

Publication of this volume has been made possible,  
in part, through the generous support and enduring vision of

WARREN G. MOON.

# REPEAT PERFORMANCES



Ovidian Repetition and the *Metamorphoses*

*Edited by*

LAUREL FULKERSON *and* TIM STOVER

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN PRESS

The University of Wisconsin Press  
1930 Monroe Street, 3rd Floor  
Madison, Wisconsin 53711-2059  
uwpress.wisc.edu

3 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden  
London WC2E 8LU, United Kingdom  
eurospanbookstore.com

Copyright © 2016

The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System  
All rights reserved. Except in the case of brief quotations embedded in critical articles and reviews, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any format or by any means—digital, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise—or conveyed via the Internet or a website without written permission of the University of Wisconsin Press. Rights inquiries should be directed to [rights@uwpress.wisc.edu](mailto:rights@uwpress.wisc.edu).

Printed in the United States of America

This book may be available in a digital edition.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Fulkerson, Laurel, 1972– editor. | Stover, Tim, editor.

Title: Repeat performances : Ovidian repetition and the *Metamorphoses* / edited by Laurel Fulkerson and Tim Stover.

Other titles: Wisconsin studies in classics.

Description: Madison, Wisconsin : The University of Wisconsin Press, [2016] | ©2016 | Series: Wisconsin studies in classics

Identifiers: LCCN 2015041518 | ISBN 9780299307509 (cloth : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Ovid, 43 B.C.–17 A.D. or 18 A.D. *Metamorphoses*. | Ovid, 43 B.C.–17 A.D. or 18 A.D.—Criticism and interpretation. | Ovid, 43 B.C.–17 A.D. or 18 A.D.—Technique. | Ovid, 43 B.C.–17 A.D. or 18 A.D.—Influence. | Repetition in literature. | Epic poetry, Latin—History and criticism.

Classification: LCC PA6519.M9 R47 2016 | DDC 873/.01—dc23

LC record available at <http://lccn.loc.gov/2015041518>

## Contents

<i>Preface</i>	vii
Introduction: Echoes of the Past LAUREL FULKERSON AND TIM STOVER	3
1 Nothing like the Sun: Repetition and Representation in Ovid's Phaethon Narrative ANDREW FELDHERR	26
2 Repeat after Me: The Loves of Venus and Mars in <i>Ars amatoria</i> 2 and <i>Metamorphoses</i> 4 BARBARA WEIDEN BOYD	47
3 Ovid's Cynus and Homer's Achilles Heel PETER HESLIN	69
4 <i>Loca luminis haurit</i> : Ovid's Recycling of Hecuba ANTONY AUGOUSTAKIS	100
5 Succeeding Succession: Cosmic and Earthly Succession in the <i>Fasti</i> and <i>Metamorphoses</i> DARCY KRASNE	125
6 Rape and Repetition in Ovid's <i>Metamorphoses</i> : Myth, History, Structure, Rome SHARON L. JAMES	154
7 <i>Metamorphoses</i> in a Cold Climate PETER E. KNOX	176

8	Ovidian Itineraries in Flavian Epic ALISON KEITH	196
9	Revisiting Ovidian Silius, along with Lucretian, Vergilian, and Lucanian Silius NEIL W. BERNSTEIN	225
10	Return to Enna: Ovid and Ovidianism in Claudian's <i>De raptu Proserpinae</i> STEPHEN HINDS	249
	<i>Works Cited</i>	279
	<i>Contributors</i>	307
	<i>Index</i>	311
	<i>Index Locorum</i>	315

## Preface

In this book we have, we hope, brought together some of the most exciting contemporary work on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. What unites the volume is a shared vision of the possibilities of Latin epic poetry, and a series of attempts to realize those possibilities. Some of the chapters explore traditional veins of allusion and intertextuality; others are more innovative in their approaches. Each chapter thus embodies a methodology of theorizing the repetitive practices of poetry, of epic, and of Ovid in particular. To capture some of the ambience of the conference in which this volume originated, including the varied authorial voices, chapters have been only minimally edited.

Thanks are due to the Langford Family Foundation for making the original conference possible, and to the Classics Department of Florida State University for its support of both the event itself and the editors. Thanks too to Stephen Fodroczi for help with the indices. Finally, Laurel would like to thank Megan Drinkwater and John Marincola (they know why!), and Tim thanks Amy Dill.

previous literary portrayals: cf. “quo, di crudeles, nisi ut nova funera cernam, / vivacem differtis anum?” (*Met.* 13,518–19) and “finita est publica clades, / sed finita tamen” (13,506).

26. The connection with Niobe is also noted by Néraudau 1981, 38.

27. Hecate in a vision forced Odysseus, culpable for Hecuba’s stoning, to build a cenotaph in her honor in Sicily. What we read in the *scholia* (ad 1181 Scheer) is, I believe, a unique extension of the story, used and manipulated by Ovid in his own narrative: ἐνθα κενοτάφιον Ὀδυσσεὺς ἰδρύσατο τῇ Ἑκάβῃ δειματούμενος ὑπ’ αὐτῆς ἐν ταῖς νυξὶ διὰ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτὸν κατάρξαι τοῦ καταλεύσματος τοῦ εἰς αὐτὴν ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων γεγονότος (“there Odysseus founded a cenotaph for Hecuba, frightened by her at night, for he was the first among the Greeks to start the stoning against her”).

28. Curley 2013, 115: “a formula of exit rather than entry, through which Ovid leaves his seal on the narrative.”

29. Cf. the discussion in James 1995.

30. Anderson 1972, 228: “He liked this powerful introductory clause so much that he repeated it in 13,546 to characterize the vengeful Hecuba.” Lateiner (2006, 196–97) provides a brief treatment of Hecuba in the context of mothers in the poem, including Procne.

31. Obelized by Bentley and subsequent editors, including Tarrant.

32. On the closural aspects of Ardea’s fall, see Papaioannou 2005, 187–97.

33. Von Glinski 2012, 91, with reference to Hinds 1993.

## 5

## Succeeding Succession

Cosmic and Earthly Succession in the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*

DARCY KRASNE

It is no longer a secret that many correspondences exist between Ovid’s *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*. Their shared framework is most clearly brought into focus by the cosmogonies that open both works and by the revelation of primordial Chaos as the alter ego of Janus, Ovid’s first interlocutor in the *Fasti*,<sup>1</sup> but Ovid has only begun as he means to go on; as Janus himself says, beginnings contain omens. Similar parallels, correspondences, and repetitions exist throughout the poems, which overtly interact with each other in multiple ways.<sup>2</sup> The “meaning” of such correspondences, of course, is anyone’s best guess. Are they meant to highlight the repeated episodes as particularly significant? Are they meant to change our perception of each work when we read them side by side? Are they meant to play up (or actively blur) the differences between epic and elegy? Are they simply meant as two complementary representations of time, one synchronic and the other diachronic? Does each work complete the other? And so forth. Rather than seeking to provide explicit answers to such questions, this chapter explores some less obvious connections between the two works, revolving around the ideas of succession, repetition, and, most of all, succession *as* repetition, on both the cosmic and the terrestrial level.

A recent and productive trend in reading the *Fasti* has been “connecting the disconnected”—that is, tracing a thematic thread between disparate parts of the work, “read[ing] across and between episodes, across and between books” (Newlands 2000, 174).<sup>3</sup> I stretch this concept further, connecting the *extremely* disconnected as well as the already-connected. To be precise, I aim to read *Fasti* 5 in light of its astonishingly orderly slew of connections not just with itself but with the *Metamorphoses*,<sup>4</sup> and even more precisely, with the

overarching temporal and cosmological framework of the *Metamorphoses*, from the origins of the cosmos to the glory of Augustus's Rome.<sup>5</sup>

Themes of succession pervade both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, linking the cosmic power dynamics of the so-called Divine Succession Myth to the dynamics of power and succession in Augustan Rome. They are particularly prevalent in the first half of *Fasti* 5, where the entire construction of the cosmos and successive generations occurs under the guise of alternative and seemingly unrelated tales (table 5.1 outlines the structure of *Fasti* 5), and in the last 150 lines of the *Metamorphoses*, where they more clearly pertain to the quandaries of imperial succession at Rome. Moreover, these themes are not unrelated to Ovid's poetics; as Philip Hardie (1997, 189–95) has argued of Ovid's *sphragis* and self-apotheosis in the final lines of the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid asserts his own self-perpetuating *fama* in contrast with the need of Rome's rulers to be replicated and aggrandized by their successors.<sup>6</sup> Poetry and politics, as always for Ovid, go hand in hand, and the network of connections between the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* helps to illuminate their interplay.

THE COSMOS WASN'T BUILT IN A DAY  
(IT WAS BUILT IN TWO)

While scholars have frequently observed that both the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* begin with a cosmogony, much less attention has been paid to the second, alternative, cosmogony that appears in each work toward their respective endpoints.<sup>7</sup> The final book of the *Metamorphoses* includes a cosmogony within the quasi-Empedoclean doctrine of Pythagoras (see Hardie 1995; Galinsky 1998), while the fifth book of the *Fasti*, which opens with the quarrel of the Muses over the origins of "May," features an alternative cosmogony in the form of Polyhymnia's song narrating the birth and (instant) rise to power of the goddess Maiestas (see Barchiesi 1991; Mackie 1992). These cosmogonies seemingly have little in common. What I propose that they do have in common, however, is an ability to substitute, albeit in very different ways, for the original cosmogony of the *Metamorphoses*. Pythagoras's speech, of which the cosmogony is a fractional part, recasts the entire *Metamorphoses* in rational and scientific terms (see esp. Myers 1994a, 133–59), while Polyhymnia's revisionist account of the birth of Maiestas recasts the allegorical/Lucretian/Empedoclean/Stoic/etcetera cosmogony of *Metamorphoses* 1 as a genealogical narrative in the style of Hesiod's *Theogony*.<sup>8</sup>

"Let us begin with the Heliconian Muses,"<sup>9</sup> says Hesiod, and so Ovid does, in *Fasti* 5. He does not, however, begin with the harmonious, like-minded

