 16th (1.649-50) and throughout his exile poetry. Indeed, these two missing entries attest to just how many temple dedications occurred on a daily basis and how Ovid could not have realistically given each one its due. His selection of events is thus just as pivotal as the way he describes them or the context with which he surrounds them.

XI. Conclusions

We began by tracing the different ways in which ancient authors treated the Jupiter/Juno dynamic, going all the way back to Homer and his memorable account of Hera's duplicity and Zeus' resulting anger. Hesiod too had exposed the swings to which their relationship is subject

¹⁰⁴⁸ Degrassi (1963) 512. See also Pasco-Pranger (2006) 179.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Degrassi (1963) 512 remarks, "Etiam dedicationes aedium Martis, Neptuni, Apollinis, Iovis Statoris, Felicitatis in diem natalem Augusti incidentes ostendunt omnes has aedes ab Augusto aut imperante eo exstructas aut restitutas esse."

¹⁰⁵⁰ Particularly at *Fast.* 2.123-24: *deficit ingenium, maioraque viribus urgent: / haec mihi praecipuo est ore canenda dies* ("My genius fails, and a greater task puts strain upon my power: I must sing of this day with a special tongue").

by juxtaposing their happy marriage that produced several legitimate offspring with the illegitimate birth of Athena from Zeus and Hephaestus from Hera. The Hellenistic poets played a more elevated game by constantly defying expectations and putting the onus on the reader, rather than relying on canonical representations. Ennius and Vergil, both of whom undoubtedly looked to their Greek models for inspiration, were responsible for integrating many of the aforementioned characteristics of the pair into the scheme of Roman religion, creating alternative backstories and appropriating many of their prominent Greek traits for Roman purposes. For Vergil in particular, Jupiter was no longer lord of the sky, but rather lord protector of Rome, a title that was intended to reflect back upon Augustus, however positively or negatively one might choose to view that connection.¹⁰⁵¹ At the same time, Hera's hostility towards the Trojans and towards Hercules among the ancient Greek texts made Juno the perfect candidate to play the antagonist for Ennius' and Vergil's epics. She again serves as an antagonist for Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, but in an extremely different way. There, her major quarrel is no longer primarily with the Trojans or with Rome, but rather with Jupiter and his many affairs.

In Ovid's *Fasti* we witness the amalgamation of all of the aforementioned treatments, with the addition of calendrical considerations, such as that of the sanctity of the Kalends and Ides, as well as temple dedications. Add to this a more compelling Augustan resonance than even that of Vergil's *Aeneid* and we are left with an almost overwhelming set of guidelines by which we are meant to assess Ovid's treatment of these two deities.¹⁰⁵² Ovid places them side-by-side

¹⁰⁵¹ Again, see Hejduk (2020) 59 for her view that "Virgil intentionally pulls our emotions in opposite directions, creating stark, unresolvable polarities...Jupiter is a focal point for this polarity."

¹⁰⁵² For Ovid prefaces his work by explicitly telling Germanicus, and by extension the reader, to expect imperial celebrations (*sacra recognosces* 1.7 and *invenies...festa domestica* 1.9). See also Green (2004a) 34-36.

when he establishes the rules by which each month is governed (1.55-56), acknowledging that the larger sacrificial victim falls to Jupiter (*grandior agna* 1.56). On the Kalends of February, the day sacred to Juno, we have our first glimpse of Juno and Jupiter alongside one another in the form of temples. The temple of Juno Sospita, however, which was founded on this day (on the Palatine hill no less!), is no longer visible (2.55-58), and after devoting several lines of high complexity to Augustus' restoration of other temples (2.60-66), Ovid then transitions to the visible yet mysterious sacrifices conducted for both Jupiter Tonans and Jupiter Optimus Maximus (2.70-71). This passage, which gives a voice neither to Juno nor to Jupiter, sets the stage for their future interactions by calling attention to Juno's absence, reminding the reader of Augustus' restoration of other temples, and finishing with a set of two sacrifices to Jupiter, whose Augustan association is underscored through the presence of *Tonantem* (2.69).

Throughout the month of February we are witness to two more episodes involving Jupiter and Juno, both of which revolve around Jupiter's lust for a young naiad. First, the Callisto narrative (2.153-92) provides a condensed version of the same story in the *Met.* that downplays Jupiter's role as a narrative character, while emphasizing Juno's disdain for Jupiter's actions that result in the illegitimate birth of Arcas. The epigraphic Fasti are devoid of the mention of any festivals or temple dedications occurring on this day, making it Ovid's choice to tell the story of Callisto's transformation into the bear constellation in the wake of both the *pater patriae* episode (2.119-44) and the brief potential allusion to Ganymede vis-à-vis the partial visibility of the constellation Aquarius (2.145-46). The issue of purification is likely again at play, as Juno demands that the bear constellation never set in the ocean (2.191-92). On the Feralia we see Jupiter treading on familiar ground as he stalks the nymph Juturna, poised to rape her with the help of the other Naiads (2.585-96). The story acts as a precursor to book 12 of Vergil's *Aeneid*, where Juturna has already been raped by Jupiter, who in turn elevates her to chief of the river

nymphs (12.139-41). There, Juno treats Juturna with respect (on the surface at least), going so far as to overlook her affair with Jupiter, an act that does not apply to any of Juno's interactions with Jupiter's love interests in the Ovidian world. In the *Fasti*, however, through the assistance of Lara, her sister nymph, Juturna is able to evade Jupiter's pursuit by plunging into the water, thereby purifying herself and maintaining her virginity—at least until the events of the *Aeneid* unfold. Now it is Jupiter's turn to become enraged (*Iuppiter intumuit* 607), not at Juturna, but rather at Lara, both for disobeying his orders and for revealing his plans to Juno. The mock-epic setting and the frivolity of the brief Juturna episode gives way to the much more serious and macabre punishment of Lara, who is raped by Mercury on her way down to the underworld after having her tongue cut out by an angry Jupiter. Much in the way Hejduk describes Vergil's polarization of Jupiter's actions in the *Aeneid*, Ovid here pulls the reader's emotions in opposite directions within the course of a single narrative. The description of Jupiter's excessive love for Juturna (*inmodico Iuturnae...amore* 2.585) and his elegiac suffering (*tulit* 2.586) are transferred onto his victim, who employs her tongue excessively (*non usa modeste* 2.607) and undergoes a much more visceral suffering at the hands of Mercury (*vim parat hic* 2.613). Meanwhile, Juno is voiceless (as Lara herself becomes) and resembles her invisible temple that began the month, becoming another casualty of the many silenced voices of the *Fasti*, as observed by Denis Feeney.¹⁰⁵³

The Kalends of May, another day that ought to fall to Juno, is said to rise from Jove (*ab Iove surgat opus* 5.111), and we then hear of Jupiter's upbringing and the power that he acquires as the celestial ruler (*invicto nil Iove maius erat* 5.125). In addition to the many literary parallels that employ the motif of beginning with or rising from Jupiter, the phrase points back at a prayer

¹⁰⁵³ Feeney (1992).

uttered by Romulus that deliberately excludes Juno from the list of Roman tutelary deities (4.827-8). Thus Flora's story of Mars' birth in the next entry on the Floralia (5.229-60) can be viewed as an act of vengeance by Juno both against Jupiter and against her neglect as a Roman deity. Although the immediate cause of Juno's desire to give birth to Mars as a solo progenitor is Jupiter's parthenogenetic birth of Athena, we must also consider the prominent theme of the birth and rearing of Jupiter on the Kalends as well as the place Juno will forge for herself within the Roman pantheon through Mars' role as the father of Romulus, founder of Rome. All of these factors are at play within Flora's unparalleled story of how she fulfilled the role of co-parent to Mars. At the same time, Flora is noticeably worried about Jupiter's reaction (5.230 and 248) and alludes to Lara's previous punishment for not adequately restraining her tongue (*ter lingua retenta est* 5.247). This episode is yet another example of Ovid's innovative skill. For he took a story that has its roots in Hesiod's Theogony, adapted it to fit within the scope of his poetic calendar, assigned a new backstory with the involvement of Flora, and then connected it to various other episodes within his poem, making it appear as if it always belonged right where it is. Lastly, this unique story of Mars' birth serves as a nice setup for the arguments Juno will make in the proem of book 6 on behalf of her position and standing within the Roman calendar and within the Roman pantheon.

