7-13-2014

AUGUSTAN TRIUMPHS: DISHONORABLE LAURELS IN OVIDS AMORES AND METAMORPHOSES

Matthew Wilkens

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/fll_etds

Recommended Citation

Matthew C. Wilkens
_____
Candidate

Foreign Languages and Literatures
_____
Department

This thesis is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Thesis Committee:

Professor Osman Umurhan, Chairperson
_____

Professor Monica Cyrino
_____

Professor Lorenzo F. Garcia, Jr.
_____

AUGUSTAN TRIUMPHS:
DISHONORABLE LAURELS IN OVID'S *AMORES* AND
METAMORPHOSES

by

MATTHEW C. WILKENS

B.A., CLASSICAL STUDIES, RANDOLPH-MACON COLLEGE
2011

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts
Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

May 2014

Acknowledgments

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to the following people who were instrumental in completing this thesis. Without your support, encouragement, and belief in me, this project could not have been possible.

To my Thesis Committee, for your collective inspiration, and the countless hours dedicated to helping me achieve my goals. Your tireless dedication to your students and high standards as scholars and professionals serve as a paradigm I look up to and will strive to replicate in my own career.

To Dr. Osman Umurhan, my advisor, you pushed me to limits I never thought possible, and thank you for being there every step of the way. I could not have hoped for a more devoted advisor who would sacrifice so much of your own time and effort to guide every aspect of my thesis experience.

To Dr. Monica Cyrino, for your keen editorial eye and helping me transform my prose from "punchy" to polished. More importantly, thank you for taking a leap of faith. You saw potential and gave me the opportunity to achieve goals I never imagined.

To Dr. Lorenzo F. Garcia, Jr., for teaching me how to read a text and think outside of the box. You constantly helped me see the bigger picture and channeled my thought process in the right direction.

To Dr. Gregory Daugherty and Mrs. Daugherty, for inspiring my love for Classics, and having faith in me. Without you, I would never have been able to embark on this journey. I can only hope that I have merited your confidence.

To the Classics Cohort at the University of New Mexico, for your patience, understanding, and endurance. Thank you Scott, Jessie, Caley, Dan, Hong, Dannu, Sam, and Makaila for all your support, and a special thanks to Trigg for being the spur that goaded me to become a better graduate student.

Augustan Triumphs
Dishonorable Laurels in Ovid's *Amores* and *Metamorphoses*

By

Matthew C. Wilkens

B.A., Classical Studies, Randolph-Macon College, 2011
M.A., Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies, University of New Mexico 2014

Abstract

Over the course of an extraordinary life, Augustus amassed an unprecedented collection of honors and accolades for his service to Rome. The wealth of extant literature during his lifetime offers a rich opportunity to investigate the circumstances in which Augustus flourished. This project analyzes Ovid's *Amores* and *Metamophoses* to reveal the trajectory of intensifying criticisms aimed at specific accolades attributed to Augustus.

My thesis begins with an examination of Book 1 of the *Amores* and its representations of the triumphal procession in order to trace the foundations of Ovid's nuanced censure of Augustus's honors or "triumphs". Then, in chapter 2, I illuminate the culmination of these same critiques expressed in the *Metamorphoses*, where Ovid's disapproval becomes more explicit. This project demonstrates how Ovid manipulates Augustan iconography in order to present the achievements of Augustus as dishonorable.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Literature in Rome flourished throughout Augustus' rise and consolidation of sole

political authority, spanning his decisive victory at Actium in 31 BC to his death in 14

AD and beyond. Many authors during this period – Livy, Horace, Vergil, Propertius and,

especially, Ovid – experienced the brutality of civil war firsthand, its effects, and its end

under the leadership of Augustus. It is no surprise then that Augustus, his achievements,

and his honors became the material of much literary output, including the *princeps'*

autobiographical *Res Gestae*. This autobiography, which was posted on his mausoleum

for public viewing at Rome, declares the vast achievements and subsequent honors

accumulated during his service to Rome.[1] As he brings his extensive record of

accomplishments to a close, Augustus writes (for the years 28 and 27 BC):

> "After I had extinguished all civil wars, when I obtained control of all affairs by
> universal consent, I transferred the republic from my power to the control of the Senate
> and the Roman people. For my service, I was named Augustus by decree of the Senate
> and the door-posts of my house were publicly wrapped with laurel garlands and a civic
> crown was placed above my door and a golden shield was placed in the *curia Iulia*,
> which, as is attested by an inscription on this shield, was given to me by the Senate and
> the Roman people on account of my virtue, clemency, justice, and piety."[2]
>
> <div align="right">Augustus Res Gestae 34</div>

Augustus condenses into two brief sentences the result of several years of political

maneuvering and savage conflict. This is hardly a comprehensive picture and, therefore,

begs the question: what does the rest of the literary record during the tenure of Augustus

---

[1] Eck (2003) 2 points out that Augustus' text "provides a self portrait… as *he* [italics mine] wished himself and his achievements to be remembered." Eck also notes that the publication of the *Res Gestae* was not limited to Rome and its citizens, but was circulated throughout the entirety of the empire.

[2] Augustus *Res Gestae* 34. "…postquam bella civilia exstinxeram, per consensum universorum potitus rerum omnium, rem publicam ex mea potestate in senatus populique Romani arbitrium transtuli. Quo pro merito meo senatus consulto Augustus appellatus sum et laureis postes aedium mearum vestiti publice coronaque civica super ianuam meam fixa est et clupeus aureus in curia Iulia positus, quem mihi senatum populumque Romanum dare virtutis clementiaeque et iustitiae et pietatis caussa testatum est per eius clupei inscriptionem." Latin citation of the *Res Gestae* comes from Cooley (2009). All translations are my own unless otherwise cited.

offer concerning his deeds, achievements, and honors? Moreover, does the view of contemporary Roman authors coincide with that of the *princeps*?

The ancient sources and modern scholarship on the Augustan Age are vast. Sources include not only the variety of authors who composed in multiple genres (elegiac and epic), but also the wealth of art and architecture whose rare combination offers one of the most comprehensive views of Rome's evolution in a time of turmoil and chaos. Scholars, seduced by this abundance of ancient material, persistently attempt to refigure the feelings, attitudes, and emotions of Roman writers and their authorial intentions to better understand their motives for writing what and as they did. For example, one of the major trends of scholarship informing our understanding of Augustan Age literature attempts to categorize the intention of authors and their works as either "Augustan" or "anti-Augustan." Sir Ronald Syme's influential history, *The Roman Revolution* (1939), still remains a foundational text for the "anti-Augustan" approach. Using an array of ancient historians, Syme constructs a picture of a Roman world seized by the brutal and aggressive tactics of a calculating individual, Augustus.[3] Others follow in this vein, most notably Paul Zanker. In *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (1990) Zanker discusses the material culture of the age and the way Augustus deployed a complex web of visual imagery to promote and legitimize his ascension to sole authority in Rome. On the pro-"Augustan" side, and perhaps most ardently, Karl Galinsky (1996) illustrates the benevolent qualities of Augustus. By combining a wide variety of textual evidence alongside material culture, Galinsky argues for a Roman populace that heaps honors onto their savior out of respect and reverence, rather than fear and influence. Philip Hardie

---

[3] It is worthwhile to note that Syme composed his biography of Augustus during World War II, a period in which oppressive monarchies were abundant.

(2002) furthers the discussion by suggesting the poets of the age were in tune with the Principate and even played an integral part of the transformation process from civil war to peace. Hardie strives to look beyond the dominating literary figure of Augustus and focuses instead on the broader development of ideological narratives, especially in the works of Ovid as the final poetic voice of this era. Scholars on both sides of the "Augustan" and "anti-Augustan" debate utilize both the entirety of Augustan Age literature, as well as the unique contemporary environment of each individual author, to defend their classifications. Thus, it is not merely blatant "positive" or "negative" textual references that illuminate authorial intent, but rather the complex network of subtextual and intratextual correspondences combined with synchronous ancient material culture that influences modern perspectives on the Age of Augustus.

Nevertheless, the "anti-Augustan" and "Augustan" perspectives have faded from the forefront of discussion lately and have since been replaced by a new position that eliminates the previous exclusivity of reading authorial intent. Some current trends in Augustan scholarship do not attempt to categorize an author or an individual piece of literature into strict classifications, but these scholars aim instead to highlight how a single text can offer multiple readings and therefore focus on the reception of the text on the contemporary audience. Fredrick Ahl and Duncan Kennedy, for example, concentrate on "figured speech," or the way an author conceals his motives and leaves the interpretation in the hands of the audience. According to Ahl's 1984 article, "The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome," figured speech is a rhetorical device used by ancient authors to sidestep any direct statement of reproach, and allows the readers to come to their own logical conclusion by following the facts presented to them. Kennedy

(1992) reevaluates this position by analyzing the semiotics of language, or how the meaning of specific words and themes offer a unique interpretation for the contemporary audience. For example, the term "*Pax,*" or Peace, has a distinct connotation during the civil war, and then acquires a separate meaning following the consolidation of power under Augustus. We must, therefore, consider the specific terminology and the time period during which it is evoked.

This thesis aims to engage in the debate between "Augustan" and "anti-Augustan" readings of Augustan Age literature, while making use of the current trend of scholarship concentrating on the reception of a text. Using Ovid's *Amores* and *Metamorphoses*, I will argue that Ovid, well aware of the contemporary significance of major Augustan iconography, intentionally provokes a negative reception of the honorable achievements of Augustus. Although my reading does not intend to categorize Ovid as either "Augustan" or "anti-Augustan," I suggest a more nuanced analysis of Ovid's objections to specific elements of Augustan iconography. My analysis will focus on instances where Ovid brings specific symbols directly associated with Augustus into his poetic compositions in order to challenge the unprecedented and even unjustified honors accumulated by the *princeps*. The laurel wreath and his golden shield serve as two primary examples by which Ovid criticizes and challenges Augustus. These symbols help articulate the notion that as the honors of the *princeps* grow to unparalleled extents, so too does the audacity of Ovid's criticisms. It is not that Ovid is entirely "Augustan" or "anti- Augustan," but rather he is particularly opposed to the accumulation of such honors under false pretenses.

Over the course of this project, I will trace the gradually rising intensity of Ovid's criticisms beginning first in his elegiac collection, the *Amores*, and then culminating in his epic, the *Metamorphoses*. In fact, Ovid grew so bold in his accusations of the *princeps* and his various legislative reforms that the poet would be exiled in 8 AD. *Carmen et error*,[4] "a poem and a mistake," were the two charges Augustus levied against Ovid which led to his *relegatio*[5] at Tomis, a desolate province near the Black Sea on the extreme border of the empire. There was neither trial nor decree by the Senate, only the sole mandate by Augustus.[6] Although it is difficult to reconstruct the condemning evidence concerning the *error*, it has been argued by many, and even by Ovid himself, that his *carmen* was a major component of his punishment.[7] It is reasonable to believe, then, that examples exist embedded within Ovid's poetic corpus that offended the *princeps* in any number of ways. My project will locate these instances of offensive material and demonstrate that it was the poetic manipulation of Augustan achievements and honors, such as his legislative reforms and claims to a revitalized Golden Age, that incurred the wrath of *princeps*.

---

[4] Ovid *Tristia* 2.207. While Ovid provides an abundance of information on the *carmen*, he is relatively mute on the subject of the *error* because he does not want to reopen Augustus' fresh wounds (*Tristia* 2.209). See Tibault (1964) for a survey of the possibilities and Green (1982) for the political reasoning.

[5] It is important to point out that Augustus did not describe Ovid as an *exul* (exile)*,* but rather a *relegatus* (someone subject to banishment, but with the retention of status and property) (*Tristia* 2.133; 4.45; 5.7). This latter form of exile, *relegatio*, was milder in that Ovid's wealth and property were not confiscated, but harsher in that he could not leave his designated area.

[6] Ovid *Tristia* 2.131-134.

[7] Ovid addresses Augustus directly at *Tristia* 2.237-252 defending the *Ars Amatoria*, which was the *carmen* noted as the official cause of his downfall. He states that there is no crime (*nullum… crimen,* 240) in this text because of the disclaimer warning chaste women not to read this book (*Ars* 1.31-34). See Williams (2002) for an overview on scholarship concerning Ovid's exilic works.

The Manipulation of Augustan Iconography

As an example of Ovid's manipulation of Augustan iconography, let us consider briefly the triumphal procession, once an ancient Roman symbol of honorable victory, but later inextricably linked to Augustus in Ovid's own time. In fact, this was the highest honor a Roman citizen could enjoy while in office. Mary Beard's influential work, *The Roman Triumph* (2007), compiles literary representations of the Roman triumph throughout ancient Roman history and provides an in-depth reconstruction of the triumph's "standard" elements and practices.[8] Some key features include an extensive train of spoils, a long convoy of defeated enemies hanging their heads in shame, and the genuine exuberance of the Roman populace cheering on their conquering hero. The victorious general, wielding a laurel branch in one hand and an ivory scepter in the other, typically drives his four-horse chariot down the crowded urban streets arriving at the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, where sacrifices are made to the gods and the entire city feasts in celebration of the elimination of an external threat to Rome. If we consider this an accurate representation of the "standard" elements of the Roman triumph, as Beard suggests, we must take account of when and why an author such as Ovid strays from this paradigm.

Ovid composed descriptions of several triumphal processions during his career: yet it is most important to note that he adheres to the "standard" representation later in life while in exile, but drastically departs from it while composing freely in Rome earlier in his career. At the beginning of Ovid's elegiac career, he composed a mock triumphal procession that, as I argue in this thesis, highlights the ignoble characteristics associated

---

[8] Beard (2002) 81 provides the generally accepted order of ceremonies and states: "At the center of most modern discussions of the triumph… lies a generally agreed pictured of 'what happened' in the ceremony."

with the triumph in Ovid's day. Ovid deliberately strays from political and rhetorical convention and portrays the venerable procession as dishonorable, in that the victory is not over a worthy foreign enemy, but rather over an unwilling and defenseless opponent that bears no honor (*nec tibi laus, Amores* 1.2.22). In Ovid's telling, the spoils paraded in front of the populace are meager and do not provoke joyous cheers. Instead, the spectators only exalt the *triumphator* through fear (*omnia te metuent,* 1.2.33).

Contrary to this representation, Ovid while in exile composes another triumph. In *Tristia* 4.2, Ovid can only imagine what the triumph of Tiberius, the adopted son of Augustus, will look like, but nevertheless he provides a meticulous account of the procession. More importantly, this representation of a triumph coheres with the "standard" characteristics of the triumphal procession that were expressly absent from his previous elegiac portrayal. The elated crowd cheers at Tiberius' victory over the barbarous Germanic tribe, and his spoils of war are extensive and magnificent (*Tristia* 4.2.19-66). Indeed, the Roman spectators take extreme joy and pride in their *triumphator* and they express their honest loyalty: in this poem, Ovid attributes key terms of enjoyment to the Roman populace such as *laetetur* (15), *circumplaudere* (49), and *felix* (65), which illustrate his clear intention to praise this honorable victory celebration. These contrasting portrayals suggest that Ovid's initial depiction may have offended the last *triumphator,* Augustus, and he now must atone for his transgression while in exile.

The question arises: why does Ovid change his representation of the triumph and its iconography so drastically? My project demonstrates that Ovid engages in political dissidence from the very beginning of his career by manipulating the complex web of Augustan iconography in both his elegiac *Amores* and the epic *Metamorphoses*. Indeed,

the triumph and the laurel wreath, both synonymous with honorable victory, become

linked with Augustus after his triple triumph in 29 BC celebrating his victory in civil war.

At this time, the celebration of this venerable and ancient procession was essentially

limited to members of the imperial family. The laurel wreath that previously would only

adorn the *triumphator's* crown on the day of his triumphal celebration, now permanently

flanked the doors of Augustus' Palatine residence. I argue that Ovid takes offense to

Augustus' unmerited assumption of a revered Roman tradition and symbol, and uses his

poetry as a platform to articulate his displeasure of Augustus' ignoble deeds. At the

beginning, Ovid's critiques are restricted to elegy, a genre that posed no direct threat to

the Augustan program because of its ambivalent nature. Elegy sets it self apart from the

serious topics of Roman society and thus can disguise itself with its own seemingly trivial

tone. Ovid uses this genre to conceal the foundations of his criticisms, but once Ovid

takes up the writing of epic, he begins to challenge the honor of Augustus in a more

explicit manner.

Ovid's career begins in the genre of elegy, which was thriving at the end of the

first century BC. For his elegiac predecessors, such as Catullus and Tibullus, the prime

motif was erotic relationships and the frustrations that accrued to them. Elegy was

considered a *mollis* or "soft" not only because of its personal subject matter, but also

because it openly set itself in opposition to epic composition.[9] Rather than seek out war,

heroes, or the gods for their poetic material, these poets employed the stance of the

recusatio or "refusal" to refuse emphatically to engage with these issues because they

were totally concerned with their mistresses. Thus, when Ovid composed his first elegiac

collection, the *Amores*, he was ostensibly rejecting epic composition and the opportunity

---

[9] See Miller (2002) 4 for the comparison of *mollis* for elegy versus *durus* for epic.

to praise Augustus. Not only will Ovid abandon heroism and militaristic topics, but he will also reject major Augustan themes such as the *mos maiorum,* "the custom of the ancients," and political activity or *negotium.*

Indeed, the epic genre was considered the appropriate genre for the time because of its respected qualities and *durus,* or "serious," subject matter. Griffin points out that poetic composition during the Augustan Age could be extremely beneficial to the new regime, especially the epic genre, because poets could reaffirm the political program, as well as encourage support for a revival of ancient morality.[10] Epic could accomplish these goals not only because of its exalted status, but also because its material was based in generations of heroes and gods. It is no surprise, then, that Augustus desired an epic composition that would promote and justify his ascension to sole political authority, and Vergil was tasked to compose this panegyric.[11] His *Aeneid* follows the fated destiny of Aeneas, the founder of the Roman Empire, and masterfully weaves elements of the Augustan program into its narrative.[12] However, it is important to note that Vergil's works have also come under contemporary scholarly scrutiny, and veiled criticisms of the Augustan program in the *Aeneid* have been recognized.[13] Furthermore, due to the well-documented intertextual relationship between Ovid and Vergil,[14] it is reasonable to suggest that Ovid may have used the same techniques employed by Vergil, but that he

---

[10] See Griffin (2002) 306-319 for an overview of poetic activity in the Augustan Age, and especially 314-319 for the importance of epic in the establishment of the new regime.

[11] Galinsky (1996) 246-253 demonstrates how Vergil was in tune with the Augustan program, but also does not deny the multiple readings that can de deduced from the *Aeneid.*

[12] My brief reference to Vergil could be misleading in that I do not consider Vergil to be definitively "pro-Augustan." Scholars such as Kennedy (1992) and Johnson (1976) illuminate the difficulties in categorizing an author's, or even a text's, political agenda. Nevertheless, in reference to the specific argument about Ovid's choice of genre, I use Vergil as a counterpoint for the political implications of composing epic versus elegy.

[13] Johnson (1976) provides the foundation for reading a dissenting tone in the *Aeneid.*

[14] See Miller (2009) for an in-depth examination of the correspondences between Augustan Age poets and Augustus himself.

also may have intensified his objective of derision. When Ovid transitions into the epic genre later in his career in the *Metamorphoses*, he does not follow a single hero, but rather amasses a compendium of Greek and Roman mythologies that revolve around the theme of transformation. Ovid also imbues his epic with Augustan themes, but he does so with destabilizing intent. When Ovid composes in the more serious genre of epic, his criticism likewise takes on these same harsh, or *durus*, characteristics. My project analyzes specific examples of the "honorable victory" and its accouterments in both the *Amores* and *Metamorphoses* that highlight the poet's escalating opposition to Augustus and the honors amassed throughout his rise to power. What begin as veiled criticisms in the *Amores*, become overtly trenchant statements in the *Metamorphoses*.

Chapter One focuses on Ovid's *Amores*, a collection of elegiac poems composed in the initial years of his career. As mentioned above, the genre of elegy takes the rhetorical stance of opposing the serious aspects of Roman politics, and thus at this time elegy was seen to challenge Augustus' Principate because it exemplifies the poets' intentional refusal to praise the newly founded regime. Ovid uses the first two poems of the *Amores* (1.1 and 1.2) to establish the foundations of his criticisms against Augustus. I begin with an examination of the conflict between the poet and Cupid, the elegiac genre's patron, in *Amores* 1.1. I argue this encounter demonstrates that Ovid's decision to compose elegy was not voluntary, but rather imposed upon him by the *princeps* himself. Ovid simply cannot engage in the illustrious epic genre because the actions of Augustus are not worthy of the exalted strain. Furthermore, the figure of Cupid becomes Ovid's initial vehicle for criticism of Augustus' divine stature by means of the extended familial relationship shared by the deity and the *Divus Filius*. Then, I turn to the triumphal

procession in honor of Cupid's victory in *Amores* 1.2. In this poem, Ovid manipulates specific elements of the venerable procession in order to cast the Roman populace as captives who beg for mercy as the victorious deity rides by. This scene exhibits Ovid's perception of Rome as subject to Augustus, because instead of joyful celebration, the spectators exalt the *princeps* out of fear.

Finally, I analyze the origins of Ovid's fascination with transformation and metamorphosis in *Amores* 1.7. In the aftermath of a domestic dispute between his beloved and himself, Ovid describes the effect that the abuse has on his *puella*. On the one hand, her face is marred, and she trembles in fear; her physical characteristics are depicted as resembling natural objects, such as branches blowing in the wind or a white marble complexion. On the other hand, the specific terminology used in the poem points to the poet's arousal at the sight of the defeated and abused mistress, and he even celebrates a triumph for his victory over her. Here, Ovid parallels the poet's love for his maltreated mistress and Augustus' passion for a defeated Rome. Both revel in their dishonorable victory and celebrate their shameful actions without any indication of sympathy.