TABLE 5.1 The Structure of *Fasti* 5

1–110	Proemial material: Quarrel of the Muses
9–54	Polyhymnia's etymology: cosmogony with Maiestas
55–78	Urania's etymology: Roman <i>maiores</i>
79–106	Calliope's etymology: birth of Mercury (from Maia); Evander's journey from Arcadia to Latium
111–58	May 1
111–28	Jupiter's infancy; <i>aition</i> of cornucopia
129–46	Augustus's addition of his <i>genius</i> to the cult of the Lares Compitales
147–58	Livia's restoration of the Bona Dea's shrine; Romulus's defeat of Remus
159–378	May 2
159–82	Hyas and Hyades
183–378	Floralia
195–274	Rape and honors of Flora
229–60	Birth of Mars
275–374	Dishonoring of Flora; famine in Rome; honoring of Flora
377–78	Ovid's <i>sphragis</i>
379–414	May 3 Death and catasterism of Chiron
419–92	May 9 Lemuria
451–92	Remus's ghost; Celer's crime
493–544	May 10 Birth (and death) of Orion
545–98	May 12 Temple of Mars Ultor
603–62	May 14
605–20	Rape of Europa
621–62	Argei; Hercules and Cacus; Argive settlers
663–92	May 15 Mercury's patronage of merchants and thieves
693–720	May 20 Rape of Leucippidae; death and immortalization of Dioscuri

NOTES: This outline of the basic structure of book 5 omits epigrammatic "filler" days that consist of three or fewer couplets. For reference, these are May 5 (Lyra), May 6 (Scorpio), May 13 (Pleiades, beginning of summer), May 21 (the Agonalia), May 22 (Sirius), May 23 (Tubilustria), May 24 (Regifugium), May 25–27 (dedication of temple of Fortuna, Aquila, Bootes). Brookes (1992, 356–60) observes the change of pace in lines 721–34 (May 21 onward), as the book draws to a close with a series of epigrams. I do not mean to suggest that the epigrammatic interludes throughout do not contain material of importance, but my argument is largely involved with the more extended narrative passages of book 5.

Muses of the *Theogony* who had appeared in *Metamorphoses* 5.<sup>10</sup> Instead, Ovid's metaphorical visit to Aganippe and Hippocrene (*Fast.* 5.7–8)<sup>11</sup> produces quarreling goddesses (“dissensere deae,” 5.9) who speak one at a time (“silent aliae,” 5.10), rather than one-for-all. Alessandro Barchiesi (1991, 3–5) observes the contradiction between the “highly traditional,” “markedly proemial and programmatic tone” of the passage and the unorthodox character of Ovid's “belated convocation of the Muses in *Fasti* 5,”<sup>12</sup> but regardless of the oddities, an invocation of the Muses is necessarily proemial and programmatic, as is beginning an epic—whether heroic or didactic—with a cosmogony.<sup>13</sup> However, despite initial appearances, Ovid does not begin *Fasti* 5 with just one cosmogony. Like Hesiod, who prefaces the bulk of his *Theogony* (line 114 onward) with several theogonies in miniature (*Theog.* 11–21, 44–50, 105–13), as well as several invocations and even epiphanies of the Muses (*Theog.* 1, 36, 104, 114), Ovid prefaces *Fasti* 5 with an actual epiphany of the Muses and not one but three cosmogonic narratives, embodied by the Muses' competing songs and the oddly placed “beginning” at *Fasti* 5.111.

The first and fullest cosmogony, sung by Polyhymnia, begins in stereotypical fashion with chaos (“post chaos,” *Fast.* 5.11) and continues with the separation of the “old-fashioned” (Barchiesi 1991, 20n20) three elements of *terra*, *aequora*, and *caelum* (earth, water, and sky, 5.11–14), recalling the earlier cosmogonic system before sky (*caelum*) was replaced by *aer* and *aether/ignis* (air and fiery ether).<sup>14</sup> Apart from the archaism itself, no one has discussed Ovid's reasons for using three elements rather than four, uniquely here out of all his cosmogonies. I propose that we have here not simply the three elements, but Gaia, Pontos, and Ouranos, the three procreative principles of the Hesiodic cosmogony.<sup>15</sup> The overall Hesiodic flavor of Polyhymnia's song is enhanced by the matching of his system, and the implied personification of the elements is a necessary setup for the genealogical narrative that follows. Additionally, using *caelum* in place of *aer* and *aether* removes Juno and Jupiter from the equation on an allegorical level, appropriate for the explicitly pre-Olympian temporality with which Polyhymnia begins.<sup>16</sup>

Next, sun, moon, and stars also come into being (*Fast.* 5.15–16)—but, cautions Polyhymnia, despite the presence of the necessary physical components, the cosmos was still far from orderly, as there was no sense of rank or due honor: “par erat omnis honos” (“every honor was equal,” 5.18). Saturn, Oceanus, and Themis rarely received their due,<sup>17</sup> until finally Honor and Reverentia married and produced Maiestas, who immediately put everything to rights, flanked by Pudor and Metus as she sat atop Olympus (“medio sublimis

Olympo,” 5.27). A similar arrangement in the *Theogony*, where the four children of Styx flank Zeus's throne (*Theog.* 383–403), is representative of the finality and totality of Zeus's power.

Barchiesi (1991, 9) has observed the Augustan resonances of Maiestas's role as “a sort of permanent censor of the gods,” whose first task is to set everything to rights by figuratively taking a census (“est dea censa,” *Fast.* 5.22). However, by stratifying the celestial social order, Maiestas also paves the way for a fundamental feature of genealogical cosmogonies: the Divine Succession Myth, which Martin West (1966, 31) has referred to as the “backbone of the *Theogony*.” This is the repetitive process whereby, in each generation, the ruler of the cosmos is violently overthrown by his youngest son, until finally the stable stage within which we exist is reached.<sup>18</sup> Although here Jupiter's overthrow of Saturn is relegated to a single pentameter (“dum senior fatis excidit arce deus,” “until the elder god fell, as fated, from the citadel,” 5.34) and time is spent, instead, on the Gigantomachy (5.35–46),<sup>19</sup> the transfer of power nevertheless occurs and is recognized, a thing that could never have happened without the intervention of Maiestas, as hierarchy was unrecognized prior to her advent. Polyhymnia concludes her cosmogony with the arrival of Maiestas on earth and her careful worship at Rome by Romulus, Numa, and their successors.<sup>20</sup> We may assume, additionally, that it is the presence of Maiestas on earth that allows Romulus and Numa to rule and have successors in the first place.<sup>21</sup>

As the Succession Myth will continue to concern us as we go forward, I offer a brief refresher on the mythological tradition.<sup>22</sup> From the beginning, we see a male desire to retard progress and retain control, complemented (and thwarted) by a female desire for progress and change. Ouranos suppresses his children inside their mother, and Kronos (aided by Gaia) deposes Ouranos by castrating him with a sickle. Kronos suppresses his children inside himself, but through the combined use of *mētis* and *biē* (and advice from Gaia and Ouranos), Zeus too manages to overthrow his father. The possibility of continuing this process of son deposing father ad infinitum always lurks as a potential threat, but Zeus (unlike his father and grandfather) always averts the crisis of potential succession, thus granting humankind a stable cosmos.

Two events within mythology are directly connected to Zeus's attempts to retain his hold on the cosmic throne: his swallowing of Metis (resulting in the birth of Athena from his head) and the marriage of Peleus and Thetis (resulting in the birth of Achilles). A third event is often also acknowledged as playing a part, if an unorthodox one, in the succession narrative: the birth of Typhoeus, either from Gaia (so Hesiod) or Hera (so the *Homeric Hymn to*

*Apollo*) (Clay 2006, 65–74; Vergados 2007, 53; Felson 2011, 256).<sup>23</sup> Although scholars have seen the threat of succession as motivating the structure of various other mythological narratives as well,<sup>24</sup> the key feature of these three putative successors in the “true” Succession Myth is their *superiority* to Zeus in terms of power, rather than simply their *equality*.<sup>25</sup> Both Athena’s younger brother and the son of Thetis are destined to be greater than their father, and while the dominance of Athena’s younger brother is only implied by his future as θεῶν βασιλῆα καὶ ἀνδρῶν (“king of gods and men,” *Theog.* 897),<sup>26</sup> Thetis’s son will be φέρτερον πατέρος (“stronger than his father,” Pind. *Isthm.* 8.32) and, if he is fathered by Zeus or Poseidon, will have weapons that are more powerful than lightning and the trident (Pind. *Isthm.* 8.31–36; Aesch. *PV* 920–25). Typhoeus, too, is explicitly stronger than Zeus in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, while in the *Theogony* Hesiod makes clear the thwarted potential for Typhoeus to defeat Zeus and become the new ruler of the cosmos.<sup>27</sup> As we shall see, all three of these potential successors—especially Typhoeus and the son of Thetis—are directly relevant for Ovid’s engagement with the tradition.