Juno's speech that begins book 6 is yet another testament to Ovid's ability to draw upon previous treatments, while simultaneously innovating. Even before the speech begins, Ovid appropriates the motif of the contest over the golden apple, first by applying an adjusted form of *praeteritio*, wherein he initially denies that the contenders before him are the same as those who judged the contest of Paris, only to overturn that denial with the admission that one of that group, namely Juno, is indeed present (6.15-17). He identifies her as the sister and wife of Jove (*sui germana mariti* 6.17) and recognizes her from her statue that stood "on the citadel of Jove" (*in*

arce Iovis 6.18). This acts as a precursor to one of Juno's primary arguments on behalf of her Roman affiliation, namely her relationship with Jupiter and the proximity of her temples to his (6.27-28, 6.33-34, 6.52). Ultimately, she is denied the right of giving her name to the month of June and prevented from successfully integrating into Ovid's calendar as a Roman deity.¹⁰⁵⁴

The entry devoted to the temple of Juno Moneta on the Kalends of June is written more as a warning against those who might grasp for kingship than as a celebration of a past event. Jupiter himself appears with the epithet *Capitolino* (6.186), the Capitoline is described as Jupiter's throne (*solii, Iuppiter alte, tui* 6.188), and the entry ends with the rising of the constellation Aquila, called "the bird of great Jove" (*praepes aduncta Iovis* 6.196). All of these mentions prime the reader for the story of Jupiter Pistor (6.349-94), in which, contrary to Livy's account, the Romans successfully stave off an attack from the Gauls by throwing their bread and demonstrating a resistance to famine. Like the story of Lara on Feralia and of Mars' birth on the Floralia, the story of Jupiter Pistor on the Vestalia is without parallel. Ovid includes the majority of the Roman tutelary gods, making Jupiter the leader, but one who heeds the advice of his underlings, a marked change from the totalitarian Jupiter in *Met.* 1. Juno, however, is left out, as is any mention of her sacred Geese and the role they played—according to Livy—in actually preventing the attack. This is followed by the episode presented on the Matralia, which depicts the fruitless actions of Juno against Ino and her son Melicertes, who are saved only by the chance appearance of Hercules, one of Juno/Hera's primary rivals. Juno's final appearance in the poem is both fleeting and anticlimactic, consisting of a reference to her as Hercules' step-mother, reluctantly endorsing his newfound alliance with the Muses (6.799-800), whose combined

¹⁰⁵⁴ Unlike Venus whom Ovid ultimately acknowledges presides over the month of April: *et vatem et mensem scis, Venus, esse tuos* ("Venus, you know that both the poet and the month (of April) belong to you" *Fast.* 4.14).

temple is then celebrated. Conversely, Jupiter performs yet another act that may be read as exemplifying his status as a leader when he is forced to strike down Aesculapius for reaching beyond his station and reanimating the dead Hippolytus (6.759-60).¹⁰⁵⁵ The mention of the temple of Jupiter Stator on June 27th, a day on which no temple dedication is attested in the epigraphic *Fasti*, speaks to Ovid's desire to close his poem with the image of Jupiter as a wholly Roman deity, similar to how we viewed him on the Kalends of January, when he stood guard upon the Capitoline hill and looked over nothing that was not Roman (1.85-86).

¹⁰⁵⁵ Akin to the consequences suffered by Manlius on the Kalends of June when he allegedly set his sights on kingship (6.185-90).

CONCLUSION

It has been my contention throughout this project to explore the broad array of considerations that Ovid drew upon in forging the complex figures of Jupiter and Juno within his poem on the Roman calendar and to show that many of these considerations serve to highlight a stark sense of polarity, both amongst the figures of Jupiter and Juno as individuals and as a collective pair. In so doing, I have relied principally on the text itself, drawing additional inspiration and guidance from the vast number of resources at my disposal, including but not limited to the many scholarly commentaries on Ovid's *Fasti* (both recent and old),¹⁰⁵⁶ the groundbreaking books of Denis Feeney, Alessandro Barchiesi, Carole Newlands, and J. F. Miller,¹⁰⁵⁷ and the numerous reference materials and articles that relate both directly and tangentially to the topics discussed herein. In order to achieve the aforementioned result with regard to the figures of Jupiter and Juno, Ovid engages with their rich and diverse mythological tradition, their central role in contemporary and historical Roman cult practices, their association with the imperial family, their extensive treatment amidst the Hellenic and Roman literary tradition, and their inextricable connection to the Roman calendar. All of these factors contribute to the constantly changing landscape of the *Fasti* from entry to entry that allows for the juxtaposition of noticeably incongruent personae of these two principal deities. At the same time, we often witness the reflection of multiple personae of these deities within a single entry or reference, causing the reader to do exactly what Ovid intended him/her to do, namely to consider each entry on its own right as a self-contained unit, while also acknowledging that each entry constitutes a piece of the larger, holistic poem, which examines what it means to be a Roman—the good, the bad, and the in-between.

¹⁰⁵⁶ See p. 12 of the introduction, esp. n. 28.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Feeney (1991), Newlands (1995), Barchiesi (1997a) and Miller (2009).

In the first chapter we saw how Saturnian Juno served as an early Roman adversary and how that episode acted not only as a reflection of events transpiring within the Roman calendar between deities who are supposed to have a symbiotic relationship in accordance with Roman cult, but also as an acknowledgement and reformulation of an Ennian and Vergilian episode that involve the temple of Janus and the gates of War (*Fast.* 1.265-76). Further, we saw how Ovid created an additional bridge between that episode in his *Fasti* and a conceptually similar yet thematically different episode in his *Met.* (14.781-92), where he exchanged Janus for Venus and a bloodless and peaceful victory for total annihilation. That episode in turn is contrasted with the benevolent portrayal of the cult figure Juno Lucina on the Kalends of March (*Fast.* 3.201-58), where Mars himself celebrates the Matronalia, a festival devoted to married women. There, he not only describes the events precipitating a resolution between the Sabines and Romans, the precise inverse of the events related by Janus on the Kalends of January, but places Juno, his mother, at its center. Here, we are meant to recall the bellicose Juno of book 1 and contrast her with the wholly Roman Juno Lucina, whose temple was founded on the Kalends of March and whose sole role is the production of life rather than its termination. In both of these episodes many different factors are play, not least of which is Ovid's choice of interlocutor. While Janus seeks to align himself with the Roman cause and to espouse notions of peace and harmony in opposition to the foreign and vengeful figure of Saturnian Juno, Mars seeks to embrace his connection with his mother Juno and to highlight her role as a goddess of brides and childbirth, albeit not entirely forsaking his predilection for martial language. Such scenarios inevitably lend themselves well to an inversion of generic exspectations, as Janus, the god of peace, is forced to take on a somewhat martial disposition, while Mars, the god of war, celebrates the absence of conflict and promotes female power.