In Chapter Two, I turn to Ovid's epic composition, the *Metamorphoses*, where Ovid has moved away from the playful genre of elegy and now shifts into "serious" epic verse. Here his critiques of Augustan iconography become more explicit. My analysis concentrates on the first book of the *Metamorphoses* where Ovid challenges major Augustan claims, such as the revival of the Golden Age and the restoration of the Republic. Furthermore, Ovid brings the theme of transformation to fruition, but uses descriptions of various metamorphoses to undermine the accumulated honors of

Augustus, such as his acquisition of the venerable laurel wreath. Ovid's epic endeavor unveils the subtextual criticisms initiated in the *Amores* and brings them to the forefront in the Apollo and Daphne episode (*Metamorphoses* 1.452-567). The more audacious and unprecedented honors Augustus accumulates, the more explicit and critical of the *princeps* and his honorable achievements Ovid becomes.

By tracing Ovid's gradual intensification of challenges and criticisms directed at Augustus from the *Amores* to the *Metamorphoses*, I aim to contribute a more nuanced reading of Ovid's works, which have been classified as either "Augustan," "anti-Augustan," or neither. My analysis shows that Ovid's attitude was dependent on the various deeds of Augustus and the honors he accumulated over time. The challenges and criticisms aimed at Augustus suggest that Ovid was openly opposed to the hypocrisy of the *princeps*, but not necessarily opposed to the end of civil strife and chaos. While Ovid's tone constantly fluctuated according to the contemporary world he was living in, his work was always directed at the prime figure of authority in his world: Augustus.

Chapter One:
Challenging Triumphal Celebrations in the *Amores*

The Roman triumph is a celebration of military success marking the end of an external threat to Rome. A typical procession showcases biers overflowing with the spoils of war as joyous spectators gaze both in fascination and jubilation, while enemy captives stretch out their manacled hands and beg for clemency. The triumphant general follows this train in the *quadriga*, the four-horse chariot, garbed in the *toga triumphalis* and crowned with laurel. Then come the soldiers, marching behind their victorious leader and singing ribald songs at his expense. While the minor details of the procession may change, this formula itself remains consistent throughout Rome's history, and ancient authors have described both contemporary and past processions with remarkable uniformity. In the Introduction, I explained that my definition of the "standard" triumphal representation relies heavily on the generally accepted program of events described by Beard,[15] and my textual interpretation of the triumph draws on Galinsky's in-depth examination of the triumph and its use in Augustan elegy, especially by the poet Ovid.[16]

In this chapter, I will show how Ovid manipulates features of the triumph in *Amores* 1.1, 1.2, and 1.7 to offer a subtle critique of Augustus' divine qualities, to emphasize his dishonorable victory celebrations, and to initiate a new elegiac *topos* of bodies transforming as a direct result of oppressive violent actions. I use the phrase

---

[15] Beard (2002) 81 provides the generally accepted order of ceremonies and states: "At the center of most modern discussions of the triumph… lies a generally agreed pictured of 'what happened' in the ceremony." The only differences in scholarly opinion derive from the various interpretations of individual literary representations of the procession.

[16] See Galinsky (1969) for an exhaustive evaluation of the triumphal theme in Augustan age elegy: "The reason the *triumphus* almost became a *topos* in Roman elegy was not a literary convention rooted in Hellenistic precedent, but the elegist's individual reaction to a Roman institution… which reached its culmination… in the Rome of Augustus" (75).

"dishonorable celebration" to indicate a victory over an undeserving, or even defenseless, adversary achieved by brutal means, and then exhibited to the populace as worthy of a Triumph. Such major aspects of Augustan representation – in particular, the emphasis on the divinity and military success of the *princeps* – would have been readily evident to Ovid in his contemporary society. For example, Ovid would have witnessed Augustus' statue erected among those of the gods in Agrippa's Pantheon, and he would have seen the laurel wreaths adorning Augustus' door on the Palatine Hill; but at the same time he would have experienced the metamorphosis of Rome from a Republic to a thinly veiled autocracy. While the victory celebrations exhibit moral and legitimate success in war, their true nature of an unjust application of force is suppressed. The analysis that follows will show that Ovid was engaged in political dissidence from the outset of his poetic career.

Amores 1.1 is the programmatic poem of the *Amores* in which Cupid maliciously attacks the poet and, heedless to his protestations, forces him against his will to compose elegy. I argue that this poem illustrates Ovid's intent to use the genre of elegy and the figure of Cupid as the foundation of a critique against Augustus. Ovid's predecessors, such as Tibullus and Vergil, already firmly established the *princeps*' inclusion in the *gens Iulia* by tracing the origins of the line to the goddess Venus. Ovid does the same, but his innovation is considerable. He draws on a particular detail of the *gens Iulia* to focus on the familial tie with Iulus' half-brother Cupid. By drawing this fraternal and divine connection, Ovid seeks to align Cupid and his aggressive behavior towards the poet with Augustus and his treatment of his subjects, including, I argue, the Roman populace.

Cupid appears as a *triumphator* in *Amores* 1.2, and Ovid recounts the god's triumphal procession through the streets of Rome. Here the poet offers a startling image of the spectators at the triumph. In Ovid's recreation, the Roman populace is portrayed as supplicants provoked by fear of the deity to cheer at his accomplishment. Ovid makes this apparent by attributing emotions and body language typically reserved for triumphal captives, and especially supplicants, to the Roman populace witnessing the procession. Since Ovid has just forged an explicit connection between Cupid and the *princeps* in the opening poem of the *Amores*, I argue this representation of triumphal spectators serves Ovid's intent to challenge him by representing Augustus' regime as oppressive and the Roman people as cowed by his authority.

Amores 1.7 also explores triumphal imagery that appears to diverge from standard representations of the triumphal procession. In this poem, the poet acts as a *triumphator*. Instead of the celebration of a successful campaign over a worthy enemy, the poet welcomes a triumph after he inflicts physical violence upon his *puella*. Ovid then continues to develop triumphal imagery introduced in *Amores* 1.2 by glorifying the celebration of a dishonorable victory. Following the altercation, the abused *puella* shows signs of physical and mental change as a direct result of the physical violence she has suffered. Her body takes on abnormal characteristics, and her mental state is jeopardized. In this act of violence, I contend Ovid initiates the theme of bodily transformation as a direct result of victimization. Furthermore, I will show how Ovid begins a gradual process of using the abused *puella* to represent a Roman state that has lost its prior form as it begins to show signs of transformation from a Republic into an autocracy headed by Augustus. The full implications of bodily and political transformation will be discussed

in Chapter Two, where I analyze specific instances in the *Metamorphoses* that

demonstrate a further development and continuation of this new elegiac theme.

My analysis of these texts draws in part on two influential studies: Paul Zanker's

The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus (1990) and John Miller's *Apollo, Augustus,*

and the Poets (2009). Zanker's work on how the Augustan regime's "visual language"

influenced the perception of the *princeps* in Rome deeply informs my understanding of

the *Amores*. I have applied his observations about the use of material culture in Rome

during the Augustan age, especially concerning displays of victory and triumph, to a

textual discussion of Ovid's *Amores*. My analysis of the text shows that Ovid manipulates

the contemporary image of Augustus and his victory celebrations in order to exhibit how

Rome is compelled to honor their new political leader, rather than willingly exalting his

achievements. I have also followed Miller's methodology in his comprehensive

discussion of Augustus' adoption of Apollo as a patron deity and the occurrences of this

link in Augustan age literature. His treatment of Ovid primarily focuses on the

Metamorphoses, which will be the focus of Chapter Two of this thesis. But my analysis

in this chapter turns first to the *Amores* to trace Ovid's view on how Augustus has

adopted or suppressed various symbols, images, and deities to promote his self-image.[17]

---

[17] I follow Zanker's "top-down" notion of Augustus' self image versus Galinsky's "bottom-up" approach. Zanker (1990) believes that a "visual language" of symbols projected Augustus as on par with the gods: for example, his statue was set up in Agrippa's Pantheon alongside the Olympians and a statue of Julius Caesar. Galinsky, on the other hand, believes any exaltations Augustus received derived from the Roman people's belief in his abilities as a leader: for example, Augustus' *auctoritas* was "granted not by statute but by the esteem of one's fellow citizens" (Galinsky 1996: 14).

Identifying Cupid as Augustus

　　Following the battle of Actium in 31 BC, Augustus began to promote his victory

through a complex web of images designed to promote and legitimize his authority. To

do so, Augustus took painstaking measures to ensure his inclusion into his adopted

father's lineage, the *gens Iulia*.[18] The explicit location of Augustus within the *gens Iulia*

in Augustan poetry served to promote his just succession, and even the divine right to

rule. The *princeps* enlisted the help of his friend Maecenas, who in turn enlisted the poet

Vergil to create an epic that attributes the founding of Rome to the *gens Iulia*, and by

logical extension, to Augustus.[19] Vergil's *Aeneid* recounts the departure of pious Aeneas

from Troy and the settling of Rome. In the first book of the *Aeneid,* Augustus' divine

lineage is asserted emphatically and without ambiguity. Here, Jupiter addresses Venus,

the progenitor of the *gens Iulia*, and tells her about the fate of her son Aeneas:

> nascetur pulchra <u>Troianus</u> origine <u>Caesar</u>,
> imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris,
> Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo.
> hunc tu olim caelo <u>spoliis Orientis</u> onustum
> accipies secura; uocabitur hic quoque uotis.
>
> A <u>Trojan Caesar</u> will be born from this noble line,
> who will extend the empire to the Ocean, and his fame to the stars,
> Iulius, a name descended from great Iulus.
> You, free from worry, will receive him into the sky in the future,
> loaded with the <u>spoils of the Orient</u>; he also will be invoked with prayers.[20]
> <p align="right">Aeneid 1.286-290</p>

---

[18] See Zanker (1990) 79-82 for Augustus' appropriation of visual imagery representing the *gens Iulia* in his forum. Zanker focuses on the way Augustus took control over the city by means of a unified set of symbols that legitimized and promoted his elevated position of authority.

[19] My brief reference to Vergil could be misleading in that I do not consider Vergil to be definitively "pro-Augustan." Scholars such as Kennedy (1992) and Johnson (1976) illuminate the difficulties in categorizing an author's, or even a text's, political agenda. Nevertheless, in reference to the specific argument about Ovid's choice of genre, I use Vergil as a counterpoint for the political implications of composing epic versus elegy.

[20] The text of the *Aeneid* is from Mynors' 1969 edition. All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

The phrase *Troianus Caesar*, although highly debated,[21] refers to Augustus and not Julius

Caesar and pivots on three details: first, the family name; second, his apotheosis (*astris*,

287); and, third, the mention of the "Eastern spoils" (*spoliis Orientis,* 289). Augustus

became formally known as C. Iulius Caesar Octavianus upon his adoption into the *gens*

Iulia in 44 BC, and thus, the reference to *Iulius* in 1.288 could well be a reference to

Augustus. The reference to the apotheosis of the future descendant should also not deter

us from envisioning this *Caesar* as the *princeps*. Augustus claimed that Julius Caesar's

soul was accepted into the heavens as a comet passed by during the *Ludi Victoriae*

Caesaris in 44 BC, and as Pliny reports, "[Augustus] rejoiced in the sign of the star, to

which he himself would ascend."[22] Because of this event, Augustus adopted the *sidus*

Iulium, the Julian Star and symbol of the apotheosis, as a symbol of his divine heritage.[23]

Vergil refers to this *sidus* when describing Augustus at the Battle of Actium in the

ecphrasis of Aeneas' shield in Book 8 of the *Aeneid* (8.626-728). In that passage

Augustus Caesar (8.678) is depicted standing on the ship's prow and donning a helmet

emblazoned with the *sidus patrium* (8.681). Therefore, I interpret the reference to the

apotheosis at verse 1.287 as a proleptic statement foreshadowing Augustus' adoption of

the *sidus Iulium* and, perhaps, even Augustus' own inevitable apotheosis. Finally, the

mention of the Eastern spoils (1.290) certainly identifies this *Caesar* as Augustus. While

this could be a reference to Julius Caesar and his victory over Alexandria in 48 BC, it is

more aptly applied to Augustus, who successfully conquered Marcus Antonius and his

Eastern forces at the battle of Actium in 31 BC. Vergil refers to these *spoliis Orientis*

---

[21] Ganiban (2012) 191 provides a brief overview on the competing theories regarding the identity of the *Troianus Caesar*, and ultimately concludes that this is a reference to the *princeps*, and not Julius Caesar.
[22] Pliny *Naturae Historiae* 2.93-94.
[23] See Zanker (1990) 33-36 and Galinsky (1996) 312-313 for Augustus' appropriation of the *sidus Iulius*, and its manifestations in Roman material culture.

specifically as belonging to Augustus again in Book 8. They are the spoils taken from the *viris Orientis* (8.687), which he then paraded in his triple triumph in 29 BC. Thus, the references to the name *Iulius*, his apotheosis, and the Eastern spoils in *Aeneid* 1.286-290, taken together, cannot be interpreted as a reference to Julius Caesar, but instead must identify this *Troianus Caesar* as Augustus, and confirm Augustus as a descendant of Aeneas, son of Venus.

Ovid's predecessors, Vergil and the Roman elegiac poets, often acknowledge Cupid's filial relation to Venus, and the fraternal bond to the Trojan Aeneas. In the opening book of the *Aeneid*, Vergil describes how Venus addresses Cupid and refers to Aeneas as his *frater* "brother" (1.667). Tibullus, one of Ovid's elegiac predecessors, calls Aeneas the *volitantis frater Amoris*, "brother of flying Love" (2.5.39), and Ovid, too, places specific emphasis on Aeneas as Cupid's brother by calling him *fratris Aeneae* "your brother Aeneas" (*Am.* 3.9.13). Ovid recognizes the affiliation between Aeneas and Cupid and extends the implications of this relationship to Cupid and Augustus; since Augustus is promoting his inclusion into the *gens Iulia*, he must also be the relative of Cupid.[24] Moreover, Ovid makes this connection explicit in *Amores* 1.2.51: here the poet addresses Cupid and refers to Augustus as his *cognati Caesaris*, "your kinsman Caesar," making the familial relationship between Cupid and Augustus unambiguous. I will argue that the representation of Cupid in Ovid's amatory verse can function as a thinly veiled representation of Augustus himself. In particular, Ovid's depiction of Cupid as a tyrannical and harsh ruler corresponds to his perception of Augustus' position in Rome.

---

[24] Compare Ovid *Ex Ponto* 3.3.62 where he is addressing Cupid and refers to Augustus as *Caesar, ab Aenea qui tibi frate tuus*, "Caesar, who by your brother Aeneas [is] your [brother]," making it clear that, even in exile, Ovid emphasizes the relationship between Cupid and the *princeps*.

As the *divi filius* wielding *maius imperium*,[25] it is not difficult to imagine how Ovid could easily manipulate the contemporary image of Augustus and portray his actions negatively as those of a divine tyrant. Set against the evident literary precedent for a relationship between Cupid and Augustus, Ovid's reference to Cupid draws attention to the affiliation between the *princeps* and the god in the *Amores*.

Divine Malevolence

In *Amores* 1.1, Ovid initially desires to compose an epic in dactylic hexameter, but Cupid steals a metrical foot and leaves the poet with an elegiac couplet. The poet objects to Cupid's intervention, and questions his authority in the realm of poetry. But in spite of his protestations, the poet is struck by Cupid's arrows and transformed into an elegist. Ovid's opening poem has sparked a wide-ranging debate regarding what his programmatic statement actually is.[26] My interpretation of this poem is influenced by Thomas Habinek's view that Cupid's victory over the poet "is presented as an illegitimate extension of jurisdiction, an instance of political expansionism, and a form of sexual dominance. Ovid is but the victim of Cupid's universal ambitions."[27] However, where Habinek believes Ovid labels himself the casualty of love, I argue this scene more accurately showcases the negative effect Augustus was having on the poets of the age. After all, for the Augustan poets, the choice of genre was politically motivated.[28] To reject epic was to reject the Augustan regime, and Ovid's decision to compose elegy

---

[25] For description of *maius imperium*, see Crook (1996) 86.
[26] For sexual overtones in the poem, see Kennedy (1993) 58-63; Cahoon (1988). See Miller (2002) 241 for the poem's satirical intent.
[27] Habinek (2002) 47.
[28] See Davis (2006) 71-73, Giangrande (1981) 35, and Harrison (2002) 79 for the implications of composing elegy for Augustan poets.

rather than epic was not only a political statement, but also, more importantly, allowed

him to turn the promoted self-image of Augustus against itself. Elegy gave Ovid the

opportunity to mask his criticism of the *princeps* in the genre's patron deity, Cupid.

While the works of his predecessors mentioned the links between Augustus and

Cupid, Ovid magnifies this affiliation with destabilizing intent. *Amores* 1.1 explains that

his decision to compose elegy is not necessarily voluntary, but rather, it is being imposed

upon him.

> Arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam
>   edere, materia conveniente modis.
> par erat inferior versus – risisse Cupido
>   <u>dicitur</u> atque unum surripuisse pedem.
>
> I was preparing to relate arms and violent wars
>   in serious meter, with material matching the measure.
> The second verse was equal to the first – but, <u>it is said</u>,
>   Cupid laughed and snatched away one foot. [29]
>
> *Amores* 1.1.1-4

It is important to recognize the language with which Ovid accuses Cupid. Ovid states that

Cupid is the driving force behind his elegiac career. However, *dicitur* (1.1.4) implies less

certainty and even that he may not be entirely serious in his accusation.[30] The poet does

not witness the deity stealing the foot away, nor does he receive a direct mandate from

the proper god. According to Barsby: "Ovid's originality lies in replacing the solemn

command of Apollo by the furtive thief Cupid, and in doing so is seeking not so much to

improve upon his models as to parody them."[31] While I agree Ovid improves upon his

predecessors in originality, I read in this passage Ovid's intent to initiate an entirely new

---

[29] The text of Ovid's *Amores* is from Goold's 1986 edition. All translations are mine.

[30] Barsby (1979) 41 believes this opening statement is a "witty variation on the traditional apology," and that we cannot assume Ovid was serious about his project. Yet, Ovid tells us in *Amores* 2.1.11 that he dared (*ausus eram*) to compose an epic about the Gigantomachy. Perhaps he could not continue because his chosen subject did not reflect the most important influence of the time, Augustus.

[31] Barsby (1973) 41.

topos, rather than parody what has already been done. As noted above, Cupid and

Augustus have already been linked together by Ovid's predecessors, and the use of

dicitur here, instead of a more direct indictment,[32] accomplishes two ends. First, *dicitur*

points to Ovid's intent to continue the associations between the deity and the *princeps* in

his own works by manipulating his predecessors' statements and, second, by using

neutral language, neither admonitory nor celebratory, he is preparing the reader for the

development of his criticisms throughout the remainder of the collection.

Ovid continues by questioning his assailant. The poet asks Cupid who gave him

the jurisdiction (*ius*, 1.1.5) to dictate poetic material: the indignant question suggests

Cupid apparently has no authority to dictate poetic material because the Muses or Apollo

typically provide the material for poets (*vates*, 1.1.6).[33] These two words, *ius* and *vates,*

are especially important to the poet's rhetorical question and answer. First, as McKeown

points out, "this is the earliest occurrence of *ius* used with reference to a deity's

jurisdiction."[34] Second, *vates* is an archaic term adopted by the Augustan poets to

describe themselves and their work.[35] I argue the combination of these specific terms

illustrates Ovid's programmatic intention to locate the setting of this encounter against

Rome's contemporary political climate. *Ius* points directly to Augustus' ascension to a

position of power in the Republic; even though Augustus permanently resigned from the

consulship in 23 BC, he still maintained an elevated position of authority on account of

---

[32] Ovid's predecessors represent their own poetic enterprises as the outcome of direct intervention by Apollo who demands that they must alter their course: for example, Propertius 3.3.25 (*dixerat*); Vergil *Eclogues* 6.4 (*vellit et admonuit*).
[33] Miller (2002) 242 explains this contest over boundaries shows the transgressive nature of both elegy and Cupid. According to my argument, Cupid's intervention into the poetic realm illustrates the transgressive qualities of the *princeps* and his inability to remain within his boundaries as a *privatus*.
[34] McKeown (1989) 15 does not engage in a debate on the implications of this original statement except that it seems to be colloquial.
[35] Barsby (1973) 41.

the *maius imperium* bestowed upon him by the Senate.[36] This power extends beyond the normal measure, much like Cupid's exertion of force over the poet, which ought to belong to Apollo or the Muses. Thus, the scene offers two parallel readings. On the surface Cupid dictates his will to the poet, but the subtextual narrative suggests how Augustus imposes his will on the poets of his age, since they are forced to write about his achievements.[37]

Prior to Ovid, the actions and deeds of Augustus during the civil wars have already influenced poetic composition. Propertius, in the *recusatio* or "refusal" expressed in *Elegies* 2.1, addresses his patron Maecenas who seems to have asked Propertius to compose an epic in honor of Augustus' achievements.[38] Subtly employing the reverse rhetoric of the *recusatio*, Propertius notes that if he were inspired to write an epic, he would have to include events that Augustus would not want to be memorialized in verse, and were certainly not worthy of an epic. I argue Propertius' programmatic poem for his second book of elegies can be interpreted as an ironic treatment of the deeds of Augustus, and this was a likely influence on Ovid's own programmatic statement for *Amores* 1.1.