To return to the *Fasti*, Polyhymnia’s cosmogony is followed and balanced by the alternative etymologies for “May” championed by Urania and Calliope, both of whom are introduced with phrasing that repeats their description in book 5 of the *Metamorphoses*, perhaps recalling the cosmic implications of the Muses’ song there.<sup>28</sup> While Urania locates her derivation of “May” from *maiores* (“elders”) squarely in the time of Romulus, Calliope juxtaposes Polyhymnia’s cosmic and Urania’s Roman etymologies: she starts from the primordial marriage of Oceanus and Tethys (more or less concurrent with the events of Polyhymnia’s song) and proceeds genealogically through the birth of Pleione, her marriage to “caelifero Atlante” (“sky-bearing Atlas,” *Fast.* 5.83, phrasing to which we shall return), the birth of the Pleiades including Maia, and Maia’s union with Jupiter, before finally arriving at the birth of Mercury, who is worshiped by the Arcadians.<sup>29</sup> A swift shift of frame takes Calliope (and us) to the exile of Evander, who arrives in Latium (with his mother) bearing his ancestral Arcadian gods and institutes the worship of Faunus and Mercury. This mini-*Evandriad*, having brought us (and Mercury) to Italy, closes by attributing the name of the month to Mercury’s pious celebration of his mother, Maia.<sup>30</sup> Calliope’s song bridges her sisters’ competing etymologies with one that combines elements of both: a theogony followed by an epyllion of early Italy. Barchiesi (1991, 12–13) observes the neoteric features of her song and her stylistic “deflation” of the *Aeneid*;<sup>31</sup> alternatively, by beginning in primordial times and ending in Italy, Calliope has wildly compressed the *Metamorphoses*.<sup>32</sup>

Following this introductory material, Ovid begins the Kalends of May with yet another story of the early days of the cosmos that fits in the space between lines 33 and 34 of Polyhymnia’s cosmogony. The theme is Jupiter in his infancy, suckled by the goat of Amalthea, ultimately growing to adulthood and deposing his father (*Fast.* 5.113–28):

nascitur Oleniae signum pluviale Capellae;  
 illa dati caelum praemia lactis habet.  
 Nais Amalthea, Cretaea nobilis Ida,  
 dicitur in silvis occuluisse Iovem.  
 huic fuit haedorum mater formosa duorum,  
 inter Dictaeos conspicienda greges,  
 cornibus aeriis atque in sua terga recurvis,  
 ubere, quod nutrix posset habere Iovis.  
 lac dabat illa deo; sed fregit in arbore cornu,  
 truncaque dimidia parte decoris erat.  
 sustulit hoc nymphe cinxitque recentibus herbis,  
 et plenum pomis ad Iovis ora tulit.  
 ille ubi res caeli tenuit solioque paterno  
 sedit, et invicto nil Iove maius erat,  
 sidera nutricem, nutricis fertile cornu  
 fecit, quod dominae nunc quoque nomen habet.

The rainy constellation of the Olenian Goat is born: she has heaven as her reward for the milk that she gave. The Naiad Amalthea, renowned on Cretan Ida, is said to have secreted Jupiter in the woods. She had a beautiful nanny-goat, the mother of two kids, conspicuous among the Dictaeon flocks, with horns that were towering and curved onto her back, with an udder of the sort that Jupiter’s nurse ought to possess. She used to give milk to the god; but she broke a horn on a tree and was shorn of a half part of her beauty. The nymph took this and wrapped it in fresh herbs and brought it, filled with fruits, to the mouth of Jupiter. He, when he held the sky’s realms and sat on his father’s throne and nothing was greater than unconquered Jupiter, made his nurse a constellation and his nurse’s horn bountiful,<sup>33</sup> and now it too has the name of its mistress.

Again, the Succession Myth comes tacitly but strongly into play. Amalthea’s horn is presented to the future *rector mundi*, who, in apparent cause and effect,

immediately assumes the celestial throne and absolute power after the defeat of his father (“*ille ubi res caeli tenuit solioque paterno / sedit, et invicto nil Iove maius erat*,” “when he held the sky’s realms and sat on his father’s throne, and nothing was greater than unconquered Jupiter,” 5.125–26). While the narration cuts directly to Jupiter’s undisputed rule of heaven and the catasterism of Amalthea’s goat, glossing over the prolonged battles of the Titanomachy that took place in between, the mention of Jupiter sitting on his father’s throne (*paterno*, 5.125) tacitly reminds us of the means by which he gained that throne: the deposition of his own father, Saturn. Even the initial need for the infant Jupiter to be hidden away (*occuluisse*, 5.116) and entrusted to a wet nurse alludes to the same unmentioned set of events. The story is implicitly concerned, then, not just with Jupiter’s assumption of power, but with the means by which he attained that power and the struggle between divine generations.

The relevance of the Succession Myth here is underscored by the phrase “*nil Iove maius*.” For Ovid, “(nil) Iove maius” (“[nothing] greater than Jupiter”), which is not unlike φέρτερος (“stronger”), serves as something of a circumventing catchphrase for the Succession Myth, always implicitly (and occasionally explicitly) alluding to its events.<sup>34</sup> Ovid uses the phrase four times: once addressed by the Sun to Phaethon in explaining the current organization of the cosmos (*Met.* 2.62),<sup>35</sup> and every other time in direct connection with the succession (and avoided succession) between Saturn, Jupiter, and Achilles (*Met.* 11.224; *Fast.* 5.126; *Tr.* 2.38).<sup>36</sup> After Jupiter overthrows Saturn, there is nothing *Iove maius* in the cosmos; but Jupiter also avoids fathering Achilles in order that there be nothing *Iove maius* (*Met.* 11.217–28):

nam coniuge Peleus  
clarus erat diva nec avi magis ille superbit  
nomine quam soceri, siquidem Iovis esse nepoti  
contigit haud uni, coniunx dea contigit uni.

Namque senex Thetidi Proteus “*dea*” dixerat “*undae*,  
concipe; *mater eris iuvenis, qui fortibus actis*  
*acta patris vincet maiorque vocabitur illo.*”  
ergo, *ne quidquam mundus Iove maius haberet*,  
quamuis haud tepidos sub pectore senserat ignes,  
Iuppiter aequoreae Thetidis conubia fugit  
in suaque Aeaciden succedere vota nepotem  
iussit et amplexus in virginis ire marinae.

For Peleus was celebrated with a goddess as his wife, nor was he more proud of his grandfather’s name than his father-in-law’s, and even if it did not befall only one to be the grandson of Jupiter, a goddess spouse befell one alone. For Old Man Proteus had said to Thetis, “Goddess of the wave, conceive: you will be the mother of a youth who will, with bold deeds, conquer the deeds of his father and will be called greater than he.” Therefore, lest the universe contain anything greater than Jupiter, even though he had felt more-than-warm fires beneath his breast, Jupiter fled the nuptials of watery Thetis, and he ordered Aeacus’s son, his grandson, to take his vows in his stead and to enter the embraces of the marine maid.

Surprisingly, this prophecy of Thetis’s son as a potential future ruler of the cosmos is Ovid’s most extensive discourse on the Succession Myth. For all that Ovid has no end of Hesiodic cosmogonic material in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, he largely avoids narrating the machinery of the Succession Myth; Saturn’s fall and Jupiter’s accession to power are, by and large, abbreviated, omitted, or skirted around.<sup>37</sup> Even in the *Metamorphoses*’ cosmogonic material, where we might expect to find at least an allusion to the Succession Myth, Jupiter’s overthrow of Saturn is relegated to an ablative absolute (*Met.* 1.113–15):

Postquam Saturno tenebrosa in Tartara misso  
sub Iove mundus erat, subiit argentea proles,  
auro deterior, fulvo pretiosior aere.

After the cosmos was under Jupiter’s sway, with Saturn cast into shadowy Tartarus, a race of silver came in, cheaper than gold, more precious than ruddy bronze.

As in Polyhymnia’s cosmogony, and as in the tale of Jupiter’s infancy on Crete, Saturn’s ousting is presented as a *fait accompli*. Elsewhere, the narration is not much extended: one tale (*Fast.* 3.795–808) takes place in the midst of the Titanomachy—Saturn has been deposed and is waging war—but in fact deals with an entirely different threat to Jupiter’s nascent power,<sup>38</sup> while another (4.197–214) begins with the prophecy that Saturn will be dethroned by his son but turns into an *action* for the noisy worship of Cybele.<sup>39</sup> Ovid is not unmindful of the Succession Myth; rather, he seems intentionally to keep it just off-stage, repeatedly driving his readers to recall and reconstruct the



narrative for themselves, thus almost ensuring that they will have it in mind.<sup>40</sup> In Ovid, what is not said is frequently at least as important as what is said.<sup>41</sup>

Returning to the *Fasti*, the next day, May 2, again begins with a star myth, the origin of the Hyades. As in Calliope's epyllion, we return to the primordial days of the cosmos, with further grandchildren of Tethys and Oceanus: not, this time, the seven daughters of Atlas and the Oceanid Pleione, but the six daughters and one son of Atlas and the Oceanid Aethra. Atlas is described as "nondum stabat . . . umeros oneratus Olympo" ("nor yet did he stand with his shoulders burdened by Olympus," *Fast.* 5.169), which both contrasts with the epic *caelifero* ("sky-bearing") of Calliope's song and serves as a temporal marker: if Atlas is not yet bearing the sky on his shoulders, then Atlas has not yet been punished for siding with the Titans against the Olympians. However, by the end of the narrative, Atlas is "cervicem polo subpositurus" (5.180); the Titanomachy has evidently taken place while we were distracted by Hyas's hunting exploits and untimely death. The myth of the Hyades, therefore, takes us further along the temporal continuum that has already been established in the book, from chaos down to Jupiter's infancy and his subsequent assumption of cosmic power.

At this point, abruptly, Flora appears at Ovid's summons and tells him of her Persephone-like rape and the compensation she received for it—she now has control over flowers—before adding what might be her greatest claim to fame: it was through her agency that Mars was born, when Juno was angry over the birth of Minerva.<sup>42</sup> Again, the temporal thread of cosmogonic narration continues as gods of the second Olympian generation come into existence, and the Succession Myth continues to lurk in the background, our attention drawn to it by Flora's mention of Minerva's birth. I propose, however, that Minerva's birth is not the only way in which the Succession Myth is relevant to the unprecedented tale that Flora narrates.