Throughout the proem of book 6 (*Fast.* 6.21-64) we are met with a wide array of Junonian personae, as she attempts to convince Ovid that the month of June bears its name from her. There, we simultaneously witness Juno as a mythological, political, cult, and literary figure. In addition, many of her arguments are dependent upon actions that have taken place either elsewhere in the *Fasti* or in other literary and mythological traditions. The Juno that we see in this section of Ovid's *Fasti* is brutally self-aware and even threatens to revert back to the hostile Hellenic persona of Hera, should Ovid not side in her favor. At the same time, she reminds Ovid that she has already converted into a full-fledged Roman deity, citing her abandonment of her mythological ire towards the Romans, her historical endorsement of Roman's absorption of several local adversaries, her familial connection to the city of Rome vis-à-vis her son Mars and her grandson Romulus, and her well-established cult presence among the calendars of the neighboring Italic cities. All of this contributes to a prismatic portrayal of Juno that pits her former Trojan/Roman animosity against her contemporary role as Roman tutelary deity. Despite the fact that her claim appears to be the strongest amongst the three contenders, one of whom is her own daughter Juventas, Ovid, in the guise of a second Paris, refuses to grant her the honor of month, thus reactivating her Hellenic persona for the remainder of the month and the extant poem. We see this effect immediately on the Kalends of June, where the story of Carina and Janus takes precedence over the dedication of the temple of Juno Moneta. Not only does this allow Janus to once again exert his influence over his former foe, but the delayed dedication of the temple of Juno Moneta is devoid of its expected aitiological story, which is replaced by a condemnation of the subsequent actions of Marcus Manlius Capitolinus, which in turn serves as a warning for those who would seek to undermine the Republican ideals.

In the second chapter we offered an in-depth examination of the association of Jupiter and Augustus and a probe into the political forces at play within Ovid's *Fasti* from the

perspective of that association. After tracing that phenomenon back to Hellenistic practices and exploring the ways in which divine assimilation amongst the Romans was in many ways unique, we then dove into some of the earlier literary and archaeological evidence for the association of Jupiter and Augustus through the analysis of two of Horace's Odes (C. 1.12 and 3.5) and several coins dated to around the time of the battle of Actium in 31 B.C. Once we arrive at the poetry of Ovid, the Jupiter/Augustus dynamic for the first time in extant Roman literature becomes a running theme. Further, there is a noticeable progression between the composition of Ovid's *Met*, where Jupiter is merely endowed with Augustan features, and that of Ovid's exile poetry, where, for the most part, Augustus is wholly replaced by the ominous figure of Jupiter. The *Fasti*, whose composition no doubt extended into the period of Ovid's exile, is fascinatingly stuck somewhat in the middle of these, as its treatment of Jupiter and Augustus well shows. For at certain points in the *Fasti* the two are wholly intertwined, at other points they are tangentially associated, and at yet other points they appear to be wholly isolated from another. Yet, even in those instances when there are very few direct connections between the figures of Jupiter and Augustus, we cannot forget that the episodes in which each or both figures appear is part of a larger work that is intended to comment both on the religious as well as the imperial nature of the Roman calendar. What Ovid presents the reader with is thus a mixed bag of endearing and problematizing depictions of the Jupiter/Augustus dynamic, ranging from comic, to tragic, to elegiac, to epic, to didactic, to autobiographical.

Of great value to this chapter is Julia Hejduk's observation that Jupiter in the *Fasti* represents a "gentler" version of his counterpart in the *Met*.¹⁰⁵⁸ Although I do not wholly agree with that assertion, I do think that it has some merit and that it offers a good point of comparison.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Hejduk (2020) 255, 267.

For our first glimpse of Jupiter in the *Fasti* comes from Ovid's description of the inauguration of the consuls on the first of January (*Fast.* 1.85-86). There, Jupiter is shown perched high atop the Capitoline hill, much like his sacred bird, the eagle, gazing far and wide over the vast Roman empire. As an eagle, although he is merely watching and gazing (*spectet...tueatur*), he nevertheless appears poised to strike, should the need arise. And throughout the *Fasti* the need does occasionally arise for Jupiter to assert his power and use his thunderbolt. In contrast to this initial awe-inspiring image of mighty Jupiter, we soon encounter Janus comically describing an earlier, primitive version of the cult statue of Jupiter in a so called *angusta...aede* ("cramped temple" 1.201) that bears a thunderbolt made out of clay (*fictile fulmen* 1.202). This immediately invites comparison with the much more illustrious contemporary statue of Jupiter that no doubt gripped a thunderbolt of gold. Janus then asks Ovid and the reader to weigh the simplicity of the past against the decadence of the present, and one is forced to consider the benefit of an armed versus an unarmed Jupiter. On the Kalends of March, we hear the story of Jupiter Elicius and how Numa successfully tamed the wrath of Jupiter's thunderbolt (3.285-372). On the day honoring Veiovis (3.429-48) or "little Jove" Jupiter does not yet have any weapons. In the proem of book five we hear Polyhymnia tell of the war between the Olympians and the Giants (5.35-47), in which the former were able to procure victory and elevate the deity Maiestas as a result of the power of Jupiter's thunderbolt. On the 20th of May Mercury relates the story of how Jupiter hurled a thunderbolt to save his son Pollux from imminent death (5.693-720). Not only is Jupiter's thunderbolt said to have barely affected its target, but its role in disarming Pollux's adversary is flat out denied (5.713-14). This seems to have been a case where throwing the thunderbolt was not only unnecessary, but unwelcome. Lastly, on June 21st we hear of Jupiter deliberately hurling his thunderbolt to smite Aesculapius, who had succeeded in bringing Hippolytus back to life. Whether one sees in this a Jupiter who is attempting to preserve his own

power or a Jupiter who is acting on behalf of the public good by preserving the statusquo, it is hard not to think of Ovid's own situation and his unfair banishment at the hands of an autocratic leader with unlimited power.

Throughout the poem we see many different sides of Jupiter that weave back and forth between the stately and the elegiac. Our two direct comparisons between Augustus and Jupiter occur on the Ides of January, where the title of *summus Iuppiter* is likened to that of *aug-ustus*, and on the Nones of February, where both bear the title of *pater patriae*. These two entries involve seemingly fulsome panygeric, yet are juxtaposed with other entries that may cause the reader to reconsider the relationship between Jupiter and Augustus. One such potentially damaging juxtaposition is that of the *pater patriae* passage and the mention of the constellation of Aquarius (2.145-46), recycled from the previous book (1.651-52), in which Ovid alludes to the Trojan prince Ganymede, who was notoriously raped and abducted by Jupiter in the form of an eagle. The episode that immediately follows stems from Jupiter's rape of the nymph Callisto, a scenario that does not meld well with the contrast a few lines earlier between Romulus the rapist and Augustus, protector of chaste women (2.139). On the Kalends of May, Ovid juxtaposes the story of Jupiter's birth and ascent to power with Augustus' elevation of the new cult of the Lares (1.111-46). Not only does the mention of the Lares harken back to the episode of the Feralia and the unsettling story of their birth when their mother, Lara, rendered mute by Jupiter, was raped by Mercury on her way down to the underworld, but it also reminds the reader of Augustus' reformulation of the more ancient cult of the *Lares Praestites*. On the one hand, Augustus is seen as doing a service for the people by instituting this new cult, just as Jupiter rewarded with catasterization Amalthea, his nurse, and the horn of the goat that provided him with nourishment. On the other hand, there is also a bit of nostalgia for the past, just as there was for the era before the Jupiter and the Olympians defeated the Titans, at a time when Maiestas had

already established a period of divine harmony. Thus Ovid continuously embeds a number of nuances and subtleties into many of his references to Jupiter in the *Fasti*, especially those that either directly or indirectly reflect back on Augustus.