> quod mihi si tantum, Maecenas, fata dedissent,
>   ut possem heroas ducere in arma manus,
> non ego Titanas <u>canerem</u>, non Ossan Olympo
>   impositam, ut caeli Pelion esset iter,   20
> nec veteres Thebas, nec Pergama nomen Homeri,

---

[36] See Augustus *Res Gestae* 34.1. The *Res Gestae* is the autobiography of Augustus' deeds and accomplishments throughout his life and transcribed on the exterior of his mausoleum in the Campus Martius. All citations of the *Res Gestae* come from Cooley's 2009 edition.

[37] In terms of the nature of the influence wielded by Augustus upon contemporary poets, I follow the approach of Griffin (1984), who demonstrates that the poets born prior to the end of the civil wars were faced with the problem of dealing with a concealed autocratic regime and the *princeps'* goals of legitimation through literature. Though Griffin ends his discussion with Propertius since he was the last born of the Augustan poets who witnessed a pre-Augustan Rome, I resume from that point with Ovid and the influence of Augustus on his literary compositions.

[38] Miller (2002) 178 explains that Propertius 2.1 at the very least suggests "the possibility of elegy's direct engagement with political and social power." Ovid, looking to add his own personal touch to the elegiac genre, magnifies this connection between elegy and politics in his *Amores*. See also Griffin (1984) 207 for his discussion on the influence of Maecenas on the Augustan poets.

Xerxis et imperio bina coisse vada,
    regnave prima Remi aut animos Carthaginis altae,
      Cimbrorumque minas et bene facta Mari:
bellaque resque tui memorarem Caesaris, et tu   25
      Caesare sub magno cura secunda fores.
nam quotiens Mutinam aut civilia busta Philippos
      aut canerem Siculae classica bella fugae,
eversosque focos antiquae gentis Etruscae,
      et Ptolomaeei litora capta Phari,   30
aut canerem Aegyptum et Nilum, cum attractus in urbem
      septem captivis debilis ibat aquis,
aut regum auratis circumdata colla catenis,
      Actiaque in Sacra currere rostra Via.

But if, Maecenas, the Fates had bestowed such talent to me,
    that I could lead heroic troops into battle,
I would not write about the Titans, nor Ossa
    piled upon Olympus, so that Pelion would become the path of heaven, 20
nor ancient Thebes, nor the Pergamum name of Homer,
    and the two waters united by the order of Xerxes,
or the first kingdom of Remus, or the spirit of illustrious Carthage,
    and the threats of the Cimbri, and the good deeds of Marius;
I would commemorate the wars and achievements of your Caesar,   25
    and you would become a second care beneath great Caesar.
For how often would I recount the civilian tombs at Mutina and at Phillipi
    or the naval battle of the Silician flight,
and the destroyed hearths of the ancient Etruscan race,
    and the seized shores of the Ptolemaic Pharos,   30
or I would sing about Egypt and the Nile, which, dragged into the city,
    weakly moved the seven in its captive waters,
or the necks of kings beset by golden chains,
    and the Actian prows paraded on the *Via Sacra*.[39]

Elegies 2.1.17-34

Propertius begins by stating if the Fates had inspired him to compose a true epic,

important topics such as the Titanomachy, Gigantomachy, Thebes, or Troy would all be

unavailable to him. Instead, the repetitive potential subjunctives (*canerem* 19, 28, 32;

memorarem 25) show that he would have been compelled to compose an epic on the wars

and deeds (*bellaque resque* 25) of Augustus. Yet Propertius uses the *recusatio* form to

portray these deeds as dishonorable and thus unworthy of epic, as the events alluded to

---

[39] The text of Propertius is from Richardson's 2006 edition.

here show that Augustus' achievements came from civil war and slaughter. Perhaps it is no mere coincidence that Propertius specifically mentions certain mythological conflicts as topics that would be off limits to him, since they were all civil wars to a great extent. Additionally, the historical battles at Mutina and Philippi (27) were both decisive victories for Augustus, but were still victories in a heinous civil war. Most importantly, Propertius' reference to the Perusian massacre of 41 BC (29) deliberately presents the dishonor of Augustus' actions.[40] Augustus besieged this town where Lucius Antonius, the current consul and brother of Marcus Antonius, had manufactured a revolt against him. Following the long siege, Augustus sentenced Lucius Antonius and 300 senators to death without trial, and executed them all in a single day. Propertius' lengthy conditional statement concerning what would happen if the Fates granted him inspiration to write epic suggests the disreputable deeds of Augustus are the actual reasons why he cannot compose epic. According to Propertius, Augustus' achievements are simply unworthy of being exalted in epic meter. Nevertheless, and perhaps ironically, by enumerating all of these events in his *recusatio*, Propertius still draws attention to the ignoble deeds of Augustus.

In *Amores* 1.1 Ovid adopts Propertius' strategy of drawing attention to the dishonorable actions of Augustus for his own programmatic statement regarding his choice for elegiac composition. The essential difference between the two authors is that Ovid was composing after Augustus had firmly established his supreme position of authority in Rome, while Propertius was composing during the immediate aftermath of

---

[40] Miller (2002) notes that this specific incident "stands out because it is the only topic in the entire list… that is not in chronological order. The poet thus draws special attention to a topic that Caesar wished to forget" (182). This particular incident could even be interpreted as personally offensive to Propertius, since this was his hometown and he evidently lost friends, family, and personal property in the siege.

the civil wars. Even though their reasons for composing elegy do not match on the surface, they are both motivated by and responding to the self-promoted image of Augustus. Where Propertius was influenced by Augustus' dishonorable victories in civil war, Ovid is reacting to Augustus' proclamations of his own divine authority. Both authors are effectively challenging major Augustan achievements by focusing their reader's attention on the negative qualities and deeds of the *princeps*. Ovid figures Cupid as the divine benefactor for the poet in *Amores* 1.1, because within this deity he can conceal his ulterior motive of criticizing Augustus' disgraceful victory celebrations.[41]

Following the poet's rebuke of Cupid at the beginning of *Amores* 1.1, Ovid provides examples to defend his case against Cupid's unjustified attack. Cupid transgresses his boundaries and has no right (*iuris* 1.1.5) to impose poetic material, thus the poet mocks him by presenting a fictitious reality of various deities assuming absurd roles. Venus will wield Minerva's armaments, while Minerva brandishes Venus' love torches, and Apollo holds Mars' spear, while Mars strokes Apollo's lyre (1.1.7-12). Since Ovid uses Cupid as a representation of Augustus at the outset of poem 1.1, as I have argued above, the poet's inquiry about the jurisdiction (*iuris* 1.1.5) of the deity suggests this line of questioning is aimed at Augustus and his divine qualities as a ruler. Augustus' *Res Gestae* states that the *princeps* himself restored the Republic to the Senate in 28 BC, and then permanently relinquished formal power in Rome.[42] Nevertheless, Augustus wielded a much more potent power, *auctoritas*. The significance of *auctoritas*, as Galinsky points out, "lies not only in being part of a para- or supraconstitutional

---

[41] Ahl (1984) provides an in-depth examination of the ways in which ancient authors concealed their criticisms of tyrants or emperors using figured speech: "Figured speech provided a convenient answer to the obstacles created by imperial autocracy. (…) Writers… communicated with those in the know and contented themselves with giving the slip to those who were not" (203).
[42] Augustus *Res Gestae* 34.3.

terminology by which Augustus bypassed or, on a different view, transgressed the letter of the republican constitution. … [It also] expresses material, intellectual, and moral superiority, and is the ultimate power of the emperor on a moral level."[43] Augustus' *auctoritas*, therefore, extends beyond his status as a private citizen, much like Cupid's exertion of his own authority over the poet in *Amores* 1.1. Accordingly, when the poet questions Cupid's jurisdiction, Ovid suggests that Augustus' right to rule over the Republic is equally unwarranted. Ovid's examples of deities acting out of bounds suggests that even the gods cannot assume a role outside their own jurisdiction, and neither should Augustus, a mortal man, possess an extra-constitutional authority in the Republic.

The climax of *Amores* 1.1 comes with the poet's lament and Cupid's reaction to it. After chastising the god for acting out of bounds, the poet adds that he has no material (*nec mihi materia est* 1.1.19) suitable for elegiac verses. Ovid's elegiac predecessors, such as Tibullus and Propertius, made it immediately clear that their material would revolve around their *puella,* or *puer*, but there is no mention of Ovid's own beloved until poem 1.3, and she is not even named until poem 1.5.[44] Cupid responds to the poet's complaints by imparting material to him, and attacking the poet with an arrow specifically designed to end his current existence (*in exitum spicula facta meum,* "an arrow designed for my end," 1.1.22). Thus, Cupid exerts his divine power on a defenseless victim, and the mere mortal cannot resist his influence. The poet, fully capable of composing epic, is irrevocably changed into a wholly different form, an

---

[43] Galinsky (1996) 21. In his chapter, "A Principal Concept: *Auctoritas*" (11-41), Galinksy describes the extensive range of associations of *auctoritas* and summarizes the scholarly debate surrounding this quintessential Roman concept.
[44] See Tibullus 1.1.57 and Propertius 1.1.1, for the precedent of elegiac poets immediately attributing their poetry to their beloveds.

elegist. This scene of the violent subjugation of a defenseless victim suggests Ovid's

intention to begin to portray in a negative light the behavior of the *princeps*, mainly the

exertion of his *auctoritas* in the Republic. Not only does Augustus' *auctoritas* transgress

the Roman constitution, but it also places him dubiously at the pinnacle of Roman

morals. Moreover, the *gens Iulia* privileges Augustus with innate divine qualities, which I

argue is the precise aim of Ovid's criticism. By means of his invocation of Cupid, Ovid is

exemplifying how Augustus has used the *gens Iulia* alongside his *auctoritas* to climb to a

position of authority in the Republic. Just as the poet has no means to resist the divine

power of Cupid, Rome cannot resist the *auctoritas* of the divine Augustus. Ovid offers

his critique of Augustus to suggest that his claim of a restored Republic is a sham, and

will show Rome's true status as a conquered nation in *Amores* 1.2.

The Roman Populace as Captives

Poems 1.1 and 1.2 create a logical progression of events: first Cupid conquers the

poet in 1.1, and then the god celebrates his victory with a triumphal procession in 1.2.

Much like *Amores* 1.1, poem 1.2 has inspired varied scholarly discussion about its

potential meaning, including that it suggests the triumph of elegy, or represents a

humorous adaptation of a serious political topic.[45] My interpretation stems from Davis'

work on the political nature of the poem, but I continue from his treatment of Ovid's

---

[45] See McKeown (1989) and Galinsky (1969) on reading *Amores* 1.2 as a humorous parody of an important
Augustan celebration; see Athanassaki (1992) on reading 1.2 as the triumph of elegy; see Cameron (1968)
on its programmatic position in Ovid's first edition.

views on the military and focus more on the legitimacy and results of a dishonorable triumphal celebration.[46]

In *Amores* 1.2 Ovid continues his critique of Augustus by once again using Cupid as a figure for the *princeps*. The poet must now weigh his options in the aftermath of his conflict, and he begins by questioning whether he should yield to the dominion of Cupid or resist as he had attempted to do in *Amores* 1.1.

> cedimus, an subitum luctando accendimus ignem?
>   cedamus! leve fit, quod bene fertur, onus.   10
> vidi ego iactatas mota face crescere flammas
>   et vidi nullo concutiente mori.
> verbera plura ferunt, quam quos iuvat usus aratri,
>   detractant prensi dum iuga prima boves.
> asper equus duris contunditur ora lupatis,   15
>   frena minus sentit, quisquis ad arma facit.
> Acrius invitos multoque ferocious urget
>   quam qui servitum ferre fatentur Amor.

> Do we yield, or do we fan the growing flame by resisting?
>   Let us yield! The burden is made light, when suffered willingly.   10
> I myself have seen flames grow when fanned by a moving torch
>   and then again die with no one stoking it.
> Bulls, who are not yet broken in, refusing the first yoke,
>   suffer more wounds than those who enjoy it, accustomed to plowing.
> The untamed horse's mouth is totally subdued by the hard jagged bit,   15
>   whichever adapts to obedience feels the bridle less.
> Amor threatens the unwilling much more savagely and fiercely
>   than those who confess to suffer servitude.
>
>   *Amores* 1.2.9-18

The poet's response to his own question of submission is made without using the deliberative subjunctive. Instead, *cedimus* and *accendimus* are left in the indicative to express that there is really no question about his inevitable submission. His entire contemplative process is summed up in a single hexameter (9), and his mind is immediately made up in the first word of the following pentameter, *cedamus* (10).

---

[46] Davis (2006) 84 shows how the *Amores* deals with "[Ovid's] negative treatment of military institutions. After all, the emperor was essentially an autocrat dependent upon the army for his power."

Furthermore, it is important to note how Ovid uses the plural to express the futile conundrum. While it is possible that this could be an obvious use of the poetic plural, in light of my argument, I contend Ovid's use of the plural here suggests this useless deliberation extends to his contemporaries and more importantly to the Roman populace. The decision to submit is shared by all of Rome, and they do so in order to spare themselves from unjust persecution by the undisputed victor, Augustus.

Following the altercation with Cupid, the poet has no choice but to submit to divine authority, and he uses domesticated animals as examples to demonstrate his servitude. The choice of service animals to describe those affected by Cupid's power is a common theme of elegy, and especially for evoking the concept of *servitium amoris*, "the slavery of love."[47] The idea of *servitium amoris*, the poet's total subjection to his beloved,[48] is a crucial aspect of this poem, but Ovid does not deploy this standard elegiac trope as his predecessors did in the past. For Tibullus and Propertius, this servitude was devoted to their beloved and was characterized as *grave* or *triste*, "serious" or "sad."[49] In contrast, Ovid still has neither *puella* nor *puer* to influence his material, so his servitude cannot be attributed to an elegiac figure. Furthermore, the *servitium amoris* of the *Amores* is more often devoted to divine figures such as Cupid rather than to the *puella* herself.[50] Therefore, Ovid's description of the poet's subjugation deviates from elegiac convention and becomes an innovation of Ovidian elegiac style. Here, Ovid suggests that his subjugation and servitude are due to a divine influence, namely Cupid; but there are further implications of his decision to submit. *Amores* 1.1 already illustrates Ovid's

---

[47] Miller (2002) 254.
[48] See Copley (1947), Lyne (1979), and Murgatroyd (1981) for analyses of *servitium amoris* in elegy.
[49] Propertius 1.5.19: *grave servitium*; Tibullus 2.4.3: *servitium sed triste datur*.
[50] Boyd (2002) 95.

intention to employ the figure of Cupid to mask a critique of Augustus' divine authority. The submission of the poet in 1.2, then, is not just to Cupid, but also to Augustus. In this passage, Ovid informs us that servitude to Augustus, the *divi filius,* can neither be resisted nor questioned, and it is better to submit than face the consequences of attempted revolt. Nevertheless, this passage does not exempt the poet from persecution. According to Ovid, the victim will be spared only the harshest of punishments, but will inevitably be threatened (*urget,* 17) to comply. Ovid illuminates this position of subjection in his description of the Roman populace in 1.2, as we will discuss below.

Following the poet's deliberation on the nature of enslavement, he decides to accept his servitude to Cupid.

> En ego confiteor! Tua sum nova praeda, Cupido;
>   porrigimus victas ad tua iura manus.
> Nil opus est bello – veniam pacemque rogamus;
>   nec tibi laus armis victus inermis ero.

> Alas, I confess it! Cupid, I am your new spoil;
>   I stretch out my conquered hands to your rule.
> There is no need for war — I ask for a pardon and peace;
>   I will be no glory to you, a defenseless victim conquered by force.
> > *Amores.* 1.2.19-22

These four lines provide the subjugator Cupid with the right to a triumph and celebration of his victory. In this passage, Ovid alludes to the concept of the *confessio imperii*, or the acknowledgement by the conquered that they have actually been conquered, while his willing submission to Cupid's rule (*tua iura,* 20) recalls the poet's previous lament upon Cupid's claim of jurisdiction (*iuris,* 1.1.5) over the poet.[51] Here, the poet assumes the role of a supplicating victim. The act of stretching out ones arms (*porrigimus victas manus,*

---

[51] See McKeown (1989) 43 for Ovid's employment of *confessio imperii* in this poem.

20) to the victor is a standard sign of submission and surrender.[52] Various ancient authors describe scenes of surrender using nearly the same vocabulary. Plutarch recalls the events when a group of Lepidus' soldiers surrendered to Marcus Antonius, and states that as Antony approached their camp, he saw them "stretching out their hands," τάς τε χεῖρας ὀρέγοντας.[53] Cassius Dio also emphasizes that the act of stretching out arms signifies surrender when he writes about the surrender of the Jewish forces to the Romans in 67 AD. After they retreated behind their walls, the Jewish forces were stretching out their hands and supplicating, χεῖράς τε προετείνοντο καὶ ἱκέτευον.[54] Ovid also provides a similar scene of submission, but in an elegiac context, when Cydippe surrenders to Acontius in his *Heroidum Epistulae* by giving her conquered hands over to him (*doque libens victas in tua vota manus*).[55] Therefore, when the poet raises his hands to Cupid's domination in *Amores* 1.2, he is clearly labeling himself the *servus amoris*; yet this gesture can also be interpreted as surrendering to the autocratic desires of Augustus. As demonstrated above, Ovid is responding to the influence of Augustus in poem 1.1, and the reiteration of *iura* in poem 1.2 suggests these two poems should be read together. First there is a battle in poem 1.1, in which Cupid conquers the poet. Then, the poet admits defeat in poem 1.2 and so gives Cupid the right to the triumph, which disproportionately takes up the remainder of the poem. Reading the two poems as a cause and effect of Cupid's violence allows the reader to judge the actions of Cupid and his subsequent celebration.

---

[52] See Naiden (2006) for the concept of supplication in both ancient Greek and Roman customs, with details on the necessary steps and motions involved in a proper supplication.
[53] Plutarch, *Life of Antony* 18.3.
[54] Cassius Dio 64.14.4.
[55] Ovid *Heroides* 21.242.

The submission of the poet does raise some questions. Why, after resisting so feverishly, does the poet abandon his epic pursuits and submit to Cupid? As I have shown above, Ovid works within the genre of elegy, but manipulates specific elegiac tropes, such as the poet's divine inspiration, to develop his implicit criticisms. Thus, the poet must submit to the will of Cupid because there is no other alternative. He cannot resist his divine benefactor, just as Rome, as I will discuss below, cannot resist Augustus, the *divi filius* and descendent of Venus.

Ovid's depiction of the surrendering poet does not stray from the conventional norms of portraying a conquered adversary. The poet acknowledges his defeat by the powers of Cupid with the standard *confessio imperii*, and is paraded through the streets of Rome. However, there is another image of a conquered victim in poem 1.2 that illuminates Ovid's intent to label the current status of Rome as subjugated by Augustus. As mentioned above, the act of stretching out one's hands to a victorious general is a standard image of surrender and supplication. As the poet imagines what Cupid's triumph would look like, he offers a glimpse of how the Roman populace would react to the spectacle of the deity.

> Omnia te metuent; <u>ad te sua bracchia tendens</u>
>   vulgus "io" magna voce "triumphe!" canet.
>
> All will fear you [Cupid]; <u>stretching their arms to you</u>
>   The crowd will sing "Io Triumphe!" in a great voice.
> <div align="right">

Amores. 1.2.33-34</div>

At first glance, the reaction of the observing crowd seems appropriate. They sing "*Io Triumphe*," the standard chant at triumphal processions, and they raise their arms in the air, just like the crowd in the Circus Maximus would react as their favorite charioteer crossed the finished line. Nevertheless, as we have seen, the particular body language of

raised hands also indicates surrender, and so Ovid's implementation of *ad te sua bracchia*

tendens, "stretching their arms to you," in line 33 identifies the crowd not as joyous

spectators, but as supplicants begging for Cupid's mercy. Even though Ovid replaces the

more conventional word *manus* with *bracchia*, this act is still clearly representative of

supplication. Indeed, the phrase *tendere bracchia* exhibits Ovid's unique word choice for

describing scenes of supplication elsewhere in his verse.[56] In the *Metamorphoses*, Io

stretches out her bovine arms in supplication to Argus, Phineus admits defeat and begs

Perseus for clemency, and a dying Pelias appeals to his daughters as they stab him before

Medea slices his throat.[57] The substitution of *bracchia* for *manus* in *Amores* 1.2 is an

example of Ovid's distinctive decision to inscribe a specific meaning to the act of

supplication.[58]

In his description of the spectators at Cupid's triumph in *Amores* 1.2, Ovid differs

remarkably from standard triumphal scene representations. If an author mentions the

crowd at all, they are typically portrayed in positive terms as either applauding or

rejoicing. In fact, this characterization of the spectators is even atypical for Ovid. As we

have seen above, Ovid portrays the loyal Roman plebs in *Tristia* 4.2 as rejoicing

(*laetetur*, 15) and applauding (*circumplaudere*, 49) the victorious general as he rides by.

Also, Ovid describes how happy the crowd will be in the presence of their leader by

calling the crowd *felix* (65) as well as *laeta* (66). Furthermore, Cassius Dio reports that

even though the crowd was minimally displeased with the unprecedented amount of

lictors that accompanied Caesar in his four-day triumph in 46 BC, the spectators still

---

[56] In the *Metamorphoses* Ovid uses the phrase to suggest supplication in the following instances: 1.636, 2.477, 2.580, 3.441, 3.724, 5.176, 5.215, 7.188, 7.345, 8.432, 9.210, 9.293, 14.191.
[57] Io: 2.477; Phineus 5.176; Pelias 7.345.
[58] Anderson (1972) 280 labels *bracchia tendens* as a "standard dramatic gesture of appeal or prayer."

greatly admired the vast amount of spoils, captives, and even Caesar himself.[59] Ovid

purposefully strays from the standard representation of the Roman populace at a

triumphal procession: the crowd neither cheers nor applauds the victorious general, but

instead, lifts their hands in supplication.