While Flora's story of Mars's birth appears to be an Ovidian innovation,<sup>43</sup> it is clearly modeled on the parthenogenetic births of Hephaestus in the *Theogony* (927–29) and Typhoeus in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (305–52). In both, Hera, infuriated over Zeus's apparent production of a child (i.e., Athena) without the aid of a wife, conceives a child on *her* own; in this respect, Hephaestus and Typhoeus are parallel figures in the tradition. Although it would seem logical to assume that Mars's birth here, in the *Fasti*, is simply appropriating the traditional context of his brother's birth (cf. Boyd 2000a, 75),<sup>44</sup> the story of Mars's birth in fact shares a number of salient details with Typhoeus's birth in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.<sup>45</sup> Juno goes to ask the aid of

elder gods (*Fast.* 5.233 ~ *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 334–36); she asserts a desire to do as Jupiter has done *while remaining chaste* (*Fast.* 5.241–42 ~ *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 328–30); and she goes apart from the other gods to give birth (*Fast.* 5.257–58 ~ *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 343–48). Even if there is no evident desire on Juno's part to overthrow Jupiter in the *Fasti* narrative (in contrast to her motives in the *Homeric Hymn*), nonetheless the possibility is inherent, given the intertext. As a result, Mars becomes something he has never been before: the potential next ruler of the cosmos.<sup>46</sup>

May 2 and the Floralia come to a close halfway through the book: the first half of *Fasti* 5 has reached its end after only two days of the month have passed, and the closural device of Ovid's *sphragis* ("floreat ut toto carmen Nasonis in aevo," "that Naso's song flower in every age," *Fast.* 5.377) signals the discreteness of the preceding narrative.<sup>47</sup> Is it simply coincidence that the book began with a cosmogony (albeit a very strange one), continued a little while later with a tale about Jupiter's infancy that ended with a *post facto* nod to his deposition of Saturn, followed up those episodes with a story precisely concurrent with the events of the Titanomachy, and then added a tale that slots perfectly into the next generation of the Succession Myth? Coincidence has little place in Ovid, and as I have been attempting to show, the thematic repetition in these stories helps to bring deeper themes into view once they are set side by side.<sup>48</sup> Specifically, as we have seen, Ovid arranges seemingly unrelated narratives into an order such that, together, they substitute for a continuous narrative comprising various consecutive stages of the cosmogony.<sup>49</sup> I propose that the re-created cosmogonic structure here, with its various echoes of the Succession Myth, is a comment on issues of dynasty and succession in Augustan Rome.

#### STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS AND SUCCESSION

One passage of *Fasti* 5, which we have already briefly considered in light of the Succession Myth, lends strong initial support to a political interpretation of the theme. It is well recognized that the cornucopia was a significant symbol in Augustan Rome, the message being one of "prosperity through victory and conquests" (Galinsky 1996, 115); it frequently appeared in conjunction with Augustus's birth sign, Capricorn, the aquatic mer-goat.<sup>50</sup> Although Capricorn and Capella are not the same, either astronomically or mythologically,<sup>51</sup> Emma Gee has convincingly argued for an Ovidian correlation between Capricorn and Capella in the *Fasti* *action* of the cornucopia. She suggests that the cornucopia itself serves as a medium to join the two goats—it originates from

Capella, but Augustan iconography associates it with Capricorn. In both cases, the juxtaposition of the cornucopia, Jupiter, and a heavenly goat “fit[s] the same theme: the development and consolidation of Augustan power” (Gee 2000, 140). Gee continues with an important observation as to the precise meaning that Capricorn may have held for Augustus: according to Eratosthenes 27, Aigoceros (Capricorn) fought on the side of the gods against the Titans and protected Jupiter by blowing on his conch shell, which makes Capricorn “an appropriate tutelary sign for Augustus, the human equivalent of Jupiter” (Gee 2000, 142). There are, however, implications of civil war inherent in this association, both in terms of the Titanomachy and regarding Augustus’s own rise to power, and accordingly, says Gee, Ovid’s use of Capella is a safer recasting of these ideas.<sup>52</sup> But Capella may not be quite so far removed from an association with civil war as Gee suggests. As we have seen, her horn appears to be directly correlated with Jupiter’s overthrow of Saturn and the civil wars that ensued. Myths of divine succession are necessarily myths of civil war, and in the *Fasti*, as in Augustan iconographic rhetoric, where the cornucopia so often is linked with Capricorn and other symbols of universal domination, the horn is unflinchingly associated with cosmic power.<sup>53</sup>

We see Augustus and Jupiter similarly linked in the *Metamorphoses*. At the very end of the epic, in the course of praising Augustus, Caesar’s adoption of Augustus, and Augustus’s deification of Caesar, Ovid gives a short catalogue of sons who have surpassed their fathers (*Met.* 15.850–60):

natique videns bene facta fatetur  
 esse suis maiora et vinci gaudet ab illo.  
 hic sua praeferri quamquam vetat acta paternis,  
 libera Fama tamen nullisque obnoxia iussis  
 invitum praefert unaque in parte repugnat.  
 sic magnus cedit titulis Agamemnonis Atreus,  
 Aegea sic Theseus, sic Pelea vicit Achilles;  
 denique, ut exemplis ipsos aequantibus utar,  
 sic et Saturnus minor est Iove. Iuppiter arces  
 temperat aetherias et mundi regna triformis,  
 terra sub Augusto est; pater est et rector uterque.

And marking well the deeds of his son, [Caesar] confesses that they are greater than his own and delights to be conquered by him. As for [Augustus], although he forbids his own acts to be set before those of his father, still

insuppressible Fame, stilled by no command, sets him before though he is unwilling and fights against him in this one respect. Thus great Atreus yields to record of Agamemnon’s deeds, thus Theseus conquers Aegeus, thus Achilles conquers Peleus; and finally, so that I’m using examples that are equal to *them*, thus too is Saturn less than Jupiter. Jupiter holds sway over the airy citadels and the kingdoms of the triply shaped universe, the earth is subject to Augustus; each is father and ruler.

This is a strange catalogue. To begin with, neither Atreus nor Aegeus is particularly well known for deeds of derring-do; Atreus’s famous deeds mostly involve internecine slaughter,<sup>54</sup> while Aegeus’s most prominent acts are siring Theseus and marrying Medea. In addition, presumably because of their fathers’ shared status as comparative nonentities, Theseus and Agamemnon are not typically leveraged as exempla for the topos of father-surpassing sons.<sup>55</sup> While we may hypothesize some mythographic catalogue titled “*Qui patres suos vicerunt*” (“Those who surpassed their fathers”) that could have included Theseus and Agamemnon, the only place in extant mythology where we find sons who explicitly and unquestionably surpass their fathers is in the generational succession of the gods.

It is intriguing, therefore, that the third and fourth exempla are in fact drawn from the events of the Succession Myth, and in such a way as to muddy the seemingly transparent supremacy of Augustus and Jupiter.<sup>56</sup> While Ovid cites Jupiter’s sovereignty over the cosmos as proof of his superiority over his father, Jupiter’s own, unmentioned fears of overthrow by a son were based on his own rise to power and his place in a repeating pattern. The point is prefigured by the previous exemplum. Peleus became Achilles’s father for exactly that reason—namely, awareness and fear among the immortals, especially Jupiter himself, that Thetis’s son would surpass his father. As a result, Achilles was indeed born greater than his father, but lesser than he might have been. The word *vicit* (*Met.* 15.856) underscores the potential violence inherent in the myth and recalls the language that Proteus used in predicting the supremacy of Thetis’s son (“*acta patris vincet maiorque vocabitur illo*,” “he will conquer his father’s deeds and be called greater than him,” *Met.* 11.223).

All this begs the question of Augustus’s own successor. Famously, untimely deaths repeatedly foxed his attempts to guarantee the stability of his nascent empire,<sup>57</sup> and by the time Ovid wrote the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, there was no longer a possibility that Augustus’s successor would share any of his blood. Bill Gladhill (2012, 38) also sees the “myth” of Augustus’s

own succession as standing behind the catalogue of father-surpassing sons, but he paints all three heroes with the same brush: "Is Augustus like the heroes or Jupiter? The difference matters. Agamemnon, Theseus and Achilles invoke the Orestes, Hippolyti, and Neoptolemi, the tragic successors of their tragic fathers. Jupiter is unique in that he ends succession myths completely on the divine level." That formulation would seem to put Augustus between a rock and a hard place: he can be replaced by a degenerate successor or by no one at all.<sup>58</sup> But Jupiter, as we have seen, ends the Succession Myth by choice, since any successor of his would, unacceptably, be *love maior* (not *love peior*). Accordingly, the question of Augustus's successor, for Ovid, may be somewhat more complex than Gladhill makes it out to be.<sup>59</sup>

The catalogue of father-surpassing sons ends with a twist that lends support to this interpretation: both Jupiter and Augustus are called "pater et rector" ("father and ruler," *Met.* 15.860). In a context where they have just been described as sons who surpassed their fathers, especially given the great lengths to which Jupiter went to avoid further generational repetition, the explicit emphasis on their shared paternal aspect is somewhat unsettling, as it is fatherhood that leads to cosmic instability through the perpetuation of the Succession Myth. In the broader context, however, Augustus's role as *pater* is due not least to his recent title of *pater patriae* (meant on some level to celebrate the stability he ensures, just as Jupiter's control of the cosmos fosters stability), a detail that is illuminated by a parallel passage in book 2 of the *Fasti*, where Ovid informs Romulus of the differences between his *res gestae* and Augustus's (*Fast.* 2.127–44):

sancte pater patriae, tibi plebs, tibi curia nomen  
hoc dedit, hoc dedimus nos tibi nomen, eques.  
res tamen ante dedit: sero quoque vera tulisti  
nomina, iam pridem tu pater orbis eras.  
hoc tu per terras, quod in aethere Iuppiter alto,  
nomen habes: hominum tu pater, ille deum.  
Romule, concedes: facit hic tua magna tuendo  
moenia, tu dederas transilienda Remo.  
te Tatius parvique Cures Caeninaque sensit,  
hoc duce Romanum est solis utrumque latus;  
tu breve nescioquid victae telluris habebas,  
quodcumque est alto sub love, Caesar habet.

tu rapis, hic castas duce se iubet esse maritas;  
tu recipis luco, reppulit ille nefas;  
vis tibi grata fuit, florent sub Caesare leges;  
tu domini nomen, principis ille tenet;  
te Remus incusat, veniam dedit hostibus ille;  
caelestem fecit te pater, ille patrem.

Hallowed father of the fatherland, the people have given this name to you, the senate has given this name to you, we Equestrians have given this name to you. However, your deeds already gave it: you bear your true name belatedly. You already were father of the world a long time ago. You hold throughout the lands the name that Jupiter holds in high heaven: you are the father of men, he of gods. Romulus, you will yield: this man makes your walls great by protecting them; you had furnished them to be jumped across by Remus. Tatius and small Cures and Caenina had experience of you; with this man as leader, each side of the sun is Roman. You held some small part of the conquered earth; Caesar holds whatever there is beneath high Jupiter. You snatch wives, he orders them to be chaste under his leadership; you receive crime in the Grove, he casts it away. To you, force was pleasing; laws flourish under Caesar. You held the name of "master," he of "the first"; Remus blames you, he gave mercy to his enemies; your father made you a god, but he made his father one.