We come finally to Ovid's treatment of the collective pair of Jupiter and Juno in the *Fasti*. It is notable that a significant number of the appearances of the two are presented in the form of temple dedications. Although the gods themselves are deprived of a voice of their own on these occasions, Ovid nevertheless speaks on their behalf through his choice of which temples to celebrate, when to celebrate them within a given entry,¹⁰⁵⁹ and with which tone and context to celebrate them. All of these factors transcend the mere mention of these dedications within the epigraphic *Fasti*, if, indeed, they are noted there at all. That several of the episodes involving Jupiter and Juno are Ovid's own invention further highlights the ways in which he intended his depiction of them to be unique. At the same time, however, he is clearly relying on accounts of his predecessors, such as when he rewrites Vergil's account of Juturna's godhood or when he appropriates Hesiod's story of Hephaestus' parthenogenetic birth by Hera in his account of Mars' birth, adding in the character of Flora, not only as the source of the story, but also as its catalyst. In other cases, such as with the Callisto narrative, Ovid shortens his own longer account from the *Met.* and exacerbates the role of both Juno and Callisto as victims by depriving the reader of an anthropomorphic Jupiter and focusing instead on the suffering that results from his actions.

The two figures are constantly brought together, only to be wrenched further apart. The perfect example of this dynamic is Juno's speech in the proem of June, where she consistently invokes her intimate connection to Jupiter, as his sister, his wife, co-offspring of Saturn, and as a

¹⁰⁵⁹ Or even the entry itself, such as with the temple of Jupiter Stator.

Roman figure who shares adjacent temples with him. Yet, Ovid denies her both naming rights over the month and the privilege of being recognized as a purely Roman deity in the way Jupiter is. Instead, Ovid takes a page out of the Homeric playbook by driving them further apart, but doing so in a subtle way, characteristic of the Hellenistic poets. Perhaps Ennius is Ovid's most useful exemplum for the clever deployment of cult epithets that offer more than one interpretation.¹⁰⁶⁰ The temple of Juno Sospita (2.56) is not *sospita* or "preserved," the temple of Jupiter Tonans (2.69) exerts its presence with thunder and forecasts foul weather, the temple of Juno Moneta (6.183) is followed by a warning of a different sort with Manlius' punishment, and the temple of Jupiter Stator (6.793) at the work's end emphasizes that the god is here to stay as a protective divinity on Rome's behalf. Although the reader is deprived of the multitude of temple dedications that would no doubt have graced a sizable portion of the absent second half of Ovid's poetic calendar, those dedications that the epigraphic *fasti* record for temples of both Jupiter and Juno on the Kalends of Sept. and on Sept. 23rd, the day on which Augustus was born, are particularly tantalizing for this study.

James O'Hara in writing about Ovid's interaction with Vergilian wordplay calls him "Vergil's best reader?"¹⁰⁶¹ This is an apt characterization also for the way in which Ovid appropriates and manipulates Vergil's overarching portrayal of Juno as the *Aeneid*'s antagonist and Jupiter as the regal arbiter. Although the *Fasti* is devoid of any mutual exchange between the Jupiter and Juno,¹⁰⁶² Ovid manages to create a world where divine hostility exists in the midst of imperial greatness. While Vergil's *Aeneid* presents Juno as a figure who reluctantly relinquishes

¹⁰⁶⁰ See n. 786 above.

¹⁰⁶¹ O'Hara (1996).

¹⁰⁶² Juno does address Jupiter directly within the Callisto narrative (*Fast.* 2.180), but he does not reply, since he is not a character within that episode.

her anger towards the Trojan race in exchange for the promise that they will absorb Latin customs, Ovid's *Fasti* presents her a figure who wishes to be absorbed into the Roman pantheon and is more than willing to overlook past instances of historical and literary hostility in order to achieve that goal. Meanwhile, Jupiter is portrayed as a god who, although still subject to his base desires, functions as a microcosm of Augustan power. In that sense, Ovid has taken the general mold of Vergil's characters and thrust them into the Augustan age, where many new considerations are at play. Hercules is no longer merely Juno's nemesis, but he is also the wife of Juventas and a companion of the Muses. Jupiter is no longer cloud-gathering Zeus, but is Jupiter Tonans, Jupiter Invictus, Jupiter Pistor, and Jupiter Stator, all of which depict him in a Roman/Augustan light. Juno, on the other hand, although given the epithets Sospita and Lucina at various points in the poem, still struggles to overcome her Greek identity and in the end fails to adapt to the new Augustan regime.

The question of where Juno fits within this new political landscape is a critical one. Juno no doubt continues to serve as a prominent religious figure well into the Principate, but she is never wholly integrated into the Augustan pantheon like Jupiter, Vesta, Diana, and especially Apollo, as evidenced by her conspicuous absence from Horace's *Carmen Saeculare*.¹⁰⁶³ Nappa,

¹⁰⁶³ Although the focus of this hymn is on Apollo and Diana, Jupiter is twice mentioned (*Saec.* 32 and 73), while Juno's role as Lucina, goddess of childbirth, is displaced by the more ancient Greek goddess Eileithyia (*Saec.* 13-16). See Thomas (2011) 67-8 for Eileithyia's connections to Apollo and for Horace's deliberate blurring of the separate sacrifices offered during the *ludi* to Eileithyia at night and Juno Regina by day. The fact that the celebration of these *ludi* included the date of June 1st, the day sacred to Juno and the day on which the temple of Juno Moneta was consecrated, makes Juno's absence from the hymn even more conspicuous [especially since sacrifices to her are noted in the *Acta* (see Thomas [2011] 53-7)]. Although Thomas (2011) 58 associates the *di* of *Saec.* 45 and 46 with Jupiter and Juno, he does not substantiate this claim *ad loc.*, and even if it does reference that divine pair, the name of Juno is still left out. Lowrie (2009) 138 also acknowledges this issue, remarking upon the "poem's great conundrum: the

who acknowledges the religious scrutiny to which Ovid's *Fasti* has been subjected, is right to point out that religion is "often seen as standing in tension rather than in tandem with poetics and politics."¹⁰⁶⁴ In the case of Jupiter and Juno, who can never be wholly stripped of their underlying religious tones, the intersection of poetics and politics serves to complicate rather than resolve the multitude of discrepancies that have been explored by so many of Ovid's predecessors. For what is Ovid's *Fasti*, if not a microcosm for polarity—in terms of its underlying theme of *arae* and *arma*, in terms of its often flippant or ironic treatment of serious religious matters, and even in terms of the consideration paid to it by modern scholarship. Where some see a scattered litany of religious factoids,¹⁰⁶⁵ others see a polished literary work.¹⁰⁶⁶ Where some see a genuine work of Augustan praise,¹⁰⁶⁷ others see a potentially subversive text that bends in either direction according to the reader.¹⁰⁶⁸ Still others prefer to eschew the more subjective issue of Ovid's political motives in favor of the more concrete and identifiable features of his poetic techniques and literary influence.¹⁰⁶⁹ It is a poem that is naturally endowed with polarity in its very undertaking—turning a list of bland and unadorned epigraphic calendrical entries into a colorful pinwheel that rotates back and forth between imperialism and republicanism, but ever nationalistic. At its absolute core, the *Fasti* is a Roman poem, espousing Roman ideals. And what better way to promote Roman ideals than to put them up against a Greek backdrop. Thus

failure to name the Capitoline deities Jupiter and Juno as addresses." See also Miller (2009) 253-97 for a discussion of the *CS*'s preferential treatment of Apollo and Diana at the expense of Jupiter and Juno.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Nappa (2020) 426-27.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Fränkel (1945).