Ovid also depicts the Roman spectators in *Amores* 1.2 with uncharacteristic

emotions. Numerous ancient sources show that conquered kings and leaders dreaded the

Roman triumph, and some so much they would beg not to be paraded through the streets

of Rome or would even commit suicide beforehand.[60] Ovid, too, mentions emotions of

fear in *Amores* 1.2, but does not attribute this fear to the captives. Immediately before

mentioning the crowd shouting "*Io Triumphe*" in line 34, the poet states, *omnia te*

metuent, "all things will fear you" (33). This statement comes right after the catalogue of

captives, and right before the soldiers of love. There is nothing in the catalogue of slaves

with which *omnia* agrees, so we cannot attribute this fear to the captives who would

logically already be afraid. The pronoun *te* (33) explicitly refers to Cupid, so *omnia* (33)

then must refer to the Roman populace reacting to Cupid's presence. If so, then Ovid is

making an explicit comparison between the triumphal prisoners and the triumphal

spectators, since it is always the captives who are afraid in a triumphal procession, and

never the crowd.[61] There is no reason why a Roman audience would fear the captives of a

triumph, since the very performance of the triumph is based on the fact that they have

been defeated. Cicero elaborates on the emotions that result from witnessing a conquered

---

[59] Cassius Dio 43.20.1.
[60] Beard (2007) 114-117 describes the way foreign leaders perceived the triumph. Cleopatra is a prime example of how a defeated enemy leader would seek an alternative (such as suicide) to being paraded before the people as part of the Roman triumph.
[61] In my study of descriptions of triumphs I could find only one instance where the crowd expressed fear, but this was a reaction to the sound of the massive amounts of armor clanging together in Plutarch's account of Aemilius Paulus' triumph (*Life of Aemilius* 31.7).

foe: "…there is nothing sweeter than victory, and yet there is no testament of victory more certain than for you to see those ones who you had often feared conquered and led away towards punishment."[62] Most accounts of prisoners describe them looking downwards, hiding their shame, or supplicating, but never as inciting fear in the crowd. In *Tristia* 4.2, Ovid mentions triumphal captives turning their faces to the ground or concealing their faces with their hair.[63] Plutarch tells us that the captives in Aemelius Paulus' triumph over king Perseus were weeping (δεδακρυμένων 33.3) and supplicating (λιτανεύειν 33.3). In other words, Ovid attributes the emotions of triumphal captives to the crowd in *Amores* 1.2. It is Cupid that the crowd fears, and they supplicate and beg for mercy just like triumphal captives.

The series of events described in *Amores* 1.1 and 1.2 illustrates Ovid's intent to critique the celebration of the dishonorable actions of a leader as well as to direct attention to the similarities between Cupid's power as expressed in his poems and Augustus' subjugation of Rome. In these two poems, Cupid becomes a figure for the *princeps*, and Ovid uses the image of a malevolent and forceful deity acting outside his jurisdiction to allude to Augustus' own claim to a divine lineage and his *maius imperium,* which extends beyond the boundaries of a *privatus*.

Moreover, Ovid's choice to write elegy is a political statement in and of itself. Cupid has forced the poet to compose elegy, just as the influence of Augustus has compelled Ovid in his selection of genre. He cannot pursue epic because he would be forced to write about the deeds of Augustus, much like the *recusatio* expressed by Propertius in *Elegies* 2.1. Cupid's assault on the poet demonstrates the victimization of an

---

[62] Cicero *In Verrem.* 2.5.66.
[63] Ovid *Tristia* 4.2.24, 34.

unwilling and defenseless opponent. As Ovid demonstrates in poems 1.1 and 1.2, any attempt to resist Cupid is futile, just as Rome cannot resist Augustus' divine authority. Ovid's scene of subjugation suggests that Rome has undergone a transformation of its own: the actions of Augustus have irrevocably changed Rome into a subjugated nation.

Thus the subjugation of Rome is illuminated within Cupid's triumph in poem 1.2, where the procession is actually a celebration of the dishonorable act of victimization. The representation of the triumphal spectators deviates from standard elegiac convention, and differs from Ovid's own representation in his later poetic output. In Ovid's depiction, the crowd does not joyously and willingly praise the accomplishments of Cupid, but they are forced to do so through fear. Ovid's extraordinary representation of the crowd mimics the body language and emotions of triumphal captives and supplicants. Cupid's triumph, therefore, is a celebration of oppressive force and divine malevolence against a defenseless victim (*inermis victus*, 1.2.22). In this atypical representation, Ovid suggests that Augustus' achievements are not worthy of true praise and that the population is forced against their will to exalt the *princeps*.

Early Signs of Transformation

As we have seen in poems 1.1 and 1.2, Ovid reveals new elegiac *topoi* that suggest Rome herself is being subjugated by Augustus and that his victory celebrations are not praised enthusiastically, but hailed through fear. Cupid, as a figure for Augustus, forces the poet into an elegiac career in poem 1.1, then in poem 1.2, he celebrates his victory by parading the defeated poet before the Roman populace who are forced to celebrate Cupid's dishonorable victory through fear of the deity. Ovid continues to

deploy his subtle critique of ignoble celebrations in terms of the victimization of defenseless individuals in *Amores* 1.7.

While the focus of this chapter is to analyze triumphal scenes and themes in the *Amores* that demonstrate Ovid's gestures towards deeper political meanings by using images of Augustus and divine victimization, such themes are not prevalent in poems 1.3 through 1.6 . Instead, I suggest Ovid could have taken advantage of the second publication of the *Amores* and arranged his initial poems in this way to showcase his mastery of major elegiac themes in Book 1. Poem 1.3 marks Ovid's willing submission to his *puella,* continuing in the elegiac footsteps of Tibullus and Propertius.[64] Next, *Amores* 1.4 introduces the *vir* or "husband," a standard figure in love elegy that has precedents in Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius,[65] and 1.6 introduces the *paraclausithyron,* or the locked-out lover's serenade, which is "one of the set pieces of the elegiac genre."[66] Poem 1.5 is the most uniquely Ovidian and original poem of this group, in that it portrays an uncomplicated and successful erotic encounter with his *puella*, yet there are still some elegiac precedents for the episode.[67] However, these poems are not prominent in my thesis because they are not directly pertinent to my discussion of Ovid's presentation of dishonorable triumphal processions. Poem 1.7 is the first poem to resume the themes that have been discussed so far in this chapter.

Amores 1.7 recounts the poet's physical abuse of his mistress. Madness (*furor*, 3) has taken hold of him and he physically assaults his *puella*. This poem has received much scholarly attention concerning whether the poet's casual attitude towards his crime is a

---

[64] See Barsby (1979) 51 for the elegiac precedents for Ovid's *Amores* 1.3.

[65] See, for instance, Catullus 68.146, 83.1; Propertius 2.23.20; Tibullus 1.2.21, 1.6.8.

[66] Miller (2002) 5.

[67] For example, Propertius 2.15 begins with an elated poet who has had a successful erotic encounter with his beloved Cynthia.

serious expression of Ovid's remorse,[68] or emphasizes the poet's playful attitude, or

perhaps manifests parodic qualities.[69] Much like Cupid's assault on the poet in *Amores*

1.1 changes his form from an epic to an elegiac poet, the poet's violent attack against his

mistress in poem 1.7 alters her form both mentally and physically. The poet describes her

physical characteristics following their altercation.

> At nunc sustinui raptis a fronte capillis
> ferreus ingenuas ungue notare genas.   50
> Astitit illa <u>amens</u> albo et sine sanguine vultu,
> caeduntur Pariis qualia saxa iugis;
> exanimis artus et membra trementia vidi,
> ut cum populeas ventilat aura comas,
> ut leni Zephyro gracilis vibratur harundo   55
> summave cum tepido stringitur unda Noto;
> suspensaque diu lacrimae fluxere per ora,
> qualiter abiecta de nive manat aqua.

> But now I, iron hearted, allowed myself to rend
> her seized hair from her brow and her free-born cheeks.   50
> She stood there, <u>out of her mind</u>, with a white face without blood,
> just like the stones that are quarried from the Parian hills;
> and I saw her lifeless body and trembling limbs,
> as when the wind fans poplar leaves,
> as a graceful reed is shaken by the gentle west wind   55
> or when the water surface is rippled by the warm south wind;
> and her tears, restrained for a long time, poured over her face,
> just as water flows out from heaped up snow.
>
> *Amores* 1.7.49-58

Elegiac assaults between lovers are typically represented in this way.[70] The lover is

driven mad with frenzy (*furor*, 1.7.2-3) and tears at his beloved's hair and marks her

cheeks. However, Ovid chooses to focus on the physical and mental transformation of the

puella following the abuse, as she takes on abnormal characteristics as a direct result of

the poet's violence. The description of the *puella* is recorded through four couplets

---

[68] See Frankel (1945) 18-21.
[69] See McKeown (1989) 164.
[70] Compare Tibullus 1.6.74; Propertius 2.5.21, 2.15.17.

containing five similes.[71] Barsby states that Ovid "is fascinated by the appearance of the girl, but shows no awareness of her emotions in his choice of illustrations."[72] On the contrary, I argue Ovid does in fact recognize the emotional state of the *puella* and specifically uses inanimate objects to describe her physical and mental state. She is described as *amens* in line 51, which should not be interpreted as insane, but rather "devoid of feeling" or "out of her normal state of mind."[73] Inanimate objects have no feelings, and are therefore an apt choice for Ovid to describe both the physical and mental status of the girl at the same time. It is important to note the progression of Ovid's descriptions of transformations. In poem 1.1, Cupid's attack forces the poet into a new and unaccustomed genre, but at 1.7 the effects of violence are amplified. The abused *puella* begins to resemble an inanimate or natural object as a direct result of physical violence. These types of transformations will become explicit in the *Metamorphoses*, which will receive a fuller treatment in the following chapter.

The poet welcomes a triumph in honor of his victory over the victimized girl, just as Cupid celebrated a triumph over the victimized poet in *Amores* 1.1. Moreover, the contrast between victor and vanquished has escalated from poem 1.1 and 1.2 to poem 1.7, and is even more ignoble than the conflict between Cupid and the poet. In 1.7, a mortal man expresses quasi-divine rage on an undeserving and defenseless *puella*. Again, Ovid provides an example of celebrating victories over unworthy enemies, and in *Amores* 1.7 the poet drags the victimized *puella* through the streets of Rome.

---

[71] See Morrison (1992) for a discussion of these similes. He believes Ovid bends the genre of elegy with these epic mythological examples and suggests an inversion of the master/slave convention of Roman elegy.

[72] Barsby (1973) 89.

[73] McKeown (1989) 189 notes that the definition of *amens* in *Amores* 1.7.51 should be closer to "devoid of feeling" rather than simply "mad."

> I nunc, magnificos victor molire triumphos,
>   cinge comam <u>lauro</u> votaque redde Iovi,
> quaeque tuos currus comitantum <u>turba</u> sequetur,
>   clamet 'io, forti victa puella viro est!'
> Ante eat effuso tristis captiva capillo,
>   si sinerent laesae, candida tota, genae.
>
> Go now, Victor, celebrate magnificent triumphs,
>   wreath your brow <u>with laurel</u> and give prayers to Jove,
> and let <u>the crowd</u> of followers escort your chariot,
>   let them shout 'Io, the girl was conquered by a brave man!'
> Let the sad captive girl go before you with disheveled hair,
>   completely white, if her wounded cheeks allow it.
>
> *Amores.* 1.7.35-40

In this passage, Ovid continues to manipulate standard triumphal imagery to exemplify the celebration of shameful actions. The traditional laurel wreath (*lauro*, 36) adorns the victorious general's brow as he rides in the chariot to the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (*Iovi*, 51), accompanied by his troops (*turba*, 37), who sing ribald songs in his honor.[74] While Ovid portrays a legitimate triumphal scene, the fact that this procession celebrates the abuse and victimization of a girl cannot be disregarded.

Ovid highlights the dishonor of the poet's triumph by including one of the soldiers' songs in his triumphal representation. Beard argues against recent scholarship that suggests these vulgar songs are meant to "protect the general and his moment of overwhelming glory from the dangers of the evil eye."[75] Instead, she shows there were different variations of these songs, each of which had distinct uses. The major categories include humorous or playful songs,[76] negative political statements about the general,[77]

---

[74] For standard elements of the triumphal procession, see Beard (2007) 81-82 and my discussion in the Introduction above.

[75] Beard (2007) 248. For scholarship on soldiers' songs, see Versnel (1970) 70.

[76] For an example of humorous songs, see Suetonius *Divus Iulius* 49.4, 51.

[77] See Cassius Dio 43.20.3 for an example of political dissent.

and songs that indicate the "true victor," or *triumphator*.[78] I agree with Beard that the varying registers of the soldiers' songs can question the authority of the victor, and even cast doubt on the honor that a procession bestows.[79] Thus, I argue that Ovid specifically uses this type of dissenting song in poem 1.7 to develop the theme of dishonorable celebrations. The soldiers' song in Ovid's poem is excessively sarcastic and demeans the general in his moment of triumph by drawing specific attention to the fact that his victory was not over an enemy threat, but his own beloved. Furthermore, this song indicates the "true victor" of the conflict is in fact the abused *puella*, and not the triumphing poet. Not only do the soldiers address her specifically in their chant, but the cruel poet himself also characterizes her as possessing extreme beauty in the aftermath of his rage.

Many captives would express their grief by tearing at their own faces and hair,[80] but here, the poet celebrates his own disgraceful actions: he has only one spoil to display, and the girl's wounds are not a sign of her personal grief, but were maliciously inflicted by the poet and thus magnify his dishonor.[81] Furthermore, she is described as *candida tota* (40), which has a wide array of meanings, but in elegiac contexts, the word *candida* is reserved to describe radiant beauty.[82] This honorific description of the victim echoes the depiction of her face following the poet's attack, where the color of her skin is said to

---

[78] Livy 28.9.18, 10.30.9 tells us that the soldiers' songs can be directed at the person to whom the triumph ought to have been awarded.

[79] Beard (2007) 248 points out the mercurial qualities of the Roman triumph. She poses questions about the risks and rewards of celebrating a triumph, suggesting the triumph is almost uncontrollable.

[80] See Beard (2007) 107-142.

[81] See Beard (2007) 118-119 for the importance of spoils, especially enemy captives, to the grandeur of a triumph.

[82] McKeown (1989) 184 points out that Ovid is not describing her fear by referring to her pallor, but he is lauding her beauty. In his view, Ovid is manipulating an "encomiastic epithet… drawing attention to her attractive pale complexion, the beauty of which is enhanced by the contrast with her scratched cheeks."

resemble famous Parian marble (52), which is known for its pure white color;[83] the reference to marble also suggests the girl is like an inanimate statue, which contributes to the portrayal of her state of mind as "devoid of feeling" (*amens*, 51). These two references to the superlative beauty of the victimized girl illustrate Ovid's intent to mock celebrations of oppression and subjugation. It is almost as if the poet acknowledges his abusive behavior with his triumph, and rationalizes his injustice by believing the victimization has somehow beautified his mistress for the better. This resonates with Augustus' own rationale for his subjugation of Rome through civil war, where he covered the brick façade of the old Republic and concealed his shame with a marble veneer.

In *Amores* 1.7, Ovid continues to develop themes of violent oppression and subjugation as well as the celebration of these dishonorable actions. Yet Ovid also initiates a new theme of bodily transformation into inanimate or natural objects as a direct result of violence and victimization. The poet's abuse alters the physical and emotional characteristics of the *puella,* as she begins to resemble pure white marble (52), leaves blowing in the wind (54), or water stirred by the breeze (56). All of the poem's descriptions of her physical characteristics emphasize her change of form: moreover, the altered *puella* loses all ability to voice objection, or defend herself from persecution. Note how Ovid explicitly chooses natural elements that are all helpless in their depicted environments. The leaves on the tree cannot fight the power of wind, nor can snow resist the sun's heat, and Parian marble will inevitably be sculpted into new forms. Ovid selects these images to highlight the metamorphosis of the girl into a new helpless state of being and her inability to resist.

---

[83] McKeown (1989) 189-190 shows that Parian marble describes her pale complexion, beauty, and most importantly, her lack of emotion.

Thus the triumphal celebration of *Amores* 1.7 actually proves to be a celebration of the poet's own dishonor. The conquered girl is the sole spoil of war, a distinct mark of an inglorious triumph, and she takes on the traditional guise of a triumphal captive (*effuso tristis captiva capillo* 39). However, Ovid draws attention to the hypocrisy of the poet's celebration of an unworthy achievement by describing the girl's beauty in contrast to the wounds left by the poet's own hand. Instead of fearful and anguished, the girl is defined as *candida* "radiant" (40), a word reserved for superlative beauty in elegiac contexts, and thereby her status is essentially inverted in the triumphal procession from captive to *triumphator*. The poet, fully aware of his victimization of the girl, disregards any feelings of shame; in fact, he seems to be aroused by his own visible signs of power and authority inscribed on the features of his subjugated mistress. Ovid portrays the victor in this way, I argue, to allude to Augustus' own attraction to and possession of a subdued Rome. The analogy is supported by the fact that images of an ignoble Augustan victory were displayed throughout Rome, even to the extent that his doors were adorned with laurel, the ancient symbol of Roman victory, in the aftermath of a brutal civil conflict. Furthermore, the poet shows no feeling of remorse for his abusive actions in poem 1.7. The final couplet states that all of his deeds will be undone if she merely rearranges her hair (67-68). Such a superficial remark undercuts all of the poet's laments about harming his mistress and demonstrates his utter disregard for his treatment of her. This destabilizing final couplet suggests that the poet, much like Augustus, is infatuated with his own dishonor.

Yet we must also consider why Ovid engages in and even celebrates the same corrupt authority that was earlier so adamantly criticized. In *Amores* 1.15, Ovid makes his

criticism of victory celebrations transparent: "Let trifles amaze the mob" (*vilia miretur vulgus* 1.15.35). While Ovid desires eternal glory that will surpass kings and their triumphs (*cedant carminibus reges regumque triumphi* 1.15.33), he indicates that it must be achieved by just means. It is not furtive Cupid who will bring him the renown he craves; rather the true god of poetry, Apollo, must grant him perpetual fame.[84] By enacting the same degraded authority that was wielded by Augustus, Ovid achieves a trivial triumph over his *puella* in poem 1.7, and its commemoration bestows personal shame instead of honor; in this way, Ovid suggests that everlasting glory and fame can only be achieved by just and honorable action. Therefore, Ovid exhibits himself as a victimizing tyrant in poem 1.7 to draw attention to the corrupt authority of the *princeps*.

   Amores 1.7 invokes themes that Ovid first presents in poems 1.1 and 1.2. As demonstrated in the discussion above, Ovid includes atypical triumphal imagery to draw attention to and question the legitimacy of triumphal processions and the honor they bestow on the *triumphator*. The poet's unwarranted act of violence in 1.7 is purely an act of *furor* (2-3), and exceeds rational or just action, much like Cupid's assault on the poet in 1.1. In each of these poems, Cupid and the poet, wielding supernatural power, assault a defenseless victim.[85] In 1.7 the *puella* assumes the role of the conquered, but just as he does in poem 1.2, Ovid questions the legitimacy of the poet's triumph, and indicates that the *puella*, even in her victimized state, is the "true" victor. These three poems demonstrate how Ovid's triumphal scenes present an alternative perspective on the honor of triumphal processions, and suggest how these events may have been viewed in Rome.

---

[84] Ovid *Amores* 1.15.35-38
[85] The poet's madness is so intense that he could even strike the gods (*Amores* 1.7.5).

Conclusion

In the *Amores,* Ovid creates scenes congruent with standard elements of elegy. Amorous battles and triumphs are not strangers to the genre, but Ovid manipulates these common tropes to construct new elegiac themes that hint at the current status of Rome as a subjugated entity under the direct influence of Augustus. The battle with Cupid in poem 1.1 illustrates the poet's submission to elegy, but, as I have shown, it also demonstrates how Ovid was compelled to compose elegy rather than epic. The choice to compose elegy is a political statement to reject the establishment of a Principate, and Ovid chooses the elegiac genre, not because he is inspired by a *puella* as his predecessors were, but because he deems the actions of Augustus as not worthy of epic commemoration.

Moreover, Ovid stresses the negative aspects of triumphal scenes in the *Amores.* The events or battles that bestow Rome's greatest honor are frequently represented in Ovid's verse as particularly dishonorable, in that the victories are won over unworthy opponents by brutal means. Cupid violently attacks the poet in poem 1.1 with irresistible force; defenseless against this divine power, the poet transforms into an elegist. In honor of his victory, Cupid's triumph parades through the street with its accustomed pomp, but when the victorious general comes into the view of the crowd, Ovid strays from the conventional depiction by portraying the spectators as triumphal captives. Ovid's atypical representation of the Roman populace as captives illustrates his intent to portray the current status of Rome as conquered by Augustus.

Ovid continues to develop the theme of dishonorable and unworthy celebrations in the triumphal scene of poem 1.7. Here the poet victoriously triumphs over his own physically abused mistress, but Ovid presents the procession as marred by its own spoils.

In this poem, the triumph celebrates the conqueror's shame, rather than a glorious victory, since he has violently attacked his defenseless *puella*, and her wounds are visible to the spectators. The soldiers sing ribald songs, as is customary during the procession, but these are not designed for the purpose of jest. These songs can have many different connotations, and Ovid chooses to portray them as pointing at the shame of the general and indicating the true victor, the victimized *puella*. Thus, the poet is in fact celebrating his own shame. In this poem, I argue, Ovid deliberately calls attention to the fact that although Augustus ended civil war and ushered in a new era of peace, in the process Rome had become a conquered nation. After all, in order for Augustus to end the civil war, he first had to conquer Marcus Antonius, a Roman citizen. So, by placing Rome in the position of the subjugated triumphal captive, a victim undeserving of such brutal treatment, Ovid identifies Augustus' triumphal celebration as dishonorable.