As the refounder of Rome, Augustus is Romulus's "successor" as well as Caesar's,<sup>60</sup> and he surpasses him, too, in every way. The last line of the *synkrisis* highlights the nearly paradoxical explanation for Augustus's supremacy: it derives from his own filial piety, since, as Ovid points out in the *Metamorphoses*, Augustus himself could not become a god without making his father one ("ne foret hic igitur mortali semine cretus, / ille deus faciendus erat," "therefore, lest the latter be created of mortal seed, the former had to be made a god," *Met.* 15.760–61). Ironically or not, Augustus's self-aggrandizing deification of his father is seen as eminently praiseworthy—perhaps the greatest of his deeds, just as Caesar's belated act of paternity was the greatest of his (*maius* [= *maximum*] *opus*, *Met.* 15.751).<sup>61</sup>

Caesar made Augustus his son; Augustus made Caesar a god. In *Metamorphoses* 15, however, it is not just Augustus's filial piety that makes him supreme, but the agency of *libera Fama* (*Met.* 15.850–54)—Fama who, like Augustus

himself, is ever-increasing.<sup>62</sup> But following the adoption of Tiberius in AD 4, Augustus was no longer just *pater patriae*; he was now also a father in as true a fashion as Caesar was his own father. The similarity is emphasized by the mention of Tiberius's adoption a scant twenty lines before the catalogue of fathers and sons in *Metamorphoses* 15, celebrated in language that avoids suggesting that Augustus had any part in generating Tiberius.<sup>63</sup> Indeed, Tiberius's birth is attributed solely to Livia, through the periphrasis "*prolem sancta de coniuge natam*" ("the child born from his hallowed spouse," 15.836) (cf. Sharrock 2002a, 105–6; Pandey 2013, 442); all that Augustus contributes is his name ("*ferre simul nomenque suum curasque iubebit*," he will bid him bear his name and his cares at the same time," 15.837).

This a-patrilineal and ostensibly chaste production of a successor may seem strikingly similar to Juno's conception of Mars in *Fasti* 5, and I believe that it should. By the time Ovid composes *Metamorphoses* 15, Tiberius has become Augustus's heir, and by the time Ovid revises *Fasti* 5, Tiberius—the man with no Julian blood—has become *princeps*.<sup>64</sup> Carole Newlands (1995, 108) sees these dynastic and familial tensions as underpinning the story of Mars's birth; a connection with Ovid's wording at *Metamorphoses* 15.836 is not a difficult stretch. Although Ares was never a candidate for succession in traditional Greek myth,<sup>65</sup> in Rome, his own son's city, Mars is akin to Jupiter's crown prince; and if Mars is Jupiter's Roman heir, then Romulus is Mars's. But Ovid has already shown, in *Fasti* 2, Augustus's superiority to his "predecessor" Romulus.<sup>66</sup> Does this mean that Tiberius is primed to surpass Augustus? Not necessarily—Romulus assuredly does not surpass Mars, nor does Mars surpass Jupiter in actuality. After all, "*nil Iove maius*."

There is also the extremely tricky question of whether the superiority of the successor is, in fact, to be avoided or desired. Caesar delights in his son's superiority (*Met.* 15.850–51); Jupiter assiduously prevented the same. As Hardie (1997) points out, Pythagoras's story of the self-reproducing phoenix may be the best analogy for Roman succession: each subsequent ruler is to be a carbon copy of his predecessor, thus avoiding superiority or inferiority.<sup>67</sup> This is not precisely what Augustus himself did: while he was made successor by the bestowal of Caesar's name—successor, not ruler—he subsequently assumed a new name that, with its connection to *augeo*, expressed his potential to surpass his predecessor. Just as Jupiter changed the rules of the game in order to maintain his supremacy,<sup>68</sup> Augustus changed his name (again) to help ensure the same. Like Caesar, however, he too subsequently bestowed his name to ensure continuity. It remains to be seen which model Tiberius will follow:

will he be inferior, equal, or superior to Augustus? Will he adhere to the precedents set by Augustus, or will he overthrow the (recent) *mos "maiorum"*? Ovid treads a fine line, saying just enough to allow multiple interpretations.

Within Rome, it seems, there should be no Succession Myth. The son does not overthrow the father; rather, the father designates a successor to perpetuate his fame and name, and the son (hopefully) ensures that his father's fame lives. Caesar did this with Augustus, and Augustus in turn deified his father;<sup>69</sup> and now Augustus has done the same with Tiberius, after running out of suitable Caesars.<sup>70</sup> The name, of course, is all-important (see Hardie 1997, 193–94)<sup>71</sup>—and the name of Augustus Caesar on the temple of Mars Ultor seems literally to increase the building that bears it: "*spectat et Augusto praetextum nomine templum, / et visum lecto Caesare maius opus*" ("and he sees the temple bordered with the name 'Augustus,' and the work seemed greater with 'Caesar' read," *Fast.* 5.567–68). Do we catch a hint of *Iove maius* and the Succession Myth here, as well as Julius Caesar's *maius opus* of adoption, alongside Augustus Caesar's (*maius*) *opus*?<sup>72</sup> Does the name "Augustus" fulfill its meaning by magnifying whatever it adheres to?<sup>73</sup> Does the name itself mean more than its referent? Again, Ovid provides no concrete answers to the questions that he implicitly raises.

The *Fasti* continues to offer commentary on this point, however, with particular focus on the dynamics of Roman inheritance. Mars re-enters the narrative in the second half of book 5 to witness the newly constructed temple of Mars Ultor, which Ovid emphasizes is appropriately located in the city of Mars's son: "*debebat in urbe / non aliter nati Mars habitare sui*" ("not otherwise ought Mars to dwell in his own son's city," 5.553–54). The temple itself is built as an act of filial and patriotic piety (5.569–80), but Newlands (1995, 101) observes additional, heightened genealogical interests in the passage: "The description of the temple also reflects Mars' family interests as founding father of the Roman race. Mars mentions by name only those Romans to whom he is symbolically or genealogically related: Aeneas, Romulus, and Augustus. . . . Mars singles out Aeneas, Romulus, and Augustus as important, semidivine figures who perpetuate his own fame and ethos." In *Fasti* 2 and *Metamorphoses* 15, it is Jupiter and Augustus who are the fathers ("*hominum tu pater, ille deum*," "you are the father of men, he of gods," *Fast.* 2.132; "*pater est et rector uterque*," "each is father and ruler," *Met.* 15.860). As Mars surveys his new temple, however, in a passage that "emphasizes the importance of patrilineal descent in the smooth transition of destined power" (Newlands 1995, 102), it is Mars and Augustus who are the *patres patriae*, the figures through whom

the succession passes. By becoming the father of the man who founded Rome, Mars has—on one level—succeeded Jupiter after all.

Yet another myth in *Fasti* 5 supplies additional commentary on the complex of Jupiter, Mars, Augustus, Tiberius, and even the Succession Myth itself. The unusual genesis of Orion, produced by three divine fathers, one mortal father, and no mother, recalls (but inverts) the birth of Mars a few hundred lines earlier. Barbara Weiden Boyd and Carole Newlands both observe this point, Newlands (1995, 110) noting that “births of this kind are not a common phenomenon,”<sup>74</sup> while Boyd (2000a, 80–81) dwells on the unusually pronounced absence of a mother figure. Certainly a connection can be drawn between the father-laden birth of Orion and the Roman “myth” of succession, where (as it turns out) a mother need play no role in generating the heir to the throne. However, Ovid in fact also alludes to an extant tradition that understands Gaia as Orion’s mother.<sup>75</sup> Accordingly, Orion’s birth may complement the tale of Mars’s birth in more ways than one: in addition to reversing it, it also reinforces the implications of the Succession Myth inherent in the earlier tale by quietly hinting at the alternative story of Typhoeus’s birth.<sup>76</sup>

Furthermore—to climb out on a precarious interpretative limb—let us not ignore the cause of Orion’s catasterism, the scorpion.<sup>77</sup> In another context, this might simply be seen as adhering to a version of the traditional myth in which Earth and the scorpion were responsible for Orion’s death. However, in a context of succession and inherited power, especially as Ovid did have a choice about which version to follow, it may be that we should remember that Scorpio is (in some fashion) Tiberius’s birth sign.<sup>78</sup> The point is made more promising by Newlands’s (1995, 114) observation that the Scorpion’s “role as pursuer of Orion across the skies . . . is taken over by Mars Ultor. Mars’ arrival chases Orion and the other star signs from the sky (545–56).” The connection between Mars and Scorpio may suggest a concomitant association between Tiberius and Mars, while reaffirming the primary difference between Orion and Mars: Orion, with his purely paternal heritage, is more like Augustus, while Mars, with his purely maternal heritage, is more like Tiberius.

#### CONCLUSION

The themes of succession and apotheosis are not limited to the first half of *Fasti* 5 and the very end of the *Metamorphoses*. As we have already seen in the myth of Orion and the visit of Mars to the temple of Mars Ultor, the themes of the first half of *Fasti* 5 continue in the second half of that book; similarly, paternal and fraternal *pietas*, both relevant to the issue of Augustan succession, are

recurrent motifs throughout *Fasti* 5 (see Boyd 2000a).<sup>79</sup> In addition, these themes can be traced much earlier in the *Metamorphoses*, beyond the confines of the final book and in ways that again bring together the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*. For instance, Sophia Papaioannou (2006) has investigated the arrival of Aesculapius at Rome as a matter of filial succession (drawing together *Metamorphoses* 1, 2, and 15, and *Fasti* 1 and 6) (see also Barchiesi 1991, 5–7), while the tale of the Coroni in *Metamorphoses* 13.685–99 prefigures the themes of *Metamorphoses* 15 (cf. Papaioannou 2006, 132–33).<sup>80</sup> This earlier tale, in retrospect, also links the *Metamorphoses* to the *Fasti*, as the Coronid youths are the grandsons of Orion, themselves produced parthenogenetically from their mothers’ ashes much as the phoenix is produced from its father’s; moreover, as it is comets, not youths, that rise from the ashes in the version of Antoninus Liberalis (*Met.* 25), Ovid may be allusively creating an early model for Caesar’s comet that is directly linked to the tales of *Fasti* 5.<sup>81</sup>

The end of the *Metamorphoses*, with its linear concept of time and strong teleological drive (Feeney 1999; Gildenhard and Zissos 2004), is an appropriate place for the poet to locate themes of succession, just as the epic appropriately opens with a cosmogony. The *Fasti*, however, is circular,<sup>82</sup> and we recall that it is even (re-)dedicated to the next imperial heir, Tiberius’s own putative successor.<sup>83</sup> Why, then, does Ovid choose May—neither the beginning, nor the end, nor the middle—to explore the important and pertinent theme of the Succession Myth? It is, I propose, because May, the *mensis Maius*, is the month of *maiora*;<sup>84</sup> it is the month where “go for greater” can be the motto of success—and succession.