¹⁰⁶⁶ The majority opinion today. For the general change in assessment see Miller (1992a).

¹⁰⁶⁷ McKeown (1984), Herbert-Brown (1994), and Fantham (1995).

¹⁰⁶⁸ Hinds (1992b), Feeney (1992), Newlands (1995), and Barchiesi (1997a).

¹⁰⁶⁹ Miller (1982), (1991), (1992b), and (2002a).

Ovid presents the reader with many different shades of the deities Jupiter and Juno, ultimately creating an image of the pair that simultaneously acknowledges their literary history, while superimposing their Augustan relevance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BMCRE = H. Mattingly *et al.*, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, London, 1923-75.

GRF = H. Funaioli, *Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1907; repr. Stuttgart, 1969).

RE = A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, and W. Kroll (eds.), *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart 1893–2000.

Adkins, L. and R. A. Adkins (1996). *Dictionary of Roman Religion*, New York.

Amerasinghe, C. W. (1953). "Saturnia Juno: Its Significance in the *Aeneid*," *Greece and Rome* 22: 61-69.

Anderson, W. S. (1958). "Juno and Saturn in the *Aeneid*," *SPh* 55: 519-32.

——— (1997). *Ovid's Metamorphoses Books 1-5*, Norman.

Baldwin, B. (1987). "Dating Manilius' *Astronomica*," *Maia* 39, 101-03.

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

——— (1997a). *The Poet and the Prince*, Berkeley.

——— (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.

——— (1999). "Venus' Masterplot: Ovid and the Homeric Hymns" in P. Hardie, A.

Barchiesi, and S. Hinds (eds.), *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception* (Cambridge): 112-26.

——— (2001). *Speaking volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*, London.

——— (2005). *Ovidio Metamorfosi. Volume I (Libri I-II)*, Milan.

- Barton, T. (1995). "Augustus and Capricorn: Astrological Polyvalency and Imperial Rhetoric," *JRS* 85, 33-51.
- Basanoff, V. (1945). *Evocatio*, Paris.
- Beard, M. (1987). "A Complex of Times: No More Sheep on Romulus' Birthday," *PCPhS* 33, 1-15.
- (2007). *The Roman Triumph*, Cambridge, MA. and London.
- Beard, M., J. North, and D. Price (eds.) (1998). *Religions of Rome*, 2 vols., Cambridge.
- Bispham, E. and C. Smith (2000). *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy: Evidence and Experience*, New York.
- Blank-Sangmeister, U. (1983). "Ovid und die Aitiologie des Juni in Fasti 6.1-100," *Latomus* 42: 332-49.
- Bömer, F. P. (1957-8). P. *Ovidius Naso: Die Fasten*, 2 vols., Heidelberg.
- (1986). *Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen, Buch XIV-XV.*, Heidelberg.
- Booth, J. (1991). *Ovid: Amores II*, Warminster.
- Boyd, B. W. (2000). "'Celabatur Auctor:' The Crisis of Authority and Narrative Patterning in Ovid 'Fasti' 5," *Phoenix* 54, 64-98.
- (ed.) (2002). *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, Leiden, Boston, Köln.
- Boyle, A. J. (2003). *Ovid and the Monuments: A Poet's Rome*, Bendigo, Victoria.
- Bretzghaimer, G. (1993). "Jupiter Tonans in Ovids Metamorphosen," *Gymnasium* 100, 19-74.
- Brookes, I. N. (1992). *A Literary Commentary on the Fifth Book of Ovid's Fasti*, PhD Dissertation, University of Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Bruun, P. (1972). "Evocatio deorum: Some Notes on the Romanization of Etruria," in H. Biezais (ed.), *The Myth of the State; based on papers read at the Symposium on Myth of the State held at Åbo, 68 September 1971* (Stockholm): 109-20.

- Burnett, A. (1983). Review Work(s): *Das Bild des Augustus auf den frühen Reichsprägungen. Studien zur Vergöttlichung des ersten Prinzeps* by Rainer Albert, *Gnomon*, 563-65.
- Cahoon, L. C. (1983). "Juno's Chaste Festival and Ovid's Wanton Loves: *Amores* 3.13," *CQ* 2, 1-8.
- Cairns, F. (1972). *Generic Composition in Greek and Latin Poetry*, Edinburgh.
- (ed.) (1986). *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar: Fifth Volume 1985*, Liverpool.
- Cancik, H., H. Schneider, C. F. Salazar, & D. E. Orton (2002). *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the ancient world*, Leiden.
- (ed.) (1986). *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar: Fifth Volume 1985*, Liverpool.
- Carter, J. B. (1902). *Epitheta deorum quae apud poetas latinos leguntur*, Leipzig.
- Chiu, A. (2016). *Ovid's Women of the Year: Narratives of Roman Identity in the Fasti*, Ann Arbor.
- Chrissanthos, S. G. (2019). *The Year of Julius and Caesar: 59 BC and the transformation of the Roman Republic*, Baltimore.
- Coffee, N. (2009). *The Commerce of War: Exchange and Social Order in Latin Epic*, Chicago.
- Cole S. (2013). *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*, Cambridge.
- Commager, S. (1995). *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*, Oklahoma.
- Conte, G. B. (1994). *Genres and Readers* (Trans. by Glenn W. Most), Baltimore.
- Corbeill, A. (2004). *Nature Embodied: Gesture in Ancient Rome*, Princeton and Oxford.
- Della Corte, F. (1983). "Giunone, come personaggio e come dea, in Virgilio," *Atene e Roma* 28, 21-30.
- Degrassi, A. (1963). *Inscriptiones Italiae*, vol. 13, Rome.
- Dolansky, F. (2011). "Reconsidering the Matronalia and Women's Rites," *CW* 104.2: 191-209.
- Douglas, E. M. (1913). "Juno Sospita of Lanuvium," *JRS* 3: 60-72.

- Drucker, M. (1977). *Der verbannte Dichter und der Kaiser-Gott: Studien zu Ovids späten Elegien*, (Diss. Heidelberg, 1977).
- Dumézil, G. (1966). *Archaic Roman Religion* (Trans. by P. Krapp), Chicago.
- (1970). *Camillus: A Study of Indo-European Religion as Roman History*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Edwards, C. (1993). *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge.
- Evans, E. C. (1939). *The Cults of the Sabine Territory*, New York.
- Fantham, E. (1983). "Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*: Sources and Motivation," *HSPH* 87, 185-216.
- (1986). "Ovid, Germanicus, and the Composition of the *Fasti*," *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5: 243-81.
- (1995a). "Rewriting and Rereading the *Fasti*: Augustus, Ovid, and recent Classical Scholarship," *Antichthon*, 29: 42-59.
- (1995b). "Review Article: Recent Readings of Ovid's *Fasti*," *CP* 90, 367-78.
- (1998). *Ovid: Fasti IV*, Cambridge.
- (2002). "The *Fasti* as a Source for Women's Participation in Roman Cult," in G. Herbert-Brown (ed.) *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium* (Oxford): 23-47.
- (2009). *Latin Poets and Italian Gods*, Toronto.
- Fears, J. R. (1981). "The Cult of Jupiter and Roman Imperial Ideology," *ANRW* 2/17/1, 3-141.
- Feeney, D. C. (1984). "The Reconciliations of Juno," *CQ* 34, 179-94.
- (1991). *The Gods in Epic*, Oxford.