Finally, Ovid initiates the theme of transformed states in *Amores* 1.7. As a direct result of victimization, in this poem the *puella* shows signs of a changing physical and emotional state as she begins to take on inanimate characteristics. This begins a trope that Ovid will develop further in his epic *Metamorphoses* and will be the subject of my examination in the next chapter. Here, Ovid will focus on the total physical transformations of victims, but will emphasize the retention of their previous state of mind: that is, regardless of their new form, the victims continue to exemplify their former identity. Ovid's victims will come to represent a subjugated Rome that no longer encompasses its true form as a Republic. Ovid combines the themes presented in *Amores* 1.1, 1.2, and 1.7 to bring his critique of the Augustan regime to fruition in the

Metamorphoses. Not only does the victimization of helpless individuals continue, but also the celebration of dishonor becomes paramount.

Chapter Two:
Confronting Augustan Honors in the *Metamorphoses*

When Ovid moves from the elegiac form in the *Amores* to epic in his

Metamorphoses, he presents a massive collection of myths (over 250) that involve the

theme of change accompanied by physical transformations. While the scholarly debate on

the poem's overall tone still continues,[86] it is best to center our interpretations on what

Ovid himself claims to be his motivation. His preface (1.1-4) states that it is not the deeds

and wars of heroes or gods that motivate his composition, but rather the transformations

of forms that compel him to compile, and even reinterpret, a vast catalogue of Greek and

Roman mythologies.

> In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas
> corpora: di, coeptis (nam vos mutastis et illa)
> adspirate meis primaque ab origine mundi
> ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen.
>
> My soul desires to sing about forms changed into
> new bodies: O gods (for even you manipulated them)
> breathe life into my undertaking and weave a continual
> song from the origins of the world to my own time.[87]
> <div align="right">*Metamorphoses* 1.1-4</div>

Homer's and Vergil's epic compositions begin with a programmatic noun that offers the

tone or theme of the poem;[88] yet Ovid begins his narrative with an unusual preposition

---

[86] Ovid's tone and the purpose of the *Metamorphoses* continue to baffle scholars because of the lack of
continuity throughout all 15 books. Knox (1986) believes the *Met.* defies all genre classification, while
Hinds (1987) emphasizes the importance of generic epic norms throughout the poem. See Graf's (2002)
chapter "Myth in Ovid" for an evaluation of the function of myth in Ovid's narrative. For the challenge of
Augustan themes, see Hinds (1992) and Johnson (1996). For a positive Augustan sentiment, see Salzman
(1998); Barcheisi (1997); Galinsky (1975, 1996); Habinek (1997, 1998, 2002). For a feminist reading, see
Cahoon (1988 and 1996). On cultural transformation during the Augustan age, see Habinek and Schiesaro
(1997), esp. Wallace-Hadrill's chapter "*Mutatio Morum*."
[87] The text of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* books 1-5 are from Anderson's 1998 edition. All text translations are
my own unless otherwise cited.

(*In,* 1.1) and then postpones the completed object (*corpora,* 1.2) until the first line of the following hexameter.[89] The focus will be on forms changed into new bodies, and more importantly, it will stem from his own rational intelligence. Like the deliberate change in Ovid's syntax, his content and themes will also reflect this "transformation" of the epic composition.

In light of my discussion in the previous chapter on the initiation of the theme of metamorphosis in the *Amores*, we can see from the these programmatic lines that Ovid clearly intends to resume his unique perception of this topic. Many have already noticed Ovid's inversion of the opening of the *Amores* in the proem of the *Metamorphoses*, where his material is no longer dictated by Cupid, but rather the personal desire of the poet. [90] However, we must also pay attention to Ovid's genius at work in his programmatic statement. Ovid not only writes about "forms changed into new bodies," but also about "forms changed *in a new work*." The term *corpus* need not solely refer to an actually body, whether is be human, animal, or some other natural phenomena. Instead of "body," *corpus* can also be translated as "a compendium of scientific, literary, or other writings," or more simply as the common cognate.[91] Our minds make the logical connection that forms must change in to something, and Ovid skillfully hides an ulterior motive in our reckless assumption. While the unprecedented enjambment places extreme emphasis on the subject of his work and it also blinds the reader to additional

---

[88] Homer *Iliad* 1.1 Μ νιν "wrath"; Homer, *Odyssey* 1.1 νδρα "man"; Vergil *Aeneid* 1.1 *Arma virumque* "arms and the man."

[89] Galinsky (1975) 3 points out that the initial preposition is "unusual and deliberate." Anderson (1997) 150 is also perturbed by the preposition and adjective combination, but neither scholar offers a suggestion as to the reason why Ovid would begin his epic in this way.

[90] See Harrison (2002) 87 and Feldherr (2002) 163-164.

[91] *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (2012) 492 *corpus* definition 16.

interpretations. Ovid's mind desires to take up the foundations of mutated forms in the *Amores* and continue their development in his new epic corpus, the *Metamorphoses.*

Even though Ovid's content has a recognized precedent in Hellenistic poetry, the *Metamorphoses* is truly an epic without equal.[92] His focus is on the transformations of bodies into new forms, but there must be more at stake in his reimagining of myths than the simple retelling of how a man becomes a wolf, or why a woman turns into a tree. Ovid resumes his initial criticisms of the *princeps* in the *Amores,* who openly celebrates his dishonorable victory in civil war, and continues to develop the theme of dishonorable victory celebrations in the first book of the *Metamorphoses*. Even though specific instances of triumphal processions found in the *Amores* recede from this narrative, the theme of dishonorable victories and celebrations persists, but in new form. In place of descriptions of the procession, Ovid focuses on seemingly glorious victories over a wide variety of enemies or victims, and although it may appear that Ovid has shied away from the celebration aspect, he in fact becomes even more critical of dishonorable acclamations in the *Metamorphoses* than previously in the *Amores*.

In Book 1 of the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid informs the audience that he intends to resume his criticisms of Augustus and his acclamations of victory. Just as he did in the *Amores,* Ovid again manipulates major Augustan iconography, but with the *Clupeus Virtutis* ("Shield of Virtue"), the return of the *Aureum Saeculum* ("Golden Age"), and the symbolic laurel wreath. His rendition of the four ages of mankind, along with specific marked terminology, i.e. *pietas*, which has specific resonance with the Augustan moral

---

[92] Galinsky (1975) 2 cites, amongst others, Boeus's *Ornithogonia* and Nikander of Colophon's *Heteroioumena* as precedent for Ovid's focus on the metamorphosis theme.

reformation, challenges the restored Golden Age by comparing the degenerate Iron Age with contemporary Rome.

Ovid further criticizes Augustus in the Council of the Gods episode (1.163-252). Here, Ovid uses an *ekphrasis* to compare the immortal realm with Rome, and also equates Jupiter and his divine council to Augustus and the Roman Senate. When Jupiter is portrayed as a sole ruler wielding unquestionable *imperium*, Ovid draws parallels to Augustus and the Roman Senate cowed by his *auctoritas*. Jupiter believes the only way to save mankind from itself is by eradicating the existing morally destitute population and ushering in a "New Race" with an immaculate origin. However, the generation that comes to populate the world is in fact no different from the previous one, whereby Ovid suggests that, much like Jupiter's "New Race," Augustus' new Rome is equally fabricated.

Finally, the laurel is a symbol of Roman victory and triumph, and Augustus possessed the perpetual honor of this venerable icon adorning the doors on his Palatine residence. However, Ovid makes a point to exhibit the dishonorable connotations this symbol has in his day. Instead of granting the laurel tree a prestigious foundation myth, or *aetion*, as his predecessor Callimachus had done, Ovid deliberately taints its significance by attributing its establishment to the familiar myth of Apollo and Daphne. When Ovid replaces the epic defeat of Python with the erotic conquest of Daphne as the *aetion* of the venerable laurel, he emphatically trivializes the ancient icon and denies it any honorable qualities. The audience would immediately recognize not only the break with Callimachus' conventional narrative, but also the ignoble traits that Ovid attributes to a symbol directly associated with Augustus.

Ovid's first book of the *Metamorphoses* consistently challenges Augustus' claims to a new Golden Age and a restored Republic. As he states in the first two lines of his project, Ovid will comment on external appearances that change into new bodies, much like the Roman Republic that has mutated into a veiled autocracy. According to Ovid, Augustus may claim to have rehabilitated the destitute Roman society and that his rule ushered in a new Golden Age, but this metamorphosis is only skin-deep. This "new Rome" is in fact no different than the first and still bears the same innate nature. Ovid presents the opening sequence of myths with seamless transitions and begs the audience to consider them as a single unit. In doing so, we witness a criticism of Augustus, who revels in his own dishonorable actions. Rome is most certainly not in a new Golden Age, and the venerable laurel wreath hanging above his door exhibits his ignoble victory in civil war.

The Golden Age of Augustus

After the victory at Actium in 31 BC, Augustus was left as the unopposed head of state, and began to usher in an era of peace and prosperity. One of his major goals was the restitution of the *mos maiorum*, the moral code of their ancient Roman ancestors,[93] and there is no better paradigm for ancient virtue than the Golden Age of mankind. Among the numerous deeds and achievements recorded in the *Res Gestae,* Augustus lists his moral reformation.

> Legibus novis me auctore latis multa exempla maiorum exolescentia iam ex nostro saeculo reduxi et ipse multarum rerum exempla imitanda posteris tradidi.

---

[93] See Zanker's (1990) 156-159 sub-chapter *Mores Maiorum* for an explanation of the importance of moral regulation to Augustus. Zanker states that during this era, "immorality was regarded as the greatest evil of the past and the reason for the collapse of Rome."

> By new laws passed under my authority, I restored many traditions of our ancestors now forgotten from our age and I myself delivered the archetype of many things that should be imitated by later generations.
>
> *Res Gestae* 8[94]

Although the official publication of the *Res Gestae* (14 AD) postdates the publication of the *Metamorphoses* (8 AD), Werner Eck points out that Augustus wrote this account early in his career and continued to revise it until his death.[95] Augustus' initial attempts to regulate Roman morality failed, but after nearly a decade of attempting to integrate this ethical system,[96] Augustus finally achieved the influence necessary to carry out his proposals. Frank points out that the combination of retrieving the lost standards of Crassus in 20 BC, the repulsed *coup d'état* in 19 BC, and Augustus' triumphant return from the East allowed him to establish firmly, "a comprehensive program of [moral] reform, and culminated in the Secular Games of 17 BC to mark the dawn of a New Age."[97] From May 30 through June 3, 17 BC, the *Ludi Saeculares,* the Secular Games, were held in honor of the restored Golden Age. Naturally, as Augustus had previously done following Actium, poets had to contend with this new era. Horace, perhaps most famously, composed the *Carmen Saeculare* in honor of the games and it was even recited publicly on the Palatine and Capitoline hills on the final day.[98] Ovid too, was confronted with the transformation of the ages, and this metamorphosis of Rome into a new age offered him a perfect opportunity to juxtapose the Augustan Golden Age with reality. In

---

[94] All citations of the *Res Gestae* come from Cooley (2009).

[95] Eck (2003) 133.

[96] Augustus first failed in 29/28 BC to introduce moral reform, but eventually succeeded in 18 BC when the *Leges Juliae* passed. See Zanker (1990) 157; Galinsky (1996) 128-131; Frank (1975) for details on Augustan moral legislation.

[97] Frank (1975) 44.

[98] Galinsky (1996) 102 points out that although Horace incorporated the Augustan themes of morality into his composition, he "stops short of proclaiming a Golden Age, and especially a Golden Age of automatic bliss or felicity."

his catalogue of the transition from the Golden Age to the Iron Age, Ovid introduces the foundation of his challenges and criticisms of major Augustan acclamations, such as the return of the Golden Age of mankind.

The transition from a decrepit Roman society to an utopian Golden Age is a supreme concern for Augustus, even after his decisive victory at Actium. Ovid also was fascinated with the evolution of the Ages, and sets out to challenge the Augustan concept the "Golden Age" by comparing it to the Iron Age. After a brief recollection of the creation of the world from loose matter into elements and masses (1.5-88), Ovid recounts the decline of mankind through the four ages: Gold, Silver, Bronze, and Iron. In the Golden Age there was no government, war, or agriculture, and the earth provided everything to the population willingly; but after Saturn was imprisoned in Tartarus, the Silver Age began under the patronage of Jupiter. The previous age of endless spring was replaced with the four seasons, and people were forced to plow the earth and take shelter in caves. Nevertheless, this generation still bore no ill will towards one another. While the Bronze Age ushered in the concept of conflict, it was not until the Iron Age, the most inferior, that all manner of immorality spread over the earth.

Ovid's enumeration of the ages follows Hesiod's rendition of the decline of mankind throughout the generations in his *Works and Days*,[99] and Vergil too detailed mankind's degeneration in all three of his major works.[100] However, in Ovid's account, the Golden Age (1.89-112) and the Iron Age (1.127-150) receive disproportionate attention compared to the Silver and Bronze Ages (1.113-127); and perhaps it is no mere

---

[99] Hesiod *Works and Days* 109-201, claims that there were Five Ages of mankind, and includes the Age of Heroes in between the Bronze and Iron Age to reflect the Trojan War.

[100] Vergil *Eclogues* 4.4-7; *Georgics* 1.125-159; *Aeneid* 6.791-797. Since these works were published in 39 BC, 29 BC, and 19 BC, respectively, the idea of recasting a new Golden Age has a long literary history, and Ovid, therefore, is working within an existing tradition.

coincidence that Ovid treats both the Gold and Iron Ages equally with twenty-three lines apiece in order to draw specific attention to each. Indeed, Ovid provides meticulous details on the characteristics of the Gold and Iron Ages as a way to assign contemporary relevance.

Ovid uses the opening Ages scene in his epic narrative to challenge methodically the Augustan Golden Age with terminology inextricably linked to the *princeps*.

> Aurea prima sata est aetas, quae <u>vindice nullo</u>,
> sponte sua, <u>sine lege</u> fidem rectumque colebat.　　90
> poena metusque aberrant nec <u>verba minantia fixo</u>
> <u>aere legebantur</u> nec supplex turba timebat
> iudicis ora sui, sed erant <u>sine vindice</u> tuti.
>
> First came the Golden Age, which, <u>without any protector</u>,
> <u>without law</u>, was cherishing faith and virtue by its own free will.　　90
> Punishment and fear were absent, and <u>threatening words</u>
> <u>established in bronze were not read</u>, nor was a supplicant crowd
> fearing the verdict of their own judges, but they were safe <u>without a protector</u>.
> *Metamorphoses* 1.89-93

Ovid describes the Golden Age strictly in terms of negation, implicitly demonstrating the inherent differences between the true Golden Age and Ovid's own time. First and foremost, Ovid states the Golden Age lacks any sort of protector or defender (*vindice nullo* 1.89; *sine vindice* 1.93). The repetition of the term *vindex* in the context of the Golden Age recalls claims made by Augustus himself. For example, in the first line of the *Res Gestae*, Augustus states that he delivered Rome into a state of freedom (*in libertatem vindicavi*, 1.1); he was also honored on coins as the *libertatis P. R. Vindex*, "The Defender of the Liberty of the Roman people."[101] Ovid's use of the term *vindex* in this description of the Golden Age, therefore, suggests a direct response to Augustus's

---

[101] For Augustus as *Vindex* see Syme (1939) 155 and 307. This title was stamped on coins honoring Augustus' victory over Marcus Antonius, and "indicates armed usurpation attempted or successful, the removal of either a pretender or a tyrant."

"version," in which he is the *vindex* of Rome by his own admission. Furthermore, no law (*sine lege* 1.90) was needed to mandate faith and virtue in the Golden Age. Ovid issues another direct challenge to Augustus' claim by pointing to the legislative reforms passed by Augustus, which constitute his virtuous Roman society. As Sir Ronald Syme describes it, the *Leges Juliae*, passed in 18 BC, were "principal laws designed to curb licence, establish morality, and…in a word, to restore the basics of civic virtue."[102] According to its own rhetoric, Augustan moral legislation claims a "return" to the values of a superior age, but Ovid points out that the Golden Age was golden precisely because it did not have laws, punishment, or the need of a defender. He presents the utopian age in the *Metamorphoses* as the pinnacle of existence only to contrast it by exactly what the contemporary age is not.

Instead of the glorious Golden Age, it is Ovid's description of the morally destitute Iron Age that draws comparisons to the current status of Rome.

> Iamque <u>nocens ferrum ferroque nocentius aurum</u>
> prodierat; prodit bellum, quod pugnat utroque,
> sanguineaque manu crepitantia concutit arma.
> Vivitur ex rapto; non hospes ab hospite tutus,
> <u>non socer a genero, fratrum quoque gratia rara est</u>.   140
> inminet exitio vir coniugis, illa mariti;
> lurida terribiles miscent acontia novercae;
> filius ante diem patrios inquirit in annos.
> <u>Victa iacet pietas</u>, et Virgo caede madentes,
> ultima caelestum, terras Astraea reliquit.   150

> Now <u>harmful Iron and Gold more harmful than Iron,</u>
> came forth; War comes forth, which fights with both,
> and clashing arms in bloody hands strike together.
> Men live off of what they take; A guest is not safe from his host,
> <u>nor a father from a son in law, and even goodwill from a brother is rare</u>.   140
> A husband awaits the death of his wife, and she the death of her husband;
> Frightful stepmothers concoct yellow potions;
> Sons inquire about their fathers age beforehand.

---

[102] Syme (1939) 443.

> Piety lies conquered, and the Virgin Astrea,
> the last of the gods, abandons the bloodstained earth.   150
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.141-150

In this most degenerate of ages lands become owned, wars are waged, and all morality

disappears. Honor, truth, and loyalty (*pudor verumque fidesque* 1.129) all flee the world,

and in their place arrive crime, deception, treachery, violence, and heinous desire

(*fraudesque dolique insidiaeque et vis et amor sceleratus* 1.130-131). Ovid states that this

era also witnessed a desire for precious metal. While the earth is mined for harmful iron

(*nocens ferrum* 1.142), it is exceeded by even more dangerous metal, gold (*nocentius*

aurum 1.142). Here, Ovid draws the image of the Golden Age back to the audience's

mind while describing the horrors of the Iron Age, and directly points to an association

with the Augustan Golden Age. Ovid description transposes Augustus' Golden Age into

the Age where people aggressively seek gold, and perhaps even makes the comparison

that Augustus desire for the Golden Age is even more harmful to Rome than war,

violence, or crime.

Ovid also describes the various impieties plaguing the world during this Age, and

most specifically the social disorder and utter lack of morality. Ovid's picture of the Iron

Age is driven by conflict and war, and he focuses on the violation of social customs

within the family. Anderson points out that the mention of violence between *socer* and

gener (1.145) would immediately bring the relationship between Julius Caesar and

Pompeius Magnus to the reader's mind, since Caesar had married his daughter Julia to

Pompeius in order to solidify a political alliance.[103] The alliance proved futile and civil

war broke out between the brothers-in-law in 49 BC. As if this was not explicit enough,

---

[103]Anderson (1997) 165 states, "Allusions to the two as in-laws start in their own day with Catullus 29.24,
then appear prominently in *Aen*. 6.826-31."

Ovid points out the strife between brothers (1.145). While any conflict in general presents an obvious dissimilarity to the Golden Age, civil war is a distinctive characteristic of the Iron Age.

Ovid delays his most poignant remark until the end of his description of the Iron Age, and in the process points directly to another major piece of Augustan moral legislation. On January 13, 27 BC, the senate erected a golden shield in the Curia Iulia, inscribed with four carefully chosen Roman values: *virtus, clementia, iusitia,* and *pietas*; thus the shield was named the *Clupeus Virtutis,* the Shield of Virtue. While Augustus considered these four values to be important to his moral reformation,[104] of the four, *pietas* was crucial to Augustus. Even the inscription on the shield itself puts emphasis on this duty: *pietas erga deos patriamque,* "piety towards the gods and the fatherland." It is the only virtue on the shield that is given particular details about the manner in which one should carry out their duty. Galinsky believes these four specific virtues were chosen not only because, "[t]hey speak to the merits Augustus has already demonstrated and to his obligation to continue such in the future, [but] they are also the virtues of the *res publica* and as such shared by all."[105] Ovid's bold statement at the end of his treatment of the four ages echoes the prime virtue with destabilizing intent. Once Ovid juxtaposes the contemporary Golden Age with the degraded Iron Age, the phrase *victa iacet pietas* (piety lies conquered 1.149) exemplifies the affiliation. *Pietas* serves as the pivot that connects the two seemingly disparate generations, wherein during the previous Age of Gold *pietas* thrives, but in the current Iron Age it has been utterly defeated.

---

[104] See Galinsky (1996) 80-83 for analysis of the *Clupeus Virtutis.* He also points out that these values are not canonical, and are not consistent with other lists of virtues published by Cato and Plato.
[105] Galinsky (1996) 80.