#### NOTES

Many thanks to Tim Stover and Laurel Fulkerson for their invitation to contribute to this volume, to John Miller for sending me some unpublished work on the myth of Amalthea’s goat in *Fasti* 5, and to Lauren Ginsberg and Liz Gloyn for their helpful comments that, as always, enabled me to drastically improve this chapter from its original form.

1. “me Chaos antiqui . . . vocabant” (“the ancients used to call me Chaos,” *Fast.* 1.103). See, among others, Barchiesi 1991; Hardie 1991; DiLorenzo 2001. I use Alton, Wormell, and Courtney 1997 for quotations of the *Fasti* and Tarrant 2004 for the *Metamorphoses* (but with consonantal *u* normalized to *v*); all translations are my own.

2. I use the term “repetition” without implying priority of composition, which is often impossible to determine. The two poems can narrate the *same* episode (e.g., the rape of Persephone); they can narrate parallel episodes (e.g., four different

cosmogonies within the two works); they can narrate interlocking or otherwise related episodes (e.g., stories from and related to the *Aeneid*, in *Met.* 13–14 and throughout the *Fasti*); and they can narrate “twin” episodes that each shed light on how we ought to read the other (e.g., Apollo and the raven, at *Met.* 2.409–632 and *Fast.* 2.243–66). The most important work of the last few decades on the intersections between the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* is naturally Hinds 1987, while Barchiesi 1991, Newlands 1991, Barchiesi 1997, and Garani 2011 all focus on more localized correspondences; Sharon James’s contribution to this volume (chapter 6) looks at the interaction between the two poems’ handling of the theme of rape. I have been unable to obtain the recent (2012) dissertation by E.J. Goode titled “Beyond Persephone: A Study of the Twice-Told Tales in Ovid’s *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*.”

3. Newlands coined the phrase “connecting the disconnected” in this work; it was subsequently adopted by John Miller in a recent (2014) paper for the Classical Association of the Middle West and South.

4. Boyd (2000a, 94–95) has investigated some of the internal thematics of *Fasti* 5, seeing in it “three major interconnected narrative patterns . . . : 1. the power of divine authorization . . . ; 2. the replication of marvelous birth stories . . . ; 3. the power of *pietas*.” Newlands (1995, 87–123) produces a unified reading of the book, while Miller (2014) looks at the connections just within the Kalends of May (5.111–58). My reading complements rather than contradicts these various interpretative forays.

5. This is prefigured in the myths of May 1; Miller (2014) shows how “Ovid [brings] us from Jupiter’s cradle (112) to Livia and Augustus (157–58).” I argue below that this temporal span is also (twice) prefigured in the book’s proemial material, the three competing songs of the Muses.

6. Hardie (1997) also observes that while Augustus may successfully immortalize his father and may expect the same from his descendants, poets have the ability to bestow immortality on *anyone* through the flowers of their poetic garland and the unsurpassed *kleos* (*fama*) that it grants. See also Fantham 1985, 252–53; Ov. *Pont.* 4.8.45–90. Ovid’s *sphragis* in the *Fasti*, set at the midpoint of book 5, further develops this idea of poetic immortalization and self-reproduction, again in connection with themes of succession, but now Ovid’s own: the metapoetic goddess Flora, who has just aided Juno in parthenogenetically producing a son, allows Ovid to reproduce himself, *toto in aevo*, through his poetry. I discuss most of these ideas in more depth below.

7. Ham (2013, 37–38) sees a “philosophical frame” surrounding both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, but while he identifies the cosmological “doctrine of the four elements” as creating this framework in the *Metamorphoses*, it is the Vestalia in *Fasti* 6 that for him forms the framing counterpart to Janus’s cosmogony in book 1. (Ham is correct in his observations; Polyhymnia’s cosmogony forms a different sort of counterpart to Janus’s cosmogony.)

8. Cf. Fantham 1985, 267–68, on the uniqueness of this Hesiodic narrative.

9. Μουσάων Ἐλικωνιάδων ἀρχώμεθ’ αἰεῖδεν (Hes. *Theog.* 1).

10. Their harmony: φωνῆ ὁμηρεῦσαι (“agreeing in voice,” *Theog.* 39); “chori . . . nostri” (“our choirs,” *Met.* 5.270). Their unanimity: ὁμόφρονας (“like-minded,” *Theog.* 60); “dedimus summam certaminis uni” (“we granted the totality of our contest to one,” *Met.* 5.337).

11. Mackie (1992, 85) observes that the precedents of “Callimachus’ *Aitia* and Hesiod’s *Theogony* . . . are entwined together . . . in the reference to *fontes Aganippidos Hippocrenes*.”

12. The quotations (in order) come from pp. 3, 4, and 5. Ovid’s con- and invocation of the Muses is also belated in the *Metamorphoses*—they convene in book 5 and are only invoked in book 15.

13. So too is beginning a work with Jupiter, as at the beginning of Aratus’s *Phaenomena* (ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, “let’s begin from Zeus,” *Phaen.* 1). Ovid does the same once he reaches the inconclusive end of the Pierides’ quarrel and embarks on his material for the Kalends of May (“ab Iove surgat opus,” “let the work start from Jupiter,” *Fast.* 5.111). Gee (2000, 129) points out the Aratean imitation and draws attention to its displacement (it is “the first astronomical entry of book 5, but the beginning neither of the work (*opus*, 111) nor even of the book”), while Boyd (2000a, 66–67) observes that Polyhymnia’s cosmogony is already highly Aratean, recalling the narrative of the departure of the maiden goddess Dike.

14. Ham (2013, 447–52) collects passages from Latin literature that refer to the four elements. The term *ignis* is preferred to *aether*, although the two seem interchangeable (cf. Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.84, 3.30–31). *Caelum*, by contrast, seems to substitute for *aer* only in late authors (specifically, Lactantius and Claudius Donatus).

15. The accusative form of *caelum* (*Fast.* 5.14) obscures whether neuter *caelum* or masculine *Caelus* (Ouranos) is meant. *OLD* s.v. *caelum*<sup>2</sup>: “The masculine form is found . . . as the name of a deity.” Also relevant may be the post-elemental (and, in Lucretius, post-atomic) “tripartite division of the universe” that Wheeler (1995, 97) sees in *Met.* 1 as deriving from Homer’s shield of Achilles.

16. In various traditional allegorical interpretations, the lower *aer* was the anagrammatic representation of Hera, while the upper *aether* or *ignis* was Zeus, the active principle (see Feeney 1991, 149–50, 329). In Ovid’s other cosmogonies, which do not deal with the succession of the gods, there is no need to be so scrupulous.

17. Barchiesi (1991, 10) relates Themis’s cameo to Pindar’s *Hymn to Zeus*, which symbolizes the order of the cosmos through Zeus’s marriage to Themis. However, the choice of Themis may hold additional significance within the *Fasti*, as θέμις and *fas* are near equivalents. This may also be pertinent to the repeated prominence of Carmentis, Evander’s mother, within the *Fasti*: according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 1.31), Carmenta was called *Themis* in Greek (or, rather, Themis was called *Carmenta* in Latin). She can, therefore, be considered the ideal *vates* of the *Fasti*.

18. There are analogues of the Succession Myth in various mythographic systems; see M. West 1997, 288–96. Mackie (1992, 85–86) recognizes the relevance of the Succession Myth to Polyhymnia's cosmogony but sees the genealogies as more important; I see them as inseparable.

19. While it is true that Roman poets conflate the Gigantomachy, Titanomachy, battle against Typhoeus, and assault of the Aloidae (see especially Vian 1952; Hardie 1986), conflation does not necessarily imply a failure to discriminate, and it seems unlikely to me that, for instance, the fraternal/filial nature of the Titanomachy, as opposed to the hubristic endeavors of the Giants and Aloidae, is simply forgotten, especially given the clear distinctions drawn in Hesiod's *Theogony*. (See O'Hara 1994, 222–24, for a reminder to be wary of the total conflation of these various stages of opposition by and to the Olympians.) A parallel with Augustus's Gigantomachic endeavors may be implied (see Fantham 1985, 268).

20. Boyd (2000a) reads this, I think rightly, as an inversion of the departure of Astraea/Dike/Iustitia.

21. Naturally, Augustus embodies both Romulus and Numa, but it is also possible to imagine Caesar as Romulus to Augustus's Numa, which adds another dimension to the present reading. See below for the political ramifications of these themes.

22. For simplicity's sake, I follow the Hesiodic system here (see Clay 2003 for a detailed analysis); although there are a plethora of variants in non-Hesiodic systems of cosmogony, the basic framework remains more or less the same.

23. See also Yasumura 2011 on various challenges to Zeus's power. For the sake of convenience and clarity, I refer to the gods' opponent as "Typhoeus" throughout, although his name takes multiple forms in the tradition, even within the same author.

24. Mythology is rich with inherent possibility: Apollo might be a threat were he not eternally an ephebe and therefore intrinsically less powerful than his father; Athena might, too, were she not female. Hermes, as the last-born of the Olympians, is in the appropriate position to overthrow his father; Prometheus, as the descendant of another Titanic line, may engineer the trick at Mekone as a bid for laying claim to the cosmic throne; and so forth. See Clay 2003, 106; Vergados 2007, 53; Felson 2011, for these and other arguments; Clay (2006) argues that all of the long *Homeric Hymns* implicate the Succession Myth and the organization of the cosmos on at least some level.

25. Felson (2011, 264) observes that "equality" seems to invite competition," but that does not mean it allows even a remote possibility of success.