- (1992). “*Si licet et fas est: Ovid’s Fasti and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate*” in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus* (Bristol), 1-25.
- (1998). *Literature and Religion at Rome: Culture, Contexts, and Beliefs*, Cambridge.
- (2004). *Interpreting Sacrificial Ritual in Roman Poetry: Disciplines and their Models*, in A. Barchiesi, J. Rüpke, and S. Stephens (eds.) *Rituals in Ink: A Conference on Religion and Literary Production in Ancient Rome held at Stanford University in February* (Stuttgart): 1-21.
- (2007). *Caesar’s Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Feldherr, A. (2010). *Playing Gods: Ovid’s Metamorphoses and the Politics of Fiction*, Princeton.
- Fisher, J. (2014). *The Annals of Quintus Ennius and the Italic Tradition*, Baltimore.
- Flower, H. I. (2017). *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, Princeton.
- Fox, M. (1996). *Roman Historical Myths: The Regal Period in Augustan Literature*, Oxford.
- Fratantuono, L. M. and R. A. Smith (2018). *Virgil. Aeneid 8*, Leiden.
- Frazer, J. G. (1929). *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*, 5 vols. edited with translation and commentary, London.
- Gaertner, J. F. (2005). *Ovid Epistulae ex Ponto, Book 1*, Oxford.
- Galinsky K. (1996). *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*, Princeton, NJ.
- Gee, E. (2000). *Ovid, Aratus and Augustus: Astronomy in Ovid’s Fasti*, Cambridge.
- Goldschmidt, N. (2013). *Shaggy Crowns: Ennius’ Annales and Virgil’s Aeneid*, Oxford.
- Goold, G. P. (1983). “The Cause of Ovid’s Exile,” *Illinois Classical Studies* 8, 94-107.
- Gradel, I. (2002). *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, Oxford.

- Green, S. J. (2001). "Docens Poeta: Development of the Interviewer's Skills in Ovid's *Fasti*," *Latomus* 60, 603-12.
- (2004a). *Ovid Fasti I: A Commentary*, Mnemosyne Supplement 251, Leiden.
- (2004b). "Playing with Marble: Monuments of the Caesars in Ovid's *Fasti*," *CQ* 54, 224-39.
- Gray-Fow, M. J. G. (1988). "The Wicked Stepmother in Roman Literature and History: An Evaluation," *Latomus* 47: 741-57.
- Grether, G. (1946). "Livia and the Roman Imperial Cult" *AJP* 67, 222-52.
- Gurval R. A. (1995). *Actium and Augustus: Politics and Emotions of Civil War*, Ann Arbor.
- Gustaffson, G. (1999). *Evocatio Deorum: Historical and Mythical Interpretations of Ritualised Conquests in the Expansion of Ancient Rome*, Uppsala.
- Hardie, P. (1989). *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*, Oxford.
- (1991). "The Janus Episode in Ovid's *Fasti*," *MD* 26, 47-64.
- (1992). "Augustan Poets and the Mutability of Rome" in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus* (Bristol), 59-82.
- (2002). *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*, Cambridge.
- (2004). *Ovidio: Metamorfosi. Volume VI (Libri XIII-XV)*, Milan.
- Harries, B. (1989). "Causation and the Authority of the Poet in Ovid's *Fasti*," *CQ* 39: 164-85.
- (1991). "Ovid and the Fabii: *Fasti* 2.193-474," *CQ* 41: 150-68.
- Harrison, S. J. (1991). *Vergil: Aeneid 10*, Oxford.
- Heinze, R. (1919). *Ovids elegische Erzählung*. Berichte der Sächsischen Akademie zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse, 71.7, Leipzig.
- Hejduk, J. D. (2009). "Jupiter's *Aeneid*: *Fama* and *Imperium*," *CA* 28, 279-327.
- (2011). "Epic Rapes in the *Fasti*," *CP* 106, 20-31.

- (2020). *The God of Rome: Jupiter in Augustan Poetry*, Oxford.
- Henzen, W. (1874). *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*, Berlin.
- Herbert-Brown, G. (1994). *Ovid and the Fasti: A Historical Study*, Oxford.
- (2009). “Fasti: The Poet, the Prince, and the Plebs,” in P. E Knox (ed.) *The Blackwell Companion to Ovid* (Oxford): 120-39.
- Hermans, R. (2012). “Juno Sospita: A Foreign Goddess through Roman Eyes,” in S. T. Roselaar (ed.) *Processes of Integration and Identity Formation in the Roman Republic* (Leiden): 327-36.
- Heyworth, S. J. (2018). “Editing and interpreting Ovid’s *Fasti*: text, date, form,” *ExClass* suppl. 10, 103-20.
- (2019). *Ovid Fasti: Book 3*, Cambridge.
- Hickson, F. V (1993). *Roman Prayer Language: Livy and the Aeneid of Vergil*, Stuttgart.
- Hinds, S. (1987). *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse*, Cambridge.
- (1988). “Generalizing about Ovid,” in A. J. Boyle (ed.), *The Imperial Muse*, 23-29, Victoria, Australia.
- (1992a). “Arma in Ovid’s *Fasti* – Part 1: Genre and Mannerism,” *Arethusa* 25, 81-112
- (1992b). “Arma in Ovid’s *Fasti* – Part 2: Genre, Romulean Rome, and Augustan Ideology,” *Arethusa* 25, 113-53.
- (2007). “Ovid among the Conspiracy Theorists” in S.J. Heyworth (ed.) *Classical Constructions* (Oxford), 194-220.
- Hirst, G. (1928). “Prologue to the Georgics,” *TAPA* 59, 19-32.
- Hopkinson, N. (1984). “Callimachus’ Hymn to Zeus,” *CQ* 34, 139-48.

- Horsfall, N. (1973). "Dido in the Light of History," *PVS* 12, 1-13.
- (2000). *Virgil, Aeneid 7. A Commentary*, Leiden.
- Houghton, L. B. P. (2007). "Tibullus' Underworld," *CQ* 57.1: 153-65.
- Howell, P. (1968). "Postis," *Philologus* 112: 132-35.
- Hunter, R. (1993). *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies*, Cambridge.
- Ingleheart, J. (2010). *A Commentary on Tristia 2*, Oxford.
- Johnson, P. J. (1997). "Ovid's Livia in Exile," *CW* 90, 403-20.
- (2008). *Ovid before Exile: Art and Punishment in the Metamorphoses*, Madison.
- Johnson, W. R. (1978). "The Desolation of the *Fasti*," *CJ* 74, 7-18.
- (1996). "The Rapes of Callisto," *CJ* 92, 9-24.
- Johnston, P. A. (2002). "The Anger of Juno in Vergil's *Aeneid*" in W. S. Anderson and L. N. Quartarone (eds.) *MLA Approaches to Vergil's Aeneid* (New York): 123-30.
- Keegan, P. M. (2002). "Seen, not Heard: *Feminea Lingua* in Ovid's *Fasti* and the Critical Gaze," in G. Herbert-Brown (ed.) *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium* (Oxford), 129-54.
- Keith, A. (1994). "*Corpus Eroticum*: Elegiac Poetics and Elegiac *Puellae* in Ovid's *Amores*," *CW* 88.1: 27-40.
- Kenney, E. J. (1969). 'Ovid and the Law', in C. M. Dawson and T. Cole (ed.), *Studies in Latin Poetry*: 241-66, Cambridge.
- (ed.) (1982). *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: Volume 2*, Cambridge.
- (2002). "Ovid's Language and Style," in Boyd, B.W. (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, Leiden, 27-89.
- King, R. J. (2006). *Desiring Rome: Male Subjectivity and Reading Ovid's Fasti*, Columbus, OH.