Ovid's recollection of the four ages serves multiple purposes for his narrative. On the one hand, it fulfills Ovid's programmatic remark to start his narrative at the beginning of time (*ab origine mundi* 1.3) and continue until his own time. The movement from the creation myth to the account of the ages shows a chronological progression of time that informs the remainder of the *Metamorphoses*. On the other hand, Ovid uses the theme of transformation and its physical manifestations to address deeper metaphorical and political implications of Rome's own metamorphosis into a new Golden Age. The description of the morally corrupt Iron Age points directly to the Augustan moral reformation and even challenges the pinnacle of Roman virtue, *pietas*. Ovid presents his Golden Age in this way to exhibit the Augustan Golden Age as a false façade that underscores the superficiality of Rome's transformation from a morally depraved society plagued by civil discord into the reborn Golden Age. According to Ovid's interpretation, Rome did not experience an immaculate rebirth, and its true "inner self" lies concealed beneath the false promises of the Augustus.

As Augustus demonstrates his desire to curb the decline of Roman social and moral codes and return to Republican virtue, Ovid manifests a quasi-covert critique of this conversion. The juxtaposition of the Golden and Iron Ages shows Ovid is aware of the claim that the Golden Age, free from government persecution, war, and moral depravity, has returned; yet Ovid's description of the Iron Age acts as the true reflection of Rome. The Golden Age in the *Metamorphoses* stands in direct defiance to Augustus' claim to a resurrected *Aureum Saeculum.* This conflicting portrayal of the moral campaign of Augustus at the very beginning of his epic composition suggests that Ovid

intends to challenge major Augustan motifs throughout his massive catalogue of mutations, transformations, and metamorphoses.

The *Palatia Caeli*

Immediately following the progression of the four ages, Ovid moves to a plotline his predecessors and even Ovid in his earlier works avoided: the Gigantomachy (1.151-162).[106] As I argue in Chapter One, Propertius states in his *recusatio* that such a topic would be off limits to his poetic composition.[107] If he were to write an epic, he would be forced (*canerem* 1.19, 28, 32; *memorarem* 25) to contend with the dishonorable deeds of Augustus.[108] Ovid, too, previously tried to compose an epic featuring the Giants' assault on Mount Olympus, which he recounts in *Amores* 2.1. However, his mistress slams the door on his attempt, and consequently halted his epic endeavor.[109] Anderson states that during Ovid's own lifetime "this war, The Gigantomachy, … was said to parallel the ravages of Civil War, and Jupiter's triumph to anticipate the victory and peaceful rule of Augustus in a new Golden Age."[110] Since Augustan poets tended to avoid this dispute between the gods and the children of Earth, we must consider why Ovid finally decides to refer to this touchy subject.

On the one hand, the location of the Gigantomachy scene can be explained as a temporal one. Ovid follows the course of time from Creation through the four ages and now must continue on to the scene of the assault on Mount Olympus. On the other hand, I

---

[106] Xenophanes 1.21 says the praiseworthy symposiast should always avoid this specific topic in his songs.
[107] Propertius *Elegies* 2.1.19-20
[108] Propertius *Elegies* 2.1.17-34
[109] Ovid *Amores* 2.1.17
[110] Anderson (1997) 166.

argue Ovid continues his criticisms of Augustus in the epic battle and defeat of the Giants

by countering the claims of a pacified world.

> Obruta mole sua cum corpora dira iacerent,
> perfusam multo natorum sanguine Terram
> immaduisse ferunt calidumque animasse cruorem
> et, ne nulla suae stirpis monimenta manerent,
> in faciem vertisse hominum. Sed et illa propago   160
> contemptrix superum saevaeque avidissima caedis
> et violenta fuit: <u>scires e sanguine natos</u>.

> When crushed under their own weight their savage corpses lie there,
> they say that Mother Earth, drenched in so much blood
> of her children reanimated the hot gore
> and, so that the memory of her own children would remain,
> she turned them into human form. But even this offspring   160
> despised the gods and was most greedy for savage slaughter
> and was violent: <u>you know they are born from blood</u>.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.156-162

Since Ovid's predecessors and contemporaries agreed that Jupiter's victory over the

Giants was said to parallel the victory of Augustus in civil war, we can assume Ovid had

this in mind as he composed his own Gigantomachy. After the battle of Actium,

Augustus claimed to usher in a new age of peace, but Ovid's portrayal of the victory and

subsequent peace suggests the new world order was no less savage than before. Instead,

we are presented with a truly gory depiction of Mother Earth dripping wet with the blood

of her own children (1.157). Perhaps Ovid was alluding to the fact that Rome itself was

equally stained by the civil wars. What is most striking is Ovid's description of the new

world order that is born from the ravages of civil conflict. Mother Earth creates an

everlasting memorial of her rebellious and vicious children by making them into human

beings (*in faciem vertisse hominum,* 1.160). According to Ovid, mankind is innately

bloodthirsty (*avidissima caedis,* 1.161) and we are testament to our own origins. Ovid's

chilling apostrophe (*scires e sanguine natos,* 1.162) does not include any specification as

to whom this race refers, but I suggest that because Ovid is narrating the Gigantomachy, a topic that has undeniable correspondences with Augustus' victory in civil war, we are to understand *natos* with "we" as its subject *rather* than "they." Ovid's own generation is one crafted in the aftermath of civil conflict, and he invites the reader to "cross the distance that separates [them] from the mythical account, to recognize [themselves] in these human beings."[111] The utter moral depravity of the Iron Age is nearly complete as Ovid continues to make overt contrasts to the Augustan *Aureum Saeculum* through the seamless transitions of time.

The Gigantomachy provides the foundation for the subsequent tale of the Council of the Gods and Lycaon, where Ovid makes a comparison between Jupiter and Augustus without ambiguity. However, before Ovid creates the parallel between Omnipotent Jupiter and the *princeps*, he must first clue the reader in to his plan by providing an *ekphrasis* of the immortal realm:

Quae pater ut summa vidit Saturnius arce,	
ingemit et facto nondum vulgata recenti	
foeda Lycaoniae referens convivia mensae	165
ingentes animo et dignas Iove concipit iras	
conciliumque vocat: tenuit mora nulla vocatos.	
Est via sublimis, caelo manifesta sereno;	
lactea nomen habet, candore notabilis ipso.	
hac iter est superis ad magni tecta Tonantis	170
regalemque domum: dextra laevaque deorum	
atria nobilium valvis celebrantur apertis.	
plebs habitat diversa locis: hac parte potentes	
caelicolae clarique suos posuere penates;	
hic locus est, quem, si verbis audacia detur,	175
haud timeam magni dixisse Palatia caeli.	
Ergo ubi marmoreo superi sedere recessu,	
celsior ipse loco sceptroque innixus eburno	
terrificam capitis concussit terque quaterque	
caesariem, cum qua terram, mare, sidera movit.	180

---

[111] Anderson (1997) 168.

As father <u>Jupiter, son of Saturn</u>, saw these things from the highest citadel,
he groaned and, remembering the filthy feasts of the Lycaonian tables,
not yet well-known because it had been done recently,   165
he took up in his heart a wrath massive and worthy of Jupiter
and called a council; no delay held those that had been summoned.
There is a high road clear in the calm sky:
it bears the name the Milky Way, known for this very glow;
this is the path for the gods <u>to the halls of the great Thunderer</u>   170
and the royal home: on the right and the left the atriums
of noble gods with doors wide open are crowded,
the Plebeian gods live in a different place: but in this place
the powerful and eminent gods erect their household-gods;
this is the place, if boldness may be given to the statement,   175
I would hardly be afraid to have called it the <u>Palatine of the great sky</u>.
<u>Therefore when the gods settled in the marble inner chamber,</u>
<u>he, elevated in that place and leaning on an ivory scepter</u>
shook three times and four times the terrifying hair of his head,
with which he moves the land, the sea, and the stars.   180

Metamorphoses 1.1.163-180

Ovid uses a peculiar epithet to describe Jupiter, which would evoke multiple emotions

amongst his audience. Anderson points out this reference could be simple epic

convention, since Vergil used the same epithet in book four of the *Aeneid*,[112] or could

remind the audience of Jupiter's impious relationship with his father.[113] In addition to

these suggestions, I would add that Ovid makes use of the patronymic epithet to

underscores the idea of the succession motif, which was a prime concern of the

princeps.[114] The description of Jupiter's anger at mankind is also striking. Ovid classifies

the god's wrath as both massive and worthy of Jupiter (*ingentes… et dignas Iove… iras,*

1.166), but the two adjectives seem contradictory and even imprecise. Does Ovid mean

Jupiter's massive anger is justified or that his anger is characteristically *ingens*? Due

argues the adjectives are essentially nullified by Jupiter's decision to call a counsel rather

---

[112] Vergil *Aeneid* 4.372 "*Saturninus…pater*"
[113] Anderson (1997) 168.
[114] Tacitus *Annales* 1.3 highlights Augustus's obsession with securing a dynasty.

than act out of rage, and states that Jupiter, "finds it wiser to act like a constitutional monarch and to secure a kind of parliamentary backing."[115] Nevertheless, this position ignores the fact that the punishment had already been carried out prior to any deliberation (*facto… recenti*, 164). Therefore, Jupiter's wrath should be considered as typically *ingens*, instead of worthy for the almighty divinity. It seems that Ovid intends to characterize Jupiter, and perhaps even his contemporary equivalent Augustus, as precipitous and impulsive in his actions.

As Jupiter recalls his encounter with Lycaon and calls the gods to an assembly at the *Palatia Caeli* (1.176), the Palatine of the Sky, Ovid interrupts the narrative with an *ekphrasis* of the realm of the gods that makes an unquestionable comparison to Rome. On a clear night, you can make out the Milky Way, which is apparently the road that leads up to Jupiter's halls (*ad magni tecta Tonantis,* 1.170). The noble gods (*atria nobilium,* 1.172) dwell all along this road, but the plebeian gods (*plebs*, 1.173) live elsewhere. Here we can see how Ovid segregates the immortal realm just like his own present day Rome, where the wealthy aristocrats take up residence on the Palatine Hill, while the lower class citizens live on the lesser hills or down in the Subura. He completes his anthropomorphosis of the gods by stating that they too establish and worship their own household gods (*posuere penates,* 1.173). Ovid's road to Jupiter's residence thus portrays distinctively Roman elements, not only topographical and social, but also religious. He ends his *ekphrasis* with an apology for his contemporary analogy: "This is the place, if boldness may be given to the statement, I would hardly be afraid to have called it the Palatine of the great sky."[116] What was a mere suggestion up to this point becomes a

---

[115] Due (1974) 71.
[116] Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1.175-176

stated fact, which Ovid is not afraid to say; mainly, the Palatine Hill in Rome has direct association with the realm of the immortal gods.

Now that Ovid has firmly suggested the image of Rome to the reader's mind, he offers an image of Jupiter convening the Council of the Gods in which there are noticeable characteristics suggesting a connection with Augustus convening a Senate meeting.[117] All the gods are seated in attendance within an inner marble sanctum. Augustus, too, was known to host Senate meetings in large rooms veneered in marble, a distinctive feature of the renovations made by Augustus on public buildings.[118] At this time in Roman history, Augustus was not only insisting on a return to Republican virtues, but also claimed that he restored the governing responsibilities to the people and the Republic; yet Ovid does not impart any Republican procedural characteristics to the Council of the Gods. Instead, Jupiter presides over his fellow Olympians alone, seated on an elevated platform, and holding an ivory scepter (*sceptro…eburno,* 1.178). His position and accouterments give the impression of a King ruling over subordinates rather than consuls conducting the Senate meeting. The ivory scepter (*sceptrum eburnum*) is a recognized symbol of authority, *imperium*, wielded by the Kings before the Republic or those that currently had legal control of a military force.[119] Furthermore, it is interesting to note that Ovid does not expressly state that Jupiter is the figure seated above the rest. It is true that *ipse* (178) would naturally and contextually refer back to *Pater… Saturnius*

---

[117] See Miller (2009) 334-338 for an exhaustive treatment of the historical and intratextual similarities. Galinsky (1979) 29 also suggests that Ovid engages in the standard poetic practice of "making a myth relevant to one's own time by dressing it in modern garb." Tissol (2002) 306 also remarks, "When Ovid represents Jupiter summoning the gods to the *palatia caeli* (1.176), Jupiter not only becomes Romanized but a reflection of Augustus whose house stood on the earthly Palatine Hill."

[118] Suetonius *Divus Augustus* 28.3 tells us that Augustus was truly (*iure*) able to claim he had received Rome made of brick and left it covered in marble.

[119] Anderson (1997) 170 states the ivory scepter is a standard symbol for regal authority, and Ovid also references the ivory scepter at 7.103 when describing King Aeetes (the *Rex* at 7.102).

(163), but Ovid deliberately places *caesariem* (180) in an emphatic position by means of significant hyperbaton. This specific word choice refers backs to Homer's epic description of Zeus at *Iliad* 1.528-530, where Jupiter nods his head of magnificent hair in assent and causes the earth to shake. Anderson (1997) suggests that Ovid "spoils the majesty of the scene" by negating the suspense caused by the enjambment of *terrificam* (179) and ending with only luxuriant hair (*caesariem*, 1.180) instead of a lightning bolt perhaps. However, Ovid's delay diverts the attention of the audience solely to the postponed *caesariem*, which sounds nearly identical to name of the ruler who currently hosts the Senate meetings, Caesar Augustus.[120] The suspense is not diminished in any way; rather, Ovid ingeniously builds the suspense from the very beginning of the passage with the *ekphrasis* of the Palatine in the sky that explicitly, and even admittedly, affirms the setting in contemporary Rome and then ends his description of Jupiter hosting the Council of the Gods with symbols that have direct correspondence to the *princeps*. Although Ovid never mentions Augustus directly, the postponement of *caesariem* gives the audience exactly what they expect by hiding his intention in a witty trivialization of Homer's epic precedent. Ovid not only describes the way Jupiter reigns over the city of the gods, but also constructs a paradigmatic realm that is indistinguishable from Rome and its sole leader Augustus.

Ovid's depiction of Jupiter at the Council of the Gods includes clear similarities to, and perhaps even a covert identification of, Augustus hosting a Roman senate meeting. He then makes explicit what was expertly concealed (*terrificam…caesariem*, 1.179-180) in the prior description of Jupiter. In an indignant speech, the divine king tells

---

[120] de Vann (2008) 81-82 shows that *caesaries* "having long hair" was probably cognate with the name Caesar.

his senate that the Giants' assault on Olympus was not as troublesome as the current state

of mankind, and calls for the immediate destruction of all humanity. Jupiter states,

perdendum est mortale genus, "The mortal race must be destroyed."[121] Both the initial

line placement adds additional emphasis on the action, and the future passive periphrastic

construction also dictates an implied necessity or obligation. According to Jupiter, and he

even swears by the River Styx (1.189), he has tried everything (*cunca…temptata* 190) to

curb the behavior of mankind, but their degenerate nature must be cut away with a sword

(*ense reciendum est* 191), like gangrenous flesh from an incurable body (*inmedicabile*

corpus, 190). When Jupiter finally gives justification for the destruction of the entirety of

humanity, he tells the gods that it is all due to the plot of one single mortal, Lycaon,

renown for his feral savageness. The language used in Jupiter's speech points more

readily to a mandate than to a judgment that will be voted on. Ovid uses two

constructions, *perdendum est* and *reciendum est*, within four lines of each other to imply

a sense of necessity that leaves the council with no other alternative. The vile actions of

mankind are never explained, but instead are categorized as equal to the deceit laid out by

Lycaon against Jupiter. It is for this reason that the human race must be purged from the

world to save it.

As Ovid describes the reaction of the gods to Jupiter's speech, he finally makes

his comparison between the immortal council and contemporary Rome explicit:

> Confremuere omnes studiisque ardentibus ausum
> talia deposcunt: sic, cum manus inpia saevit   200
> sanguine Caesareo Romanum exstinguere nomen,
> attonitum tantae subito terrore ruinae
> humanum genus est totusque perhorruit orbis;
> nec tibi grata minus <u>pietas</u>, <u>Auguste</u>, tuorum
> quam fuit illa Iovi. qui postquam voce manuque   205

---

[121] Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1.1.188

murmura conpressit, tenuere silentia cuncti.

> All the gods resounded loudly and with burning zeal demanded
> the one that had dared such things: just like when an impious band raged   200
> to extinguish the name of Rome with Caesarian blood,
> and the human race was shocked by such a terror
> of sudden ruin and the whole world trembled,
> the <u>loyalty</u> of your subjects, <u>Augustus</u>, is no less pleasing to you
> than it was to Jupiter, who then with a word and his hand   205
> stifled the roar, all held silence.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.199-206

The governing council immediately consents with the divine king and demands

punishment for the perpetrator without hearing a single shred of condemning evidence.

Ovid then offers a bold simile comparing the raucous assembly to a crazed mob in Rome,

whose madness is driven by an assassination attempt on Augustus.[122] The address to

Augustus (*Auguste*, 1. 204) may seem like a tribute to the *princeps* in the context of the

Jovian association made obvious in the previous scenes. On the one hand, it would be

pleasing to Augustus to hear that he commands the same type of loyalty (*pietas*, 1. 204)

which Jupiter wields over the gods, and that the entire world was up in arms to defend

their leader. However, if Rome has truly returned to a Republic, as Augustus so

adamantly claims in his *Res Gestae*,[123] certain aspects of this simile are condescending.

Looking back at the simile, there is no deliberation over the correct course of action.

Jupiter has already enacted his personal vengeance on Lycaon regardless of their consent.

When Jupiter finally divulges the details of the crime that merits the eradication

of humanity from the world, we find that it too is a violation of another prized institution

that traces back to the Republic, the guest-host relationship. When he comes to the

---

[122] The scholarly trend to view this assassination as a reference to Julius Caesar has been quelled by the fact that this was only an attempt on the life of Caesar and not an actual death. See Miller (2009) 337, Due (1974) 71-72, and Feeney (1991) 199 for analysis of this scene as a failed assassination of Augustus. Against this reading, see White (2002) 14-15.

[123] Augustus *Res Gestae* 34.

kingdom of Lycaon, he gives the sign that he was a god, but Lycaon was unconvinced and sought to test the god's mortality. In an extreme violation of the guest-host covenant, Lycaon serves the god cooked human flesh. The audacious Lycaon is immediately punished for his actions and Jupiter destroys Lycaon's house around him, and as Lycaon flees to the hills, he is transformed into a wolf, an external manifestation of his inner savage nature. Once Jupiter finishes recounting the events of this personal travesty, he states emphatically that all mankind is worthy of destruction (*digna,* 241). It is important to note that Ovid's version of the myth departs significantly from early Greek accounts. While he still commits egregious sins against the gods, Lycaon's evils, "are balanced by his role a civilizing hero."[124] Feldherr suggests that "if Lycaon's error is really a failure to recognize that gods can disguise themselves as men, his experience is very relevant to Ovid's own readers who are making their first acquaintance with anthropomorphized gods in the work."[125] Yet, there is more at stake in Ovid's use of anthropomorphosis. The audience is not only encountering personified gods in the text, but also in their own lives. After all, Augustus himself is the *divi filius*, the son of a god, and Ovid has already made the comparison between Augustus and Jupiter explicit. Ovid's intention, then, is not to familiarize the audience with humanized gods, but to call attention to Augustus's own divine associations.

Once again, the council roars with approval, but Ovid inserts noteworthy terminology to bring the contemporary Roman environment to the forefront. The speech is again characterized as an indignant rant. The term *frementus* (1.244) reminds the reader

---

[124] Feldherr (2002) 171 notes that Lycaon's claim to fame is not solely based on his crime, but also as an institutor of religion and even as the founder of the cult of Zeus Lykaios. For alternative accounts Lycaon, see Forbes-Irving (1990) 90-95 and 216-218.
[125] Feldherr (2002) 172.

that Jupiter's state of mind is not rational, but consumed with wrath (*iras,* 1.166), so

much so that the furious tirade pours from his mouth (*ora indignantia,* 1.181). Ovid also

states that the presiding gods shared Jupiter's passion (*confremuere omnes,* 1.199) before

they had even heard the details of the case. Once Lycaon's treachery has been fully

explained, Jupiter again calls for the annihilation of mankind. One part of the Council

openly approves (*probet,* 1.244) the motion to eradicate mortal life and goads Jupiter's

ravings, while the rest "play their part" (*inplent,* 1.245). This verb *impleo* is indeed and

interesting choice of words, since it does fit the context of a judge carrying out his duty to

pass judgment.[126] Lee points out that this use of *impleo* can also function as a theatrical

metaphor.[127] Following this secondary reading, Ovid destabilizes the solemnity of the

council, suggesting that they withhold any opposition to Jupiter's declaration and

participate merely as actors whose role highlights the current futility of the Roman Senate

under Augustus' *auctoritas*.[128]

       Ovid imbues the narrative sequence of the Council of the Gods with

contemporary Roman elements that challenge the unrivaled political authority of

Augustus. By beginning with an *ekphrasis* describing the location of the Council, Ovid

clearly designates the similarities between the immortal assembly and the Roman Senate.

If the name "the Palatine of the Sky" was not obvious enough, Ovid describes the divine

realm having aristocratic gods (*nobiles*) that dwell on this hill, while the plebian gods

(*plebs*) live elsewhere – a layout that matches the socially segregated population within

Rome. As the celestial senators sit in a marble chamber, Jupiter addresses the assembly

---

[126] *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (2012) 931: *impleo,* definition 9.
[127] Lee (1953).
[128] White (2002) disagrees and agues this is a praiseworthy tone: "the comparison works to the advantage of Augustus, who has been able to redress crime on earth by less drastic means than Jupiter."

from an elevated platform while wielding an ivory scepter, a distinct mark of sole power and authority. His emotions run rampant, as he demands that the immoral human race must be purged from the world, and must be removed like a cancer from the body. Not only does Ovid's use of dual future passive periphrastic constructions in rapid sequence grammatically suggest necessity and obligation, but coupled with the fury of Jupiter, they also paint a picture of a dictator handing down mandates rather than consuls presiding over deliberations. As Ovid describes the response of the Council, he constructs a simile directly naming Augustus, who loves the total and unquestioning loyalty (*pietas,* 1.204) of his subjects just as much as Jupiter does. Ovid specifically uses the term *pietas* because of its superlative value in the eyes of Augustus, and the placement of *pietas* in the simile following the indignant rant of a sole ruler challenges Augustus' moral reformation and the return to Republican values. The suspense continues as we witness, *ex post facto*, Jupiter's vengeance on Lycaon and his bestial transformation. The Council consents to the eradication of mankind, but there is neither a vote nor any deliberation, just like the Roman Senate whose attendees only assume a theatrical role (*impleo)* of Senators. Then Ovid concludes the narrative with a term that would quell any remaining doubt in the audience as to his intention. Up until this point, Jupiter's position as the supreme ruler has been apparent by his nature. Jupiter is, in fact, the ruler of the gods, but with so much emphasis on Rome and Augustus, when Ovid finally labels Jupiter as *rex superorum,* King of the Gods, we are forced to apply this epithet duly to Augustus and his reign over the Rome and the Senate.