26. He also will have a *ὑπερβιον ἤτορ* ("overweening heart," *Theog.* 898); the prefix *ὑπερ-* may suggest his superiority.

27. ἀλλ' ὁ γὰρ φέρτερος ἔστω ὅσον Κρόνου εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς ("but let him be as much stronger as Zeus was compared to broad-eyed Kronos," *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 3.339); *κεν ὁ γὰρ θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀναξεν*, / εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησεν πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε ("and he would have ruled over mortals and immortals, had not the father of gods and men paid keen attention," *Theog.* 837–38).

28. Urania: "excipit Uranie" ("Urania followed after," *Met.* 5.260, *Fast.* 5.55). Calliope: "surgit et *immissos hedera collecta capillos* / *Calliope*" ("Calliope rises, her loose hair gathered together with ivy," *Met.* 5.338–39); "tunc sic, *neglectos hedera ridimita capillos*, / prima sui coepit *Calliopea* chori" ("then thus began Calliopea, first of her own chorus, her neglected hair wreathed with ivy," *Fast.* 5.79–80). Is Calliope neglecting her hair because Ovid has moved outside her epic purview? The cosmic overtones of the Persephone epyllion in *Met.* 5 are prominent: when Venus decides that it is time to bring both Pluto and Proserpina under her sway, she phrases it to Cupid in terms of power (*Met.* 5.369–72), as she wants the full cosmos under her control (see Hinds 1987, 108–11; Barchiesi 1999, 115–17; Johnson 2008, 64–71). She continues by naming the three goddesses who evade her power (*Met.* 5.375–77). Although prefacing Ovid's "Homeric Hymn to Ceres," these three lines are drawn directly from the preface to the (actual) *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, thus alluding to a future story in which she will finally be subjugated by Jupiter: Venus will not be successful in her bid for total dominion, except perhaps in Ovid's own erotocentric poetic corpus. It may be relevant to the cosmic overtones that Cupid—like Typhoeus, perhaps—is the only one who can overcome Jupiter (cf. *Apul. Met.* 4.33.5–8).

29. See Boyd 2000a on the importance of Mercury in *Fasti* 5.

30. Ovid, in the previous book (*Fast.* 4.61–84), had already used Evander, as well as Hercules, Ulysses, Telegonus, Halaesus, Antenor, Aeneas, and Aeneas's companion Solimus, as examples of Greeks (and Trojans) who came to early Italy, thereby explaining why the name of a Roman month might have a Greek derivation.

31. See Fantham 1992b on the Aeneas-like role that Evander plays in the *Fasti* as an alternative founder figure.

32. Polyhymnia's cosmogony implicitly does the same, by setting its unorthodox *prima origo mundi* in direct engagement with Ovid's own *tempora* through the Augustan/Tiberian theme of *maiestas*. (See Fantham 1985, 266–73, on the continued relevance of *maiestas* under Tiberius.)

33. Or, possibly, "made into stars his nurse and his nurse's bountiful horn." The plural *sidera* and the structure of the Latin are ambiguous; nowhere else does the cornucopia seem to be envisaged as a constellation, but on the other hand, Capella is normally a single star, rather than a constellation (it is part of the asterism Capra, comprising Capella and her two Haedi, "kids"), which *signum* at 5.113 seems to contradict. See Brookes 1992, 77–78, on the ambiguities of meaning (most scholars tacitly opt for one interpretation or the other); see Gee 2000, 128–29, on the astronomy of the star Capella.

34. Gee (2000, 146) sees the phrase as "a cliché of Augustan panegyric . . . signal[ing] an assimilation of Augustus and Jupiter." While I agree that there may be an implicit assimilation of Augustus and Jupiter in the recurring phrase, I do not see fulsome praise.

35. On this story of cosmos-impacting father/son dynamics, see chapter 1 in this volume, by Andrew Feldherr.

36. Valerius Flaccus, always a careful reader of Ovid, picks up on this phrase and reuses it in the exact same context: Thetis sighing that her son will not be born "Iove maiorem" ("greater than Jupiter," *Argon.* 1.133). An inversion of the phrase *Iove maius* may be visible in "Saturnus minor est Iove" ("Saturn is less than Jupiter," *Met.* 15.857), which again has both Augustan and cosmic implications; see the section "Strategies for Success and Succession," below.

37. References to Jupiter's overthrow of his father: *Met.* 1.113–14; *Fast.* 1.235–36, 3.796–98, 4.197–200, 5.34, 5.125–26. The same abbreviation or outright omission tends to occur in the next generation, and Saturn's overthrow of Uranus is never mentioned.

38. There may be hints of an alternative, non-Hesiodic Succession Myth in the story of Briareus, whom Ovid presents as a contender for universal power. Homer gives "Briareus" as the alternative name of Aigaion, calling him "greater in strength than his father" (ὁ γὰρ αὐτὲ βίην οὐ πατρὸς ἀμείνων, *Il.* 1.404), while the epic *Titanomachy* (which makes Aigaion a son of Pontos and Gaia [fr. 3 West] and therefore the descendant of an alternative, non-Ouranian genealogy) may have cast Aigaion as a Typhoeus-like challenger to Zeus (cf. *Aen.* 10.565–68; see M. West 2002, 111–12); Callim. *Hymn* 4.141–47 may also preserve vestiges of such a tale. In the *Fasti*, the story of the bull-serpent monster that Gaia produces during the Titanomachy, which Briareus tries to sacrifice, splits into two the Hesiodic story of Typhoeus: the bull's birth mimics that of Typhoeus, but the challenge to Jupiter's power comes from Briareus. Given the fragmentary nature of our evidence, this line of thought is necessarily a rabbit hole, but an interesting and pertinent one.

39. This latter seems complementary to the prophecy of Thetis's powerful son in *Met.* 11.

40. Mack (1988, 141) puts the point well: "Ovid experiments with the many ways a story can be told: one way is not to tell it at all. In order to make your reader see that you are not telling it, you have to bring it to his attention and then move off in another direction."

41. Chapter 6 in this volume, by Sharon James, explores the idea of "invoking without mentioning" in the context of Rome's foundational rapes and their tacit incorporation—through their omission—into the *Metamorphoses*.

42. The story of Flora's rape (*Fast.* 5.195–212), together with the later story of a famine that she caused at Rome after being deprived of due honor (5.279–330), suggests the complete story of Ceres and Proserpina; as Ovid has just narrated the full tale in the previous book, it will be fresh in the reader's mind. This may well be another cosmogonic tale lurking below the surface of *Fasti* 5, albeit one whose events are less clearly defined temporally; the version in *Met.* 5 has additional cosmic implications beyond the etiology of the seasons (see n. 28 above).

43. See Porte 1983 on Ovid's possible inspiration.

44. Newlands (1995, 107) sees in Mars's parthenogenetic birth a possible parallel to Erichthonius (whom she calls "Erechtheus," sometimes the same figure and sometimes

a different one), one of the early ancestors of the Athenians, especially "if we see [Flora's] flower as equivalent to the semen that brushes Athena's thigh." But the birth is far closer to that of Erichthonius's father, Hephaestus. This could still support Newlands's broader point, namely that the Ovidian circumstances of Mars's birth are meant to set Rome in parallel to Athens, but understanding the revised myth exclusively in this light strips it of much of its significance.

45. Typhoeus himself receives scant mention in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, appearing only at *Met.* 5.321–31 and 5.346–58 and at *Fast.* 2.461–64.

46. I shall return to this point below.

47. Flora, the goddess to whom (as it turns out) Rome owes its very existence, is equally responsible for Ovid's own poetry (see Newlands 1995, 108–10, 122–23, on the metapoetic status of Flora in the *Fasti*). Newlands (1995, 110) and Boyd (2000a, 77) also argue that Mars himself is conceived of here as a literary creation ("per nostras editus artes," "produced/published through our arts," *Fast.* 5.229).

48. Boyd (2000a, 78) has previously argued for a connecting strand of marvelous births that runs through *Fasti* 5 and links the birth of Jupiter to the birth of Mars, but she refutes a deeper thematic (or systematic) connection deriving from the particular stories that Ovid chooses, finding meaning primarily in the overarching themes highlighted by the repetition; see n. 4 above for the other important themes she isolates in *Fasti* 5.

49. In yet another echo of the book's opening cosmogonies, this sublimated narrative also ends with a Roman coda (*Fast.* 5.259–330). The sort of "reconstituted" narrative for which I am arguing here—where an unmentioned narrative is told in bits and pieces through other, unrelated narratives—is a possibly fundamental feature of the *Metamorphoses* on which some recent, localized work has been done. See Mack 1988, 136–41; Newlands 1997; Gildenhard and Zissos 2000; Gildenhard and Zissos 2004; Boyd 2006; Krasne 2011, 26–38. The parallel narrative mode helps to support the idea that *Fasti* 5 on some level mimics the *Metamorphoses*.

50. The cornucopia and Capricorn were both important iconographic symbols of Augustus's rule; see Taylor 1931, 165–66; Zanker 1988, *passim*; Barton 1995; Galinsky 1996, 106–18; Gee 2000, 135–42; Wray 2002.

51. Capricorn (the half-goat Aigoceros, son of Aigipan) is a constellation in its own right, whereas Capella (Amalthea) is one star in the asterism Capra, itself part of the constellation Auriga.

52. Gee 2000, 142: "Ovid's Capella carries the same set of associations as Capricorn, but is one step removed from civil war and its propaganda, a demilitarised form of Capricorn, pertaining more to the youth of Jupiter than to his *fulmina*."

53. Cf. Galinsky 1996, 107: "Fruitfulness and prosperity are not simply handed down by the gods. Instead, they are the result of Rome's dominance, which is based on efforts in war." A contradictory *aetion* of the cornucopia appears at *Met.* 9.85–92, where it is derived from the river god Achelous's horn, sheared off by Hercules in



their wrestling match over the hand of Deianira. The *Metamorphoses'* cornucopia is directly relevant to the correspondence between *Fasti* 5 and the *Metamorphoses*: this is the one place where they—and, indeed, the two poems in their entirety—outright fail to agree, and the repetition forges a link between *Fasti* 5 and the central books of the *Metamorphoses* to complement the links with *Met.* 1 and *Met.* 15 that I discuss in this chapter. Moreover, its context is highly relevant to the themes of succession and paternity. I plan to investigate this important parallel elsewhere (see Krasne 2011, 14–51, for an initial formulation of these ideas).