- Knox, P. E. (1986). "Adjectives in -osus and Latin Poetic Diction," *Glotta* 64.1: 90-101.
- (2004). "The Poetic and the Second Prince: Ovid in the Age of Tiberius," *MAAR* 49, 1-20.
- (ed.) (2006). *Oxford Readings Ovid*, Oxford.
- Koortbojian, M. (2013). *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, Cambridge.
- Kötze, M. (1991). *Weibliche Gottheiten in Ovids Fasten*, Frankfurt.
- Krasne, D. (2016). "Succeeding Succession: Cosmic and Earthly Succession in the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*," in L. Fulkerson and T. Stover (eds.) *Repeat Performances: Ovidian Repetition and the Metamorphoses* (Madison, WI), 125-53.
- Lenzi, S. (2015). *Giove e il potere della parola nelle Metamorfosi di Ovidio: Tradizione letteraria e realtà romana*, Padua.
- Lewis, N. (1985). *The Ides of March*, Sanibel, FL.
- Lieberg, G. (1969). "Iuno bei Ovid. Ein Beitrag zu Fasten 6.1-100," *Latomus* 28: 923-43.
- Littlewood, R. J. (2001). "Ovid among the Family Dead: The Roman Founder Legend and Augustan Iconography in Ovid's 'Feralia' and 'Lemuria'," *Latomus* 60, 916-35.
- (2006). *A Commentary on Ovid's Fasti, Book VI*, Oxford.
- Lively, G. (2011). *Ovid's 'Metamorphoses': A Reader's Guide*, London.
- Loehr, J. (1996). *Ovids Mehrfacherklärungen in der Tradition aitiologischen Dichtens*, Stuttgart and Leipzig.
- Lowrie, M. (2009). *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome*, Oxford.
- Maclardy, A. A. (1901). *The Aeneid of Virgil*, Princeton.
- MacKay, L. A. (1956). "Saturnia Iuno," *G&R* 3: 59-60.
- Maltby, R. (1991). *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Leeds.
- Martin, C. (1985). "A Reconsideration of Ovid's 'Fasti'," *Illinois Classical Studies* 10, 261-74.

- Martelli, F. (2013). *Ovid's Revisions: The Editor as Author*, Cambridge.
- Mazurek, E. F. (2010). "Debating Genre in Ovid's Proem to 'Fasti' 6," *Phoenix* 64: 128-47.
- McDonough, C. M. (1997). "Carna, Proca, and the Strix on the Kalends of June," *TAPA* 127, 315-44.
- (2004). "The Hag and the Household Gods: Silence, Speech, and the Family in Mid-February (Ovid *Fasti* 2.533-638)," *CPh* 99, 354-69.
- McGowan, M. M. (2009). *Ovid in Exile: Power and Poetic Redress in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto*, Leiden.
- McKeown, J. C. (ed.) (1989). *Ovid: Amores Vol. II. A commentary on Book One*, Leeds.
- Meadows, A. and J. Williams (2001). "Moneta and the Monuments: Coinage and Politics in Republican Rome," *JRS* 91: 27-49.
- Merkel, R. (1884). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*, Leipzig.
- Merli, E. (2000). *Arma canant alii: Materia epica e narrazione elegiac nei Fasti di Ovidio*, Firenze.
- Michels, A. K. (1967). *The Calendar of the Roman Republic*, Princeton.
- Miller, J. F. (1980). "Ritual Directions in Ovid's *Fasti*: Dramatic Hymns and Didactic Poetry," *CJ* 75: 204-14.
- (1982). "Callimachus and the Augustan Aetiological Elegy," *ANRW* 2.30.1: 371-417.
- (1983). "Ovid's Divine Interlocutors in the *Fasti*," in C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History III* (Brussels), Collection Latomus 180: 156-92.
- (1991). *Ovid's Elegaic Festivals*, Frankfurt.
- (1992a). "Introduction Research on Ovid's *Fasti*," *Arethusa* 25, 1-10.
- (1992b). "The *Fasti* and Hellenistic Didactic: Ovid's Variant Aetiologies" *Arethusa* 25, 11-31.

- (2002a). “The *Fasti*: Style, Structure and Time,” in Boyd, B.W. (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Ovid*, Leiden, 167-96.
- (2002b). “Ovid’s Liberalia” in G. Herbert-Brown (ed.), *Ovid’s Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*, Oxford, 199-224.
- (2004/2005). “Ovid and Augustan Apollo,” *Hermathena* 177/178, 165-80.
- (2009). *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*, Cambridge.
- Mommsen, T. (1996). *A History of Rome Under the Emperors* (Trans. by Clare Krojzl), New York.
- Montuschi, C. (2005). *Il tempo in Ovidio. Funzioni, meccanismi, strutture*, Firenze.
- Müller, D. (1987). “Ovid, Iuppiter, und Augustus. Gedanken zur Götterversammlung im ersten Buch der Metamorphosen,” *Philologus* 131, 270-88.
- Murgatroyd, P. (2003). “Ovid, *Fasti* 2.585-616 and Virgil, *Aeneid* 12,” *CQ* 53, 311-13.
- (2005). *Mythical and Legendary Narrative in Ovid’s Fasti*. *Mnemosyne* 263.
- Myers, K. S. (1994). *Ovid’s Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*, Ann Arbor.
- (2009). *Ovid: Metamorphoses Book XIV*, Cambridge.
- Newlands, C. E. (1992). “Ovid’s Narrator in the *Fasti*,” *Arethusa* 25, 33-54.
- (1995). *Playing with Time: Ovid and Ovid’s Fasti*, Ithaca.
- (1996). “Transgressive Acts: Ovid’s Treatment of the Ides of March,” *CP* 91, 320-38.
- (2000). “Connecting the Disconnected: Reading Ovid’s *Fasti*,” in Helen Morales and A. Sharrock (eds.) *Intratextuality* (Oxford), 171-202.
- (2002a). “*Mandati memores*: Political and Poetic Authority in the *Fasti*,” in P. Hardie (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* (Cambridge), 200-16.

- (2002b). “Contesting Time and Space: *Fasti* 6.637-48,” in G. Herbert-Brown (ed.) *Ovid’s Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium* (Oxford), 225-50.
- Newman, J. K and F. S. Newman (2015). *Troy’s Children: Lost Generations in Virgil’s Aeneid*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. and M. Hubbard (1970). *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I*, Oxford.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. and N. Rudd (2004). *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III*, Oxford.
- O’Brien, J.V. (1993). *The Transformation of Hera. A Study of Ritual, Hero, and the Goddess in the Iliad*. Lanham, MD.
- O’Bryhim, S. (1990). “Ovid’s Version of Callisto’s Punishment,” *Hermes* 118, 75-80.
- O’Hara, J. J. (1996). “Virgil’s Best Reader? Ovidian Commentary on Vergilian Etymological Wordplay,” *CJ* 91, 255-76.
- Orlin, E. (2010). *Foreign Cults in Rome: Creating a Roman Empire*, Oxford.
- Otis, B. (1966). *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, Cambridge.
- Pandey, N. B. (2018). “Caesar’s Comet, the Julian Star, and the Invention of Augustus,” *TAPA* 143, 405-49.
- (2018). *The Poetics of Power in Augustan Rome: Latin Poetic Responses to Early Imperial Iconography*, Cambridge.
- Parker, H. C. (1997). *Greek Gods in Italy in Ovid’s Fasti*, Lewiston, NY.
- (1999). “The Romanization of Ino,” *Latomus* 58, 336-47.
- Paschalis, S. (2010). “The Dioscuri in Pindar’s *Nemean* 10, Theocritus’ *Idyll* 22 and Ovid’s *Fasti* 5.693-720: Cattle, Brides, and Strife,” *First Drafts, CHS*, Harvard, 1-35
- Pasco-Pranger, M. (2000). “‘Vates Operosus’: Vatic Poetics and Antiquarianism in Ovid’s ‘Fasti,’” *CW* 93.3: 275-91.