The New Race

Now that mankind has been wiped from the face of the earth, obviously a new race of mankind must take their place, and when Ovid introduces the generation of mankind that currently inhabits his present-day world, he continues to challenge the concept of a return to the Golden Age with its immaculate morality. At the end of the Council of the Gods, Jupiter promises the other Olympians that he will replenish the world with a new race of mankind from a wondrous origin (*origine mira*, 1.252), but Ovid denies their recreation any noble characteristics. Instead, they are born from Mother Earth, the progenitor of the Giants, and Ovid makes it explicit that mankind is no different from their warlike predecessors.

In order to exterminate mankind, Jupiter decides to flood the world, and enlists the South Wind, Iris, and Neptune to help.[129] Deucalion, the best of men (*non illo melior*, 1.322), and Pyrrha, who revered the gods more than anyone (*metuentior ulla deorum* 1.323), were the only two mortals who survived the deluge, and grieved at the loss of their race.[130] It is no mere coincidence that Ovid places emphasis on their impeccable moral stature, and the audience would immediately expect that these two might provide the wondrous origin that Jupiter promised. If Deucalion and Pyrrha began to repopulate the world, it would be reasonable to expect their offspring to have the same innate honorable qualities. However, Ovid denies such a perfect ancestry and instead bestows upon mankind an insidious *aetion*.

---

[129] Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1.253-312

[130] Due (1974) 110 acknowledges that "…Deucalion and Pyrrha were not only morally good, but also endowed with a heroic greatness which could match their huge mission of recreating the human race," but credits their lack of agency in repopulation to Jupiter.

Deucalion and Pyrrha come to the shine at Delphi and ask Themis, goddess of justice,[131] how the race of men can be restored to the world (as if procreation was not the obvious answer!). She responds, in typical oracular fashion, with cryptic directions to throw the bones of the great mother over their shoulder. Although temporarily dumbfounded, Pyrrha realizes that the "bones of the great mother" are actually the stones on the ground since Earth is mother to all things. Lo and behold, the two mortals carry out the oracular demands and the tossed stones begin to transform into a new race of men, born from Earth.[132] Ovid ends his account of the rebirth of mankind with a brief recollection of their intrinsic nature.

> Inde genus durum sumus experiensque laborum
> et documenta damus, qua simus origine nati.
>
> Therefore, we are a tough race and used to labor
> and we give testament from which origin we are born.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1. 414-415

The recreation of mankind by divine powers offers an aetiological myth for the current race of humanity, and Ovid needs only two lines to express his perception of the new generation. Anderson suggests that this overly simple explanation of why men are tough and used to toil, "reduces the significance of the whole story to a simple aetiology…[but] the audience should not feel so restricted."[133] Although he offers no further insight into the possible implications of this all too brief explanation of the nature of man, I suggest Ovid's intention is to label the "new race" as no different from the previous generation, which was wiped out by Zeus' wrath.

---

[131] Anderson (1997) 182 notes that Themis "is said to be the oracular deity at Delphi in this early time, before Apollo (whose story follows [441 ff.]) takes control of the site."

[132] Due (1974) 74 states that every reader would recognize the race sprung from stone is the current race of mankind, but credits this merely to Ovid's "charming self-irony."

[133] Anderson (1997) 187

This "new race" was supposed to be from a wondrous origin (*origine mira* 1.252), but is that promise truly fulfilled? Is the origin of mankind actually wondrous? According to Ovid, it is most certainly not. The human race is the offspring of Mother Earth, and she is not the illustrious progenitor as one would think. In the last reference to Mother Earth, Ovid depicts her stained with the blood of her children (*perfusam multo natorum sanguine Terram*, 1.157). Zeus had just massacred the Giants attempting to overthrow the gods, but she reanimates their corpses and produces a race of man born from blood and who have the same love of slaughter and the same violent nature as the Giants and even the Great Mother herself.[134] Once this generation of mankind is eradicated, the new promised race is born from Mother Earth yet again. Ovid describes mankind as tough and accustomed to labor, and makes it apparent that this generation is the same as the contemporary generation by the inclusive first person plural verb *sumus*. He then verbally echoes Jupiter's promise, *origine mira* (line 252)*,* when stating that we are testament to our origin, *origine nati* (line 415): note that both phrases encompass the same final line position. Ovid challenges the King of the God's promise by pointing out that the new generation has all the same innate love of violence and destruction as the rest of Mother Earth's children. Her first set of offspring, the Giants, waged a bloody war against the gods, and their corpses gave rise to the next generation, which Jupiter found so depraved that he annihilated the populace. The mortal heirs to the world were to be from a wondrous origin, but instead they are born from the same mother who brought the Giants into the world. Now this race inhabits the world and they are just as bloodthirsty and hostile as ever.

---

[134] Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1.149-162

Ovid masterfully guides the reader through the opening 415 lines of the *Metamorphoses* slowly creating a picture of the world in which he is currently living, and his initial statement to recount the events from the beginning of time up to his own is never far from the reader's mind. Ovid constantly comingles the contemporary world into the narrative. First, he generates a tension between the Augustan Golden Age and his own depiction of the Golden Age. In Ovid's eyes, the Golden Age is free from war, government, and a leading figure or *vindex,* which stands as an open challenge to Augustus the *princeps* and *vindex* of the Republic. It is Ovid's depiction of the Iron Age that truly captures the essence of contemporary Rome as morally depraved and completely devoid of *pietas*, the prime virtue in Augustus' moral reformation. Then, Ovid makes his intention to cast contemporary relevance into his stories unambiguous by creating an *ekphrasis* comparing the celestial realm to Rome. In the Palatine of the Sky, *Palatia Caeli,* Jupiter presides over his *faux* Senate like a King. He dictates to the assembly that the world is beyond saving and mankind must be purged from the world, to which the immortal Senators either join in his frenzy or merely play their part like actors on stage. Once the immoral generation of mankind drowns in an epic flood, a new race is born from Mother Earth. Jupiter's promise to repopulate the world with a new and immaculate race is nullified by the fact that they are born from the mother of the Giants. The new race of man is no different from their deceased bloodthirsty brothers, regardless of how Jupiter perceives them.

As Ovid builds his narrative, the audience begins to see divine beings and their actions as parallels to Augustus and contemporary events. The logical progression of events from Creation to the repopulation of the earth is littered with both covert and overt

references to the *princeps,* and Ovid's final description of the "new" mortal generation

and its origin challenge the claims of a revived Golden Age. Ovid compels the audience

to pass judgment on the divine king, his action, and his claims about humanity as if they

were to address Augustus the *divus filius,* his victories in civil war, and his moral

reformation.

Dishonorable Laurels

At this juncture, Ovid ends his narrative of the creation myths and turns to

individual transformations. Many of the myths following the Creation narrative seem to

offer simple *aetia* such as the foundation of specific rivers, species of plants and animals.

Nevertheless, we cannot assume Ovid is merely summing up various natural phenomena

given how he has established strong associations between the past and contemporary

Rome in the first several hundred lines of the *Metamorphoses*. Indeed, Ovid does not

delay his criticisms of Augustan acclamations, and soon challenges another major piece

of Augustan iconography in the ensuing myth of Apollo and Daphne. Here, he highlights

the dishonorable characteristics of one of Rome's most venerable symbols, the laurel

wreath, which currently hangs over the doors of Augustus *in perpetuum* as a symbol of

his victory and restitution of the Republic. However, Ovid divests the laurel wreath of

any honorable qualities by attributing its foundation to the aggressive pursuit and

attempted rape of Daphne, rather than the righteous victory over the Python.[135] Ovid's

original *aetion* insists that the contemporary laurel wreath is stripped of any noble

---

[135] Feldherr 2002 (173) agrees that Ovid introduces an original *aetion,* but sees no negative connotation in the events that bring the laurel into existence.

characteristics because of its perpetual association with Augustus, which serves only to magnify the *princeps'* own dishonor.

Ovid maintains his irreverent tone when describing Apollo's battle with Python (1.438-451). Not only is the new generation of mankind brought back into the world, but Mother Earth also produces innumerable species of animals and even the dreaded Python. In addition, Ovid finally brings the second Olympian to the forefront of his narrative. While Jupiter dominated the audiences' attention from his initial appearance in the Silver Age (1.114-415), it is Apollo who finally emerges to engage the massive serpent, and he slays the beast with his bow, consequently saving mankind (1.438-447). In honor of this worthy victory,[136] Apollo institutes the Pythian games, and thereafter every man who won an event would be wreathed with a garland of oak, since laurel had not yet come into existence. His victory leads into the quasi-tragic Apollo and Daphne myth (1.452-567).[137] Cupid too appears for the first time in this sequence and strikes Apollo with one of his golden tipped arrows while Daphne is struck with one tipped with lead. The helpless god dramatically pursues the repulsed nymph, but just as Apollo is about to grasp his desire, she transforms into a laurel tree as a means to escape the god's advances. Nevertheless, Apollo takes up her new arboreal form as his sacred emblem and promises that she will be the eternal symbol of Roman victory.

Ovid's account of Apollo's victory over Python and subsequent conflict with Daphne continues to draw scholarly attention regarding its potential meanings, and to

---

[136] Keith (2002) 246-247 believes Ovid emphasizes the massive terror Python inspires in humanity, not to mention the sheer number of arrows it takes to slay the monsters, "in order to underline the epic heroism Apollo displays in killing him."

[137] Due (1974) 112 points out that "there appears to be a much tighter bond between the *Python* and the *Daphne* [scenes] than the transition itself would suggest," but credits the intervening episode with Cupid as a mere introduction into the elegiac tone of the Apollo and Daphne scene. However, my argument demonstrates that the transition between the two tales denies the laurel wreath any honorable symbolic qualities because the noble victory over the Python is ignored.

inspire new and imaginative ways of interpreting the various transformations throughout

the text. Recently, Miller's (2009) discussion of an "Augustan Apollo" in the Apollo and

Daphne encounter suggests this scene emphasizes the motif of Augustan victory in

connection with the aetiological function of Ovid's narrative.[138] Miller aptly identifies

this deity as an "Augustan Apollo" and that the motif of victory is a key component of

this scene, but because Ovid interrupts the Callimachean *aetion* and institutes an original

foundation myth for one of Rome's most recognizable symbols of victory, I argue the

scene does not exalt victory, but rather critiques Augustan victory by depicting the laurel

as a symbol of dishonor.

As noted above, it is important to recognize when Ovid's myths break from

tradition, and to decipher his possible reasons for doing so. Ovid's rendition of Apollo's

battle with the Python is remarkably faithful to the accounts of his poetic predecessors.

His account closely resembles the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* in narrative where the Python

is a prime threat to mortals (355-356), Apollo slays the serpent with his bow (357-358),

and the depiction of the dying creature (358-362).[139] However, Ovid breaks away from

convention directly following the conflict between Apollo and Python and diverges from

his predecessors.

With the assistance of Callimachus' fragments 86-89 and a passage from

Theopompus (115 *FGrH* 80), it is possible to reconstruct the Callimachean foundation

myth, a likely source for Ovid, in which Apollo adopts the laurel almost immediately

---

[138] Miller (2009) 338-349 offers an in-depth discussion of the various correspondences between Apollo and Augustus in the Apollo and Daphne scene.
[139] Miller (2009) 339.

after his honorable victory over Python.[140] At the beginning of *Aetia* 4 Callimachus

describes the *Daphnephoria*, the Delphic Laurel Procession, which is carried out in honor

of Apollo's defeat of the terrifying Python:

> …For Apollo, having, as a child, overcome the serpent Pytho, washed his hands
> in the river Peneios… cutting off a laurel growing beside it… he put it around
> his…"[141]

Regardless of the lacunae in the text, Callimachus is clearly describing the procession

that honors the victory of Apollo over the Python and the laurel's direct affiliation with

the defeat of Python. Luckily, selections of Theopompus' work have survived and can

fill the lacunae in Callimachus' text and provide details on the relationship between the

Daphnephoria and Apollo's victory over the Python.

> And there it is that the sons of Thessalians say Pythian Apollo was purified in
> accordance with a command of Zeus, after he shot the Pythian serpent with his
> bow… and that, having crowned himself with this laurel from Tempe and having
> taken a branch of this same laurel into his right hand, he went to Delphi…"[142]

Just as Callimachus describes in the *Aetia*, Theopompus explains that the laurel

procession at Delphi honors Apollo's assumption of the laurel bough in the aftermath of

the altercation with Python. Both authors insist on the affiliation between the battle and

the *aetion* of the laurel.

The combination of these two authors confirms a tradition where Apollo takes up

the venerable laurel wreath immediately following the slaying of the Python. Yet in

Ovid's recollection of the events, he deliberately bypasses this foundation myth

expressed in both the *Homeric Hymn* and Callimachus' rendition and instead institutes

---

[140] Keith (2002) 248 argues this scene's affiliation with Callimachus' *Aetion* only enhances its elegiac tone,
but does not comment on the difference in narrative structure.
[141] Nisetich (2001) 153.
[142] Nisetich (2001) 153.

one of his own design.[143] Ovid makes it explicitly clear that there was no laurel (*nondum laurus erat,* 1.450) following the triumph over Python, and Apollo wreathed his hair with no specific predilection for the genus of the tree (*de qualibet arbore,* 1.451). At this point, Ovid abruptly breaks away from the familiar Callimachean *aetion* and institutes his own foundation myth in the semi-tragic love affair between Apollo and Daphne, rather than the battle and subsequent honorable victory over the Python.

Ovid explains that Apollo's first love was Daphne, the daughter of Peneus, but it was by no mere accident that he fell in love with her head over heels; rather, it was because of the savage wrath of Cupid (*saeva Cupidinis ira*, 1.453). In the aftermath of his battle, Apollo, seeing Cupid stringing his bow, verbally assaults the boy for meddling with a weapon designed for war and tells him to stick to torches to instigate passion (1.454-462). The son of Venus admits that Apollo can pierce any beast he wishes, but his own power is greater than Apollo's since he can pierce gods. At this moment, Cupid flies off and strikes Apollo with a gold tipped arrow, and Daphne with one of lead, inciting uncontrollable love and devout chastity, respectively.

Features of Ovid's first "love scene" in the *Metamorphoses* resemble the content of his prior elegiac compositions, and the description of Apollo recalls similar charged language in the *Amores*.[144] Cupid plays the same role as an infective force, and his powers are no less lethal in the *Metamorphoses* than they were in the *Amores*. Apollo burns (*uritur, Met*. 1.496), as the poet does in the *Amores* (*uror*, *Am*. 1.1.26), and his

---

[143] Compare Pfeiffer's (1949) 95 assessment: "*Ovidii Daphnae nymphae metamorphosin* (1.452 sqq.) *nullo modo cum hac Aetiorum parte cohaerere...*" ("Ovid's metamorphosis of the nymph Daphne in no way agrees with this part of the *Aetia...*").

[144] Sharrock (2002) 97-98 believes the Apollo and Daphne scene begins the *MetAMORphoses*, and the clever wordplay is typical Ovidian style. See also Myers (1994) 61-63 for the Apollo and Daphne scene as a programmatic declaration of the amatory content.

heart is also just as empty (*in vacuo… pectore*, *Met*. 1.520; *in vacuo pectore Am*.1.1.26).

The semblance in language and terminology not only depicts the god as a hopeless

elegiac lover, but more importantly, recalls the themes of unjust oppression developed in

the *Amores.*

Urged on by uncontrollable passion, the god pursues an unwilling Daphne, and

prior to her metamorphosis, Daphne exhibits the same characteristics of the abused *puella*

in *Amores* 1.7. Although there is no direct physical violence, Daphne mirrors the same

paling complexion (*expalluit,* 1.543) as the *puella* (*candida tota, Amores* 1.7.40). Her

only escape is the desecration of her own body, and as she prays to her father to help her

destroy her own beauty, she begins to transform into a laurel tree:

> vix prece finita torpor gravis occupat artus,
> mollia cinguntur tenui praecordia libro,
> in frondem crines, in ramos bracchia crescunt,   550
> pes modo tam velox pigris radicibus haeret,
> ora cacumen habet: remanet nitor unus in illa.
> hanc quoque Phoebus amat positaque in stipite dextra
> sentit adhuc trepidare novo sub cortice pectus
> conplexusque suis ramos, ut membra, lacertis   555
> oscula dat lingo; refugit tamen oscula lignum.

> She had scarcely finished her prayer when a serious paralysis seized her arms,
> her soft breast was enclosed with thin bark,
> her hair grew into leaves and her arms into branches,   550
> her feet just then so swiftly stuck with slow roots,
> her face became the canopy: in this place only her beauty remained.
> Apollo still loves her and pressing his hand on the limb
> he still feels her heart beating beneath the new bark
> and embracing the branches—as if her true limbs—with his own arms   555
> he gives kisses to the bark; nevertheless the bark refuses the kisses.
> > *Metamorphoses* 1.548-556

As shown in Chapter One, Ovid's development of the image of transformation began

earlier in his elegiac career. In poem 1.7 of the *Amores*, the poet brutally assaults his

defenseless *puella*, and the victimized girl takes on characteristics that resemble the

natural world. Her skin is as pale as Parian marble (*Pariis qualia saxa,* 1.7.52), her limbs tremble like the leaves blowing in the wind (*membra trementia*, 1.7.53), and tears stream down her face like snow melting in the sun (*de nive… aqua,* 1.7.58). In the *Metamorphoses* the similes disappear and are replaced by full transformations. Daphne does not merely resemble the laurel tree but rather she is completely encased within the bark. The gradual development of the transformation theme now comes to fruition in the *Metamorphoses*, and is intensified by the complete transformation of victims. Furthermore, in *Amores* 1.7, the text suggested that the poet was aroused by his abused girl, as he imagined his triumphal procession in honor of his victory, and glorified her disheveled complexion; but Ovid leaves nothing to the imagination in the *Metamorphoses*. Even after Daphne turns into the laurel tree, Apollo's advances do not cease. The love struck god engages in a little light dendrophilia as he continues to feel love (*hanc… amat*, 1.553) for the girl's new form, and he even plants kisses on her bark. Nevertheless, Daphne still flees the god, and she shrinks away from his kisses (*refugit tamen oscula lignum*, 1.556). Ovid's presentation of the metamorphosis of Daphne recalls the poet's assault on his *puella* from *Amores* 1.7, but he replaces the suggestion of infatuation with one's own shame with an indicative statement: that is, Apollo loves the mutated girl just as much as when she was fleeing from him. Ovid then amplifies the dishonorable association in Apollo's dedication to Daphne.

Apollo's affection for Daphne is in no way quelled by her change in form. Even though she has transformed into a laurel tree, he still feels extreme love for the nymph and decides that since she cannot be his wife, she will be his tree. Here, Ovid finally explains the foundation of the laurel tree.

cui deus 'at quoniam coniunx mea non potes esse,
arbor eris certe' dixit 'mea. semper habebunt
te coma, te citharae, te nostrae, laure, pharetrae;
tu ducibus Latiis aderis, cum laeta Triumphum   560
vox canet et visent longas Capitolia pompas;
postibus Augustis eadem fidissima custos
ante fores stabis mediamque tuebere quercum,
utque meum intonsis caput est iuvenale capillis,
tu quoque perpetuos semper gere frondis honores.'   565
finierat Paean: factis modo laurea ramis
adnuit utque caput <u>visa est</u> agitasse cacumen.

To whom the god said, 'Since you are not able to be my wife,
you will certainly be my tree. Laurel,
my hair, my lyre, and my quiver will always have you;
You will accompany Latin generals when happy voices sing   560
triumph and when the Capitoline will witness long processions;
You, a most loyal guardian, will stand on Augustus doorposts
before the door and you will protect the oak leaves between them,
and just as my head is youthful with uncut hair,
you also always bear the perpetual honors of foliage."   565
Apollo the Healer had finished: the Laurel nodded assent
with her recently mutated branches just as her leafy head <u>seemed</u> to shake.

Metamorphoses 1.557-567

Ovid brings the contemporary image of the laurel to the forefront of his narrative, as he directs the audience's attention to the laurels and the oaken crown that hang over the doors of Augustus' Palatine residence, a gift from the Senate to honor his victory at Actium and ending civil conflict. Yet according to Ovid, the *aetion* of the laurel wreath, the symbol of victory and inextricably linked to Augustus, did not proceed from the honorable defeat of the Python, but rather from the ignoble pursuit and would-be rape of the unwilling Daphne. As Apollo lays claim to his new arboreal symbol, he perceives that the mutated girl seems (*visa est,* 1.557) willingly to acknowledge and allow his appropriation. However, the girl's nodding motion can also be attributed to trembling fear in the aftermath of the chase, as well as the desecration of her previous form. Apollo,

therefore, misinterprets her shaking terror as the willing acceptance of his dominance over her. In the previous chapter, we also observed the way Cupid was hailed in his triumph, where the spectators were provoked by fear of the deity (*omnia te metuent,* 1.2.33) to cheer at his ignoble victory over the poet. Ovid recalls the motif of dishonorable victory celebrations, but amplifies the severity of his criticism by directly challenging the laurel wreath that perpetually adorns Augustus' door. She too will have the very same eternal honor (*perpetuos…honores* 1.565).