54. Atreus and Thyestes teamed up to murder their half brother Chrysippus; subsequently, in revenge for his wife's adultery with Thyestes, Atreus fed Thyestes's own children to him, a crime so horrible that the Sun reversed his course.

55. In addition, there are alternative accounts of the paternity of both Theseus and Agamemnon; the former is also sired by Neptune (whether instead of or in addition to Aegeus), and the latter is sometimes said to be the son of Pleisthenes (*Hes. Cat.* 137a, b, c Most; *Apollod. Bibl.* 3.2.2§15). Whichever way the point is interpreted, one finds an echo of the exchange between Agamemnon, Diomedes, and Sthenelus at *Il.* 4.364–410, where Agamemnon rebukes Diomedes for being χέρεια μάχη, ἄγορῆ δέ τ' ἀμείνω (“worse in battle and better in the assembly,” 4.400) than his father, and Sthenelus rejoins that they are in fact πατέρων μέγ' ἀμείνονες (“far better than our fathers,” 4.405); although Agamemnon does not say as much, the idea of inevitable generational heroic decline (such as Nestor expresses at *Il.* 1.266–72) is inherent in his snub.

56. Gladhill (2012, 38) too sees this catalogue as drawing on the Succession Myth, although he reads its ramifications differently (see below).

57. On Augustus's succession policy, see Sumner 1967; Corbett 1974; Crook 1996, 82–112; Gruen 2005.

58. For Neoptolemus's degeneracy, cf. his own words at *Aen.* 2.547–49; the other two are both failed epebes, but perhaps not “degenerate” beyond their inability to succeed their fathers.

59. It will be clear that I also do not fully subscribe to the reading of the succession at Gladhill 2013, 313–15, where he again argues that because the shadows of Orestes, Hippolytus, and Neoptolemus hang behind their more glorious fathers, Ovid here “encodes tragic undertones . . . to Augustus' usurpation of Caesar's glory” (314) and to the question of who might suitably succeed Augustus (answer: no one).

60. Suetonius records that the Senate proposed to call Octavian “Romulus”—“quasi et ipsum conditorem urbis” (“as if he himself were also the founder of the city,” *Aug.* 7.2).

61. Hardie 1997, 190–91: “In the last episode of the [*Metamorphoses*] the two themes of apotheosis and succession are tightly woven together. The son Augustus honours his father Julius with deification, and the deified Julius in turn sheds lustre on his son.” But he also sees another filial/paternal relationship bound up in the

phrase “maius opus,” namely Ovid's debt to (and simultaneous independence from) the *Aeneid*.

62. *Augustus* derives from *augeo*, “increase”; see Hardie 1997, 193–95. For Fama's increasing size, cf. *Verg. Aen.* 4.174–90. Hardie (2005, 118–20) connects Vergil's Fama with Hesiod's Typhoeus, both of them the last-born children of Earth and described with remarkably similar traits. See Tissol 2002 on the problems with Fama as the source of Augustus's greatness; Gladhill (2013) aligns the seditious, Republican voice of Fama with Ovid's own voice.

63. On the other hand, the similarity is simultaneously downplayed by the highly genealogical language that Ovid uses of Caesar's “fathering” of Augustus (*genuisse*, *Met.* 15.758; “mortali semine cretus,” 15.760). Sharrock (2002a, 105) notes “the ironic stress on the genetic significance of Caesar's fathering of Augustus.”

64. Corbett (1974), however, argues that bloodline was never a concern of Augustus's and that Tiberius had been his first choice for successor more or less since Agrippa's death.

65. Clay (2011, 250) does see potential relevance to the Succession Myth in Demodocus's song of Ares and Aphrodite in the *Odyssey*, but only on the level of the persistent tension in the myth between *mētis* and *biē* (here represented by Hephaestus and Ares, respectively); on Ovid's double use of this myth, see chapter 2 in this volume, by Barbara Weiden Boyd.

66. The *Fasti* 2 passage must be from a pre-revision version of the poem, as Augustus is clearly alive; it may well have been composed with the express intention of corresponding to the passage in *Met.* 15.

67. Hardie 1997, 193–94: “Julius Caesar's solution [to the question of succession] is to fabricate a ‘natural’ son and give him a name which is also his own; this is the fiction of the ideal succession of the same by the same. . . . Ideally the imperial succession should replicate that of the (self-evidently fictional) phoenix, . . . a type of the Julian *gens* in its pious (405 *pius*) consecration of its father.” Where the divine Succession Myth requires one who is φέρτερος than his predecessor, succession in Rome should rely on sameness.

68. Clay 2003, 28: “In swallowing the pregnant Metis, Zeus reiterates the first two episodes of the succession myth, but with a difference; in giving birth to Athena, he appropriates the female function of procreation; and he permanently incorporates into himself the feminine principle of guile (*metis*) that had hitherto been the instrument of generational change.”

69. Although Caesar adopted Octavian in his will, making him a duplicate of himself (C. Iulius Caesar), the true duplication may have gone in the other direction, as Barchiesi (2001b, 77) suggests: “Augustus molds Caesar into a ‘double’ of himself.”

70. Hardie 1997, 195: “The matchless poet at the very end [of *Met.* 15], with no anxiety about *his* succession, stands in pointed contrast to the difficulties of finding an imperial successor. The contrast becomes sharper, barbed even, if the concealed

agenda in the last 120 lines of the poem is not the heir to Julius Caesar, but the succession to Augustus in the 'teens of the first century CE."

71. Fantham (1985, 260), in addition, sees the adoptive name changes as "imposing surface unity on what we know to have been a tension-ridden family."

72. Hardie (1997, 191) points to the poetic implications of *maius opus* in Caesar's adoption of Augustus (see n. 61 above); does the same hold true here, with Mars's temple tacitly compared to Ovid's *Aeneid*-surpassing poetic production? Gee (2000, 143) suggests that the catchphrase *Iove maius* is meant to reflect the increasing nature of **Augustus**: "The wordplay . . . helps us to associate Augustus, Jupiter, and the growth of Rome."

73. A similar notion is suggested by *Tr.* 4.2.9, although "Augustus" is omitted: "Caesareo iuvenes sub nomine crescunt" ("the youths grow under Caesar's name").

74. Newlands (1995, 111) also points out the pertinence of the myth's location within the book: "Directly before Mars plays a major role in the poem as patriarchal head of the Roman people, the unusual birth of Orion serves to remind us of Mars' birth from Juno alone."

75. The earth that covers the ox hide ("superiniecta texere madentia terra," "they covered the dripping [hide] with earth heaped over it," *Fast.* 5.533) becomes a surrogate mother figure in the same fashion that the earth that conceals Tityos becomes his mother (*Ap. Rhod. Argon.* 1.762–63), even though Zeus actually begot Tityos on Elara (whom he then hid beneath the earth). Explicit references to Earth as Orion's mother can be found at *Apollod. Bibl.* 1.4.3§25 (γηγενῆ, "earth-born") and Nonnus, *Dion.* 13.98–103; the latter clearly suggests the same line of thinking as for Tityos's parentage. The birth of Erichthonius, too, follows the same pattern: both Gaia and Athena are thought of as his mother.

76. As we saw above, the more common (and Hesiodic) version makes Typhoeus the son of Gaia rather than Hera.

77. Boyd (2000a, 83–84) notes that "Ovid's reticence about the actual cause of Orion's death is curious: does the scorpion get him or not?"

78. Although Boyd (2000a, 83n65) makes no connection with Tiberius, she does observe that "in the struggle between Orion and a monster produced by Earth can also be heard an echo of the cosmogonic tale . . . in Polyhymnia's story of *Maiestas*." The importance of Tiberius's birth sign in Rome can be seen, for instance, on the *Gemma Augustea* (Vienna, *Kunsthist. Mus. inv. IX A 79*). Often only the symbol of Capricorn alongside Augustus's head in the upper register is discussed, but Tiberius's Scorpion is also present, engraved on the shield at the far left of the lower register (see Zanker 1988, 230–32). Barton (1994, 45) observes that we lack a full understanding of Tiberius's sign: both Scorpio and Libra (the latter once connected to Scorpio as its Claws, the *Chelae*, but reimagined as a balance by the early empire; cf. Manil. *Astr.* 4.547–52) seem to be associated with Tiberius. However, as she points out elsewhere (Barton 1995, 42), it was possible to "accept more than one birth-sign."

79. In particular, as Fantham (1985, 259) points out, the prominence of the Dioscuri (and the oddly unproblematic Romulus and Remus?) may pertain to the brothers Tiberius and Drusus or the adoptive brothers Germanicus and Drusus—or even, to extend Fantham's observation, to the deceased Gaius and Lucius, who were the first to be associated with the Dioscuri as imperial heirs and *principes iuventutis* (see Poulsen 1991, 122–26). In addition, the prominence of the soon-to-be-apotheosized Hercules throughout the book suggests themes of imperial apotheosis, while the *hapax legomenon* "sidus Hyantis" in the last line of *Fasti* 5 may conceivably allude to the *sidus Iulium*.

80. See Barchiesi 1997 on closural devices in the *Metamorphoses*.

81. The phrase "signis fulgentibus" ("gleaming symbols," 13.700), although ostensibly used simply of the engraved images, may suggest the celestial *signa* of Antoninus's version, which may well have also been the version in Nicander's *Heteroioumena*.

82. Nonetheless, Littlewood (2006, 215) observes that the "concentration of myths of apotheosis at the end of" *Fasti* 6, many of which are also to be found at the end of the *Metamorphoses*, signals impending closure. As always, multiple strata of meaning and structure can be operative at once.

83. On the dynamics of power as they pertain to Germanicus in the *Fasti* and elsewhere in the exile poetry, see Fantham 1985; Fantham also argues for a late composition or reworking of at least the introductory section of *Fasti* 5.

84. The stem *mai-* shows up twice as many times in *Fasti* 5 as in any other book of the *Fasti*. See Brookes 1992, 22–28, on the prevalence of *magnus*, as well, in the opening etymologies.