- (2002). "Added Days: Calendrical poetics and the Julio-Claudian holidays,"
in G. Herbert-Brown (ed.), *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*, Oxford,
251-74.
- (2006). *Founding the Year: Ovid's Fasti and the Poetics of the Roman Calendar*,
Leiden.
- Peter, H. (1907). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*, Leipzig.
- Pettazzoni, R. (1940). "Carna," *Studi Etruschi* 14: 163-72.
- Pfeiffer, J. (1952). *Untersuchungen zur Komposition und Erzählungstechnik von Ovids Fasten*,
PhD Dissertation, Tübingen.
- Phillips, R. C. III (1992). "Roman Religion and Literary Study of Ovid's *Fasti*," *Arethusa*
25: 55-80.
- Porte, D. (1983). "La fleur d'Olène et la naissance du dieu Mars," *Latomus* 42, 877-84.
- (1985). *L'etiological religieuse dans les Fastes d'Ovide*, Paris.
- Prauscello, L. (2008). "Juno's Wrath Again: Some Virgilian Echoes in Ovid, *Met.* 3.253-315,"
CQ 58, 565-70.
- Purcell, N. (1986). "Livia and the Womanhood of Rome," *PCPhS* 32, 78-105.
- Renard, M. (1952). "Juno Covella," *Annuaire de l'institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Byzantines
et Slaves* 12: 401-08.
- (1953). "Aspects Anciens de Janus et de Junon," *Revue belge de Philologie et
d'Histoire* 31: 5-21.
- Richlin, A. (ed.) (1992). *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, New York.
- Robinson, M. (2007). "Ovid, the *Fasti* and the Stars," *BICS* 50, 129-59.
- (2011). *A Commentary on Ovid's Fasti, Book 2*, Oxford.
- Rudd, N. (1976). *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry*, Cambridge.

- Rüpke, J. (1994). "Ovids Kalenderkommentar: zur Gattung der libri Fastorum," *A&A* 40, 125-36.
- (2011). *The Roman Calendar from Numa to Constantine* (Trans. by D. M. B. Richardson), Malden, MA.
- Rutledge, E. (1980). "Ovid's Informants in the *Fasti* in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History II*, 322-31, Brussels.
- Ryberg, I. S. (1958). "Vergil's Golden Age," *TAPA* 89: 112-31.
- Salzman, M. R. (1998). "Deification in the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*," in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IX*, Brussels, 313-46.
- Santini, C. (1975). "Motivi Astronomici e Moduli Didattici Nei *Fasti* di Ovidio" *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 27, 1-26.
- Scheid, J. (1992). "Myth, Cult, and Reality in Ovid's *Fasti*," *PCPhS* 38, 118-31.
- Schiebe, M. W. (1986). "The Saturn of the *Aeneid*" *Vergilius* 32: 43-60.
- Scullard, H. H. (1981). *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*, Ithaca.
- Sear, D. R. (2000). *Roman Coins and their Values, Vol. I*, London.
- Segal, C. (2001). "Jupiter in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*," *Arion* 9, 78-99.
- Shields, E. L. (1926). *Juno: A Study in Early Roman Religion*, Northampton, MA.
- Simpson, C. J. (1991). "Livia and the Constitution of the Aedes Concordiae. The Evidence of Ovid *Fasti* I. 637ff.," *Historia* 40, 449-55.
- Skutsch, O. (ed). (1985). *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*, Oxford.
- Smith, R. A. (2006). "Books in Search of a Library: Ovid's 'Response' to Augustan 'Libertas'," *Vergilian Society* 52, 45-54.
- Stevens, S. A. (2015). *Callimachus: The Hymns*, Oxford.
- Skutsch, O. (ed). (1985). *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*, Oxford.
- Solodow J. B. (1988). *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Chapel Hill, N.C.

- Tarrant, R. J. (2012). *Virgil: Aeneid Book XII*, Cambridge.
- Taylor, L. R. (1923). *Local Cults in Etruria*, PMAAR 2, Rome.
- Thakur, S. (2014). “*Femina Princeps*: Livia in Ovid’s Poetry,” *EuGeSta* 4, 175-213.
- Thomas, R. F. (1986). “Vergil’s Georgics and the Art of Reference,” *HSCPh* 90, 171-98.
- (2011). *Horace: Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*, Cambridge.
- Thompson, D. L. (1981). “The Meetings of the Roman Senate on the Palatine,” *AJA* 85, 335-39.
- Thorton, A. (1976). *The Living Universe: Gods and Men in Vergil’s Aeneid*, Leiden.
- 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* (Leiden), 305-36.
- Toohy, P. (1996). *Epic Lessons: An Introduction to Ancient Didactic Poetry*, London.
- de Vaan, M. (2008). *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and Other Italic Languages*, Leiden.
- Volk, K. (2002). *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Ovid, Manilius*, Oxford.
- (2009). *Manilius and His Intellectual Background*, Oxford.
- Von Albrecht, M. (1981). *Ovide et ses lecteurs*, *REL* 59, 207-15.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1986). “Image and Authority in the Coinage of Augustus,” *JRS* 76, 66-87.
- (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- 30.
- Ward, M. M. (1933). “The Association of Augustus with Jupiter,” *SMSR* 9, 203-24.
- Warde Fowler, W. (1899). *The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic: An Introduction to the Study of the Religion of the Romans*, London.
- Weinstock, S. (1971). *Divus Julius*, Oxford.

- Wheeler, S. M. (1999). *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Philadelphia.
- (2000). *Narrative Dynamics in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Tübingen.
- Whitton, C. (2019). *The Arts of Imitation in Latin Prose: Pliny's Epistles/Quintilian in Brief*, Cambridge.
- Wickkiser, B. L. (1999). "Famous Last Words: "Putting Ovid's Sphragis Back into the Metamorphoses," *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 42, 113-42.
- Wilkins, J. (1988). "Ovid and the Erymanthian Bear," *Mnemosyne* 41, 378-81.
- Williams, F. (1977). "Gods and Gate-Crashing," *Mnemosyne* 30.3: 289-91.
- Williams, G. D. and A. D. Walker (eds.) (1997). *Ovid and Exile*, 2 vols. (*Ramus* 26.1-2), Berwick, Australia.
- Williams, R. D. (1973). *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books 7-12*, London.
- Wills, J. (1996). *Repetition in Latin Poetry*, Oxford.
- Wissowa, G. (1912). *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, Munich.
- Wolff, H. J. (1951). *Roman Law: An Historical Introduction*, Norman, OK.
- Woodman, A. J. and D. West (eds.) (1984). *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, Cambridge.
- Wright, H. W. (1917). *The Sacra Idulia in Ovid's Fasti: A Study of Ovid's Credibility in Regard to the Place and the Victim of this Sacrifice*. PhD Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Zanker, P. (1988). *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Ann Arbor, Mich.