Ovid deliberately denies the laurel tree the venerable qualities, which his predecessors had bestowed, and creates a new foundation myth that belittles the ancient symbol of victory. By making an explicit reference to Augustus' emblems of triumph, Ovid challenges their significance. According to Ovid, Augustus' victory was in civil war, but he has not reinstituted the Republic, and therefore his assumption of the laurel is unmerited. Just as Apollo has taken up a symbol of his own dishonor, Augustus revels in his own ignoble achievements and publicly displays his shame. Ovid uses Daphne's metamorphosis to comment on Augustus' victory acclamations and shows that laurel is no longer associated with honorable triumphs over worthy opponents, but is tarnished by triumph over Roman brethren in civil conflict.

Conclusion

Within the first 600 lines of the *Metamorphoses,* Ovid displays his genius and masterful poetic skill, and presents his audience with an epic, unrivaled in both material and ingenuity. Ovid's intent to infuse his epic world with the ambiance of his modern society is evident nearly immediately in the recollection of the four ages. As he describes

the degeneration of mankind from Gold to Iron, Ovid makes obscure references to the *Aureum Saeculum*. In 18 BC, Augustus claims that the Golden Age had been reborn along with its pure social morality. In fact, Augustus was insistent on rehabilitating the *mos maiorum* through his four cardinal values – *virtus, clementia, iusitia,* and *pietas* – which were inscribed on the *Clupeus Virtutis* that hung in the Curia. In Ovid's presentation of the Golden Age, however, he lists characteristics that call Augustus' *Aureum Saeculum* into question. The Golden Age lacks war, government structure, and, most importantly, a *vindex*. In the aftermath of civil war, Augustus was heralded as the *libertatis p. R. Vindex* on coins, and he even states in his *Res Gestae* that he liberated, *vindicavi*, Rome from civil war (*Res Gestae* 1). Ovid then juxtaposes the pinnacle of the Golden Age with its nadir in the Iron Age. During this era, mankind has lost all semblance of morality and wars are waged between one another. Ovid makes it apparent that his description of the Iron Age is actually a challenge to the *Aureum Saeculum* with the poignant remark, *victa iacet pietas* (1.149), piety lies conquered, echoing the prime value in the Augustan moral reformation. Therefore, Ovid's Iron Age is equivalent to Augustus' Golden Age and unmasks the *princeps'* claim as meritless.

Ovid continues his criticism, and even becomes more brazen, as he seamlessly shifts to the Gigantomachy narrative, a marked subject that corresponded to the end of the civil war and the beginning of the renewed Golden Age. As Ovid describes the conflict, he paints an image of the all-powerful Jupiter single-handedly slaughtering the revolting Giants. Jupiter's total power is evident as well in the subsequent story of the Council of the Gods, and it is here that Ovid makes it patently clear that he is describing the contemporary status of Rome.

If the *ekphrasis* designating the immortal realm the *Palatia Caeli,* the Palatine of the Sky, is not suggestive enough, Ovid's anthropomorphizes the celestial beings to match Roman citizens. The elite class divinities all live on this hill, while the lower class *plebs* are segregated to lesser hills, and they all erect their own *penates*. Even Ovid recognizes his daring comparison and offers a quasi-*recusatio* drawing attention to his bold accusation (1.175-176). Nevertheless, Ovid does not stop indicating that this divine domain has direct comparisons to Rome.

Ovid designs the Council of the Gods scene to match a Roman Senate meeting, yet does not imbue the venerable assembly with any of the Republican characteristics. Instead, Ovid describes how Jupiter, with all the trappings of sole authority, calls for the destruction of the entire human race based on the crime of a single man. Unlike other epic councils in Vergil or Homer, Ovid focuses on the utter lack of deliberation and the cowed nature of his assembly and compares it to the Senate in Rome under the *auctoritas* of Augustus.

Prior to eradicating the morally destitute race, Jupiter promises to repopulate the world with a species from a wondrous origin, *origine mira* (1.252). Deucalion and Pyrrha, the two most pure and chaste mortals, are the only survivors, and it would be logical that they would procreate to repopulate the Earth. Ovid denies mankind these illustrious progenitors and instead the new race of mortals springs from the bones of Mother Earth. The new race is not from a wondrous origin, but from the same mother who gave birth to the Giants. Ovid cleverly repopulates his world not with a beautiful and pious race, but with a generation as bloodthirsty and degenerate as the first. According to

Ovid, then, there has been no transcendence out of the Iron Age and into a resurrected Golden Age.

The Augustan allusions do not abate as Ovid describes Apollo's battle with Python and his erstwhile lover's tryst with Daphne. Ovid uses the combination of these two scenes to challenge the significance of the laurel, a major piece of Augustan victory iconography. Fragments of Callimachus' *Aetia* 4 indicate that Apollo took up the laurel tree as one of his sacred emblems immediately after he dispatched the Python. However, Ovid disregards this familiar *aetion* and introduces one of his own. Instead of the honorable defeat of a major threat to mankind, Ovid trivializes the Roman symbol of victory by crediting its foundation to Apollo's vain lust for Daphne. Following her metamorphosis into a laurel tree, Apollo's dedicatory speech expressly mentions the contemporary relevance of the laurel, which adorns the doorposts of Augustus' Palatine residence. Therefore, Ovid deliberately challenges Augustus' reward for his triumph in civil war and the restitution of the Republic by equating the symbol of honorable victory with the ignoble acts of Apollo.

These opening verses of the *Metamorphoses* demonstrate that Ovid was intent on pervading his stories with political and contemporary resonances. The audience witnessed both overt and covert references to major Augustan achievements and acclamations, but Ovid insists on highlighting the dishonorable qualities of these deeds, which the *princeps* would rather keep suppressed. Ovid reminds the audience that Augustus' triumphs were in civil war and that they were most assuredly not living in the Golden Age, and the laurels they see hanging over Augustus' door, a gift from the Senate for his victory and the restoration of the Republic, only underscore his shame.

Conclusion

In this project, I have traced how criticisms aimed specifically at the accumulated honors of Augustus intensify from their introduction in the *Amores* to their culmination in the *Metamorphoses*. In the *Amores*, Ovid takes aim at the triumphal accolades and the divinity of the *princeps*. In poem 1.1, the intervention of Cupid acts as a veiled reference to the influence of Augustus on the poets of the era. In poem 1.2, Ovid manipulates standard triumphal elements in order to challenge themes of Augustan victory. For example, he presents Cupid who, styled as a tyrant, parades through the streets of Rome celebrating his victory over the defenseless poet. Cupid's representation in the procession resonates with the allusion to Augustus established in poem 1.1, but Ovid amplifies his derision of the *princeps* by creating an overt parallel between the captives in the triumph and the Roman populace in attendance. This depiction of supplicating spectators suggests that fear of the divinity causes Rome to beg for clemency and submit to the will of Cupid and – by familial extension - Augustus. Following the intensification of triumph and subjugation, Ovid initiates the theme of physical violence and the act of transformation in poem 1.7. After the frenzied poet strikes his beloved *puella* and revels in his own dishonorable action in an imagined triumphal celebration, the abused victim shows signs of a physical metamorphosis. Her fearful trembling resembles leaves blowing in the winds (1.7.54), and her white complexion is likened the pure white Parian marble (1.7.52). Here, the *puella's* physical metamorphosis introduces the new theme of transformation, which becomes paramount in the *Metamorphoses.*

The transition from the *Amores* to the *Metamorphoses*, from elegy to epic, seems to correspond to the increasingly assertive Augustan program. Ovid's criticisms are no

longer exclusively aimed at the triumph and the early career of Augustus *divus filius*, but

address a broader, but more complex web of visual imagery. This network of visual

imagery includes venerable Roman icons such as the laurel wreath, and the *Clupeus*

Virtutis, which are designed to propagate Augustan victory and the reformation of Roman

social and moral law. While the incorporation of these icons supposedly magnifies the

dignity of the *princeps*, Ovid's text demonstrates how these revered symbols only

highlight the dishonor of Augustus' victory in civil war, the fictional return of the

Republic, and the false claims to a revived Golden Age. Although this thesis does not

attempt to categorize Ovid as "Augustan" or "anti-Augustan," it reveals elements of the

Augustan program that Ovid was specifically adverse to. Ovid confronts the

unprecedented accolades and honors of Augustus, which challenge his own poetic eternal

glory.

   This project contributes an innovative way of gauging Ovid's relationship with

the *princeps*, and exemplifies specific controversies between the poet and Augustus.

However, this thesis also illuminates briefly the effects of fear, supplication, and

transformation, and its resonance in representations of Rome and it's populace. I have

argued how *Amores* 1.7 and the Apollo and Daphne conflict in the *Metamorphoses* share

a likeness in both theme and in terminology. Both stories involve, in some way, the

exercise of masculine divine power on defenseless females. Since the main goal of this

thesis has been to illuminate incongruent uses of Augustan iconography, such as the

dishonorable laurel wreath in the case of Apollo and Daphne, I was only able to discuss

minimally the psychological and physiological effects of fear on the victims. In poem 1.7

and the Apollo and Daphne myth, the abusive male victimizes his beloved, but the most

intriguing part of these domestic disputes is the way Ovid manifests an infatuation with the maltreated or abused women. Both the poet and Apollo find themselves enamored and even aroused by their transformed victims, but neither abuser demonstrates any feeling of remorse for his actions. Moreover, the conquered subjects become a symbol of victory for the conqueror, who is seemingly unaware of his ignoble actions. While I highlighted the connection between Augustus and a subjugated Rome in these two scenes, I believe my interpretation also suggests an intersection of Augustan iconography and the demonstration of terror. The mass production of visual imagery designed to celebrate Augustan victory, as well as to promote and justify his reformative programs, can also be construed as ambiguous, where images of Augustan victory simultaneously demonstrate Roman subjugation.

Over the course of this thesis, we have observed specific terminology and body positions that evoke emotions of fear as well as their extended political significance. One of the recurring images is the submission of the conquered to the conqueror. In a society centered on martial conquest, supplication and the *supplex* were key figures in Roman culture. Specific body language and gestures are used to beg for mercy, clemency, or sympathy, and Naiden points out that the standard Roman gesture for supplication was stretching out your hands, especially the right hand, towards your juror in order to plead your case.[145] In *Amores* 1.2, we observe that the Roman populace participates in Cupid's triumph as the captives rather than the spectators. They "stretch their hands" (*bracchia tendens,* 1.2.33) to the victorious general as he rides by out of fear (*metuent,* 1.2.33) of

---

[145] Naiden (2006) 43-69 describes the gestures and words used in acts of supplication in various ancient cultures. He points out that the Greek gestures of the knee or chin clasp and kissing the hand of the supplicandus are notably less frequent in Roman culture. Instead, raising one's hand becomes the standard act of a Roman *supplex.*

the deity instead of adulation. In the *Metamorphoses*, Daphne seems to acknowledge (*adnuit utque caput visa est,* 1.567) Apollo's assumption of the laurel as his eternal symbol, but this acquiescence was shown to be a misinterpretation of the trembling fear (*agitasse,* 1.567) of the recently mutated nymph. Ovid seems to focus on the logical cause and effect of fear or terror on the psyche of the victimized. Furthermore, the body language of the conquered individuals demonstrates the actions of a supplicant or *supplex*.

What was not discussed in depth in this thesis, but will be a useful line of inquiry in a later project, is the use of the image of the *supplex* found in the numismatic evidence of the Augustan Age. In 20 BC Augustus peacefully negotiated the return of the lost standards of Crassus from Parthia and the surrender of the Persians to Roman rule. Coins were minted in 19 BC in honor of this momentous achievement, depicting a kneeling Parthian extending the standards upwards, evoking the traditional body language of the *supplex* in Roman culture. This kneeling barbarian figure became a stock image of victory over foreign enemies and their submission to Rome.[146] As we have seen, Ovid too uses the image of the *supplex* in his own poetic works, such as the Roman populace in poem 1.2. Even though the populace is not depicted bent down on one knee, it is nevertheless interesting that Ovid would repurpose a recognizable image of the *supplex* and the acknowledgement of subjugation in his poetry with clear references to Rome and Augustan victory.

The parallel between the *supplex* figure and Rome may be explained by the appearance of another coin type in 12 BC, the kneeling *Res Publica.* On this coin, an anthropomorphized Rome positioned on one knee extends her hand upwards towards

---

[146] Zanker (1990) 187.

Augustus. Zanker points out that this coin was minted in coordination with Augustus'

claim to have rescued Rome from civil war and restored the Republic. Nevertheless, as

this thesis has suggested, the position of Augustus as the prime political authority was

readily visible in contemporary society. Furthermore, the kneeling *Res Publica* looks

eerily similar to the kneeling Barbarian minted in 19 BC. Both figures are positioned on

one knee and stretch their hands upwards in the traditional guise of a *supplex*. In light of

this project, we have seen the ways in which Ovid challenges the declaration of a restored

Republic throughout his poetic career. Perhaps the appearance of the kneeling *Res

Publica* coin type offered Ovid a new way to criticize the *princeps* by subverting the

helping hand of Augustus with the Rome's acknowledgement of submission.

As Naiden points out, Roman sources offer two gestures of supplication, "falling

at the feet of the supplicandus and sometimes prostrating oneself as well."[147]

Furthermore, these acts are performed specifically when a *supplex* fears the one he

beseeches. We see then that there is a connection between supplication and fear in

Roman society, and the very act of supplication implies a sense of terror for those facing

judgment. It seems that kneeling *Res Publica* coin-type, embodying the distinctively

Roman attributes of a *supplex*, could have acted as a model for Ovid's scenes of extreme

fear and subsequent supplication. Just like the Roman populace in poem 1.2, or the

abused *puella* in poem 1.7, and even Daphne in the *Metamorphoses*, fear of Augustus

causes the *res publica* to submit to their conqueror. Ovid's use of the standard image of

the *supplex* alongside representations of Augustan victory suggests the kneeling *Res

Publica* that celebrates Augustan victory ambiguously portrays Rome as both victim and

victor.

---

[147] Naiden (2006) 50.

The task remains to seek out further examples of supplicating victims in Ovid's corpus that include terminology of fear and its effects, such as *metus*, *timor*, or *amens*, specifically when used to describe those acting as a *supplex*. My project has only illuminated the very beginnings of a connection between fear and supplication in Ovid's work and its parallel between Augustus and a subjugated Rome.

Bibliography

Ahl, Frederick. 1984. "The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome." *American Journal of Philology* 105: 174-208.

Anderson, William, S., ed. 1997. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books 1-5*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

——————., ed. 1997. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books 6-10.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Athanassaki, Lucia. 1992. "The Triumph of Love and Elegy in Ovid's *Amores* 1,2." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 28: 125-141.

Barsby, John. 1979. *Ovid: Amores I*. London: Bristol Classical Press.

Barchiesi, A. 1997. *The Poet and the Prince. Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Beard, Mary. 2007. *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge, MA and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Bowman, Alan K., Edward Champlin, and Andrew Lintott, eds. 1996. *The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. 10, Augustan Empire, 43 B.C.-A.D. 69*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Boyd, Barbara Weiden. 2002. *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. Leiden: Brill.

——————. 2002. "The *Amores*: The Invention of Ovid." In Boyd, ed., 91-116.

Cahoon, Leslie. 1988. "The Bed as Battlefield: Erotic Conquest and Military Metaphor in Ovid's *Amores*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 118: 293-307.

——————. 1996. "Calliope's Song: Shifting Narrators in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 5." *Helios* 23: 43-66.

Copley, Frank Olin. 1947. "*Servitium amoris* in the Roman Elegists." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 78: 285-300.

Davis, P.J. 2006. *Ovid and Augustus: A Political Reading of Ovid's Erotic Poems*. London: Duckworth.

Due, O. S. 1974. *Changing Forms: Studies in the Metamorphoses of Ovid*. Copenhagen.

Eck, Werner. 2003. *The Age of Augustus*. D. Schneider trans. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

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

Feldherr, Andrew. 2002. "Metamorphosis in the *Metamorphoses*." In Hardie, ed., 163-179.

Forbes-Irving, P. M. C. 1990. *Metamorphosis in Greek Myths.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Frank, Richard. 1975. "Augustus' Legislation on Marriage and Children." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 8: 41-52.

Frankel, H. 1945. *Ovid: A Poet Between Two Worlds.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fulkerson, Laurel. 2009. *The Ovidian Heroine as Author: Reading, Writing, and Community in the Heroides.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Galinsky, Karl. 1969. "The Triumph Theme in the Augustan Elegy." *Wiener Studien* 3:75-107.

——————. 1975. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: An Introduction to the Basic Aspects*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

——————. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

——————., ed. 2005. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Graf, F. 2002. "Myth in Ovid." In Hardie, ed., 108-121.

Grant, Showerman, ed. 1977. *Ovid: Heroides and Amores*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Green, Peter. 1982. "Carmen et Error: πρόφασις and αἰτία in the Matter of Ovid's Exile." *Classical Antiquity* 1: 202-220.

Greene, Ellen. 1998. *The Erotics of Domination: Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poety*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

——————. 1999. "Travesties of Love: Violence and Voyeurism in Ovid 'Amores' I.7." *The Classical World* 92: 409-418.

Griffin, Jasper. 1984. "Augustus and the Poets: 'Caesar qui cogere posset.'" In F. Millar and Erich Segal, eds., *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. 189-215.

Habinek, Thomas. 1997. "The Invention of Sexuality in the World-City of Rome." In Habinek and Schiesaro eds., *The Roman Cultural Revolution.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 23-43.

——————. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

——————. 2002. "Ovid and Empire." In Hardie, ed., 46-61.

Habinek, T. and Schiesaro, A., eds. 1997. *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hallett, Judith P. 2002. "The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Culture Feminism." In P. A. Miller, ed., *Latin Erotic Elegy*. New York: Routledge. 329-347.

Hardie, P. ed., 2002. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Harrison, Stephen. 2002. "Ovid and Genre: Evolutions of an Elegist." In Hardie, ed.,79-94.

Hinds, Stephen. 1987. "Generalizing about Ovid." *Ramus* 16: 4-31.

——————. 1992. "*Arma* in Ovid's *Fasti*." *Arethusa* 25: 81-153.

Holzberg, Niklas. 2002. *Ovid: The Poet and His Work*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Johnson, P. 1996. "Constructions of Venus in Ovid's *Metamophoses* V." *Arethusa* 29:125-149.

Johnson, Walter Ralph, 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Virgil's Aeneid*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Kahn, A. H. 1966. "*Ovidius Furens*: A Revaluation of *Amores* 1.7." *Latomus* 25: 880-894.

Keith, Alison. 2002. "Sources and Genres in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1-5." In Boyd ed., 235-269.

Kennedy, Duncan. 1992. *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Knox, P.E. 1986. *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——————. 1990. "In Pursuit of Daphne" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 120: 183-202 + 385-386.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1979. "*Servitium Amoris.*" *The Classical Quarterly* 29: 117-130.

Lee, A.G. ed., 1953. *P. Ovidius Nasonis Metamorphoseon Liber 1.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——————. 2002. "The Life of Love." In P. A. Miller, ed., *Latin Erotic Elegy*. New York: Routledge. 348-365.

Miller, John F. 1995. "Reading Cupid's Triumph." *Classical Journal* 90: 287-294.

——————. 2009. *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, Paul Allen, ed. 2002. *Latin Erotic Elegy.* New York: Routledge.

Morrison, James V. 1992. "Reference and Generic Transgression in Ovid, 'Amores' 1.7: Lover, Poet, and Furor." *Latomus* 51: 571-589.

Murgatroyd, P. 1981. "'Seruitium Amoris' and the Roman Elegist." *Latomus* 40: 589-606.

Naiden, F. S. 2006. *Ancient Supplication.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Nisetich, Frank. 2001. *The Poems of Callimachus.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pavlock, Barbara. 2009. *The Image of the Poet in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Pfeiffer, R. ed. 1949. *Callimachus*, 1, *Fragmenta*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Powell, Anton, ed. 1992. *Roman Poetry & Propaganda in the Age of Augustus.* London: Bristol Classical Press.

Rimell, Victoria. 2009. *Ovid's Lovers: Desire, Difference and the Poetic Imagination.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Salzman, M. 1998. "Deification in the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*." In C. Deroux, ed. *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* IX. Collection Latomus 244. Brussels. 313-346.

Sharrock, Alison. 2002. "Ovid and the Discourse of Love: The Amatory Works." In Hardie, ed., 150-162.

Syme, Ronald. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press

——————. 1978. *History in Ovid*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Thomas, Elizabeth. 1964. "Variations on a Military Theme in Ovid's *Amores*." *Greece & Rome* 11: 151-165.

Tissol, Garth. 2002. "The House of Fame: Roman History and Augustan Politics in *Metamorphoses* 11-15." In Barbara Weiden Boyd, ed., *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. Leiden: Brill. 305-335.

de Vann, M. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin*. Leiden: Brill.

Versnel, H. S. 1970. *Triumphus: An Inquiry into the Origin, Development, and Meaning of the Roman Triumph*. Leiden: Brill.

Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. 1997. "*Mutatio morum*: The Idea of Cultural Revolution." In Habinek and Schiesaro eds., *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2-22.

White, Peter. 2002. "Ovid and the Augustan Milieu." In Boyd ed.,1-25.

Zanker, Paul. 1990. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. A. Shapiro, trans. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.