

Editing and interpreting Ovid's *Fasti*: text, date, form

Ovid's *Fasti* can be seen as the pivotal work of his career. It was composed alongside the *Metamorphoses* in his maturity, but issued in the 6-book form we have after his banishment by Augustus to Tomi on the Black Sea. It gives an account of the first six months of the Roman calendar, describing the city's many festivals, touching on the rising and setting of constellations and on other annual phenomena, and underpinning all these with aetiological narratives drawn from Greek and Roman myth and history. To end a calendrical poem after six months is to produce an absurdity: Ovid surely did so by design, thus symbolizing his own truncated life in Rome — and avoiding July and August, the months of the Caesars. The poem has traditionally been of greatest concern to students of religion for the insight it gives into cult: it is no coincidence that the Loeb edition (as well as a discursive commentary) was produced by James Frazer, author of *The Golden Bough*, and a founding father of social anthropology and comparative religion. But in recent decades, as interest in Ovid has grown generally, the *Fasti* has attracted increasingly varied attention: there have been at least six translations¹ published in the last twenty five years, for example, and commentaries in English on four of the six books,² as well as considerable numbers of monographs and articles. It will remain a text where the studies of literary critics, historians and comparativists intersect.

However, this scholarly effort is not founded on a reliable edition. The standard text, the Teubner, was published (first in 1977) by Wormell and Courtney, as an act of *pietas* towards E.H. Alton, their predecessor in the Chair of Latin at Trinity College, Dublin. Alton had been working on the manuscripts of the *Fasti* for decades when he died in 1952.³ Despite the scholarship of the editors, it is not surprising that a book produced in such a way has deficiencies. There are nearly two hundred MSS, but the edition cites only five as primary, all bar two defective and one containing merely parts of three books. Even in citing these five, they are selective (and not always accurate). Giving readings from over a hundred MSS is unwieldy, and tends to produce inaccuracy and confusion; but when the tradition is so contaminated that it is impossible to draw up a stemma, to use a fragmentary five is utterly inadequate. Wormell & Courtney frequently print readings from other MSS (132 times according to Hall's review⁴). The normal procedure in such traditions is for the editor to choose between one and two dozen (Tarrant's OCT of the *Metamorphoses* uses 12, plus a number of smaller fragments, e.g.); the list will include the oldest and any later MSS that seem to have access to authentic readings not present in others cited.

As far as my current information goes, the 11th-century Montecassino MS U will remain relatively isolated in a new apparatus, though it has one certain copy (Y, identified as such by Alton 1929). A, the oldest MS (10th century; northern France), itself has a lot of errors, among them a few nonsense words, several of which may be explained by the scribe's failure to understand an unfamiliar script, namely Beneventan, as used at Montecassino, where (as I

¹ In English, Nagle 1995, Boyle & Woodard 2000, Wiseman & Wiseman 2011; in Italian, Canali 1998, Stok 1999; in German, Holzberg 1995.

² Fantham 1998 (book 4); Green 2004 (book 1); Littlewood 2006 (book 6); Robinson 2010 (book 2). Commentaries on books 3 (Heyworth) and 5 (Miller) are planned for the Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics series. Ursini 2008 is a very thorough commentary on the first 516 lines of book 3.

³ See e.g. Alton 1926a, 1926b, 1930; Alton-Wormell-Courtney 1973: 144-5.

⁴ Hall 1982: 69-70.

have mentioned) U was written. At 2.292 A (f.53v)⁵ has instead of *rude* the nonsense word *hnide*, which seems very likely to descend from a scribe's inability to make sense of the Beneventan ligature *ru*, which begins with a long vertical stroke. Again, on f. 69r, at 4.412 A's scribe has produced nonsense, *sint* having become *sira*, one assumes because of misreading of the *nt* ligature, in which the *t* can look very like a flat *a*. My hypothesis is that the lost archetype from which the stemma descends was written at Montecassino; a copy was made there. Given that the northern MSS seem not to descend from a common ancestor separate from U, it must have been the archetype itself that was brought north, while the copy remained and was later the exemplar of U. This would allow for a stemma with more than two main branches. But we probably have to assume that the archetype itself contained variants and glosses, in order to explain the contaminated state of the tradition, where U shares significant errors with a range of different MSS. Such contamination was doubtless exacerbated by horizontal transmission at later stages: readers were aware of corruption, Ovid was a popular author, and the *Fasti* was a source of desirable information. At the moment, my collations have not led to elimination of any further copies, nor any strong grouping of the 12th- and early 13th-century MSS into families. But this is likely change as more copies are read: there are about 30 earlier than 1250.⁶

One significant result is the discovery that Alton misdated one of the Berlin manuscripts: Diez B Santen. 25 (which I call S) belongs not to the 14th century, but to the 12th (like many others it seem to have been written in northern France). This is an important finding because its text is close to A, though certainly not dependent on it, and A, though earlier than any other copies, is not a reliable foundation for the text, both because it has a lot of idiosyncratic errors (a point that my collations are confirming), and also because it is preserved only as far as 5.24. At the very least, the new collations will allow for a pragmatic selection of MSS, and an apparatus that has a very different balance to that in the Teubner. I shall end this section by illustrating how the over-selective approach of Wormell & Courtney has denied to the reader a number of highly plausible readings. Let me begin with S: when one finds plausible alternatives in a broadly accurate copy such as this is, and one that is not prone to insertion of conjecture, it seems appropriate to pay attention. The Teubner prints as follows 4.433-4 (a couplet from early in the Persephone story):

praeda puellares animos prolectat inanis,
et non sentitur sedulitate labor.

The apparatus offers the following information on the hexameter: 'prolectat AU(ς):⁷ delectat Zς'; the appendix adds nothing further. The choice between variants has been made perhaps on the basis of treating Z (i.e. the agreement of the 10th-century fragment I, the 11th-century G, and M, of c. 1500) as the least reliable of the three branches, or perhaps on the basis that, as Ovid nowhere else uses the verb, *prolectat* is *difficilior lectio*. S reads *oblectat* here. This is surely what Ovid wrote: of the three prefixes *ob-* is the most easily omitted after *animos*, so if we ask the philological question *utrum in alterum abiturum erat?* and ignore the improper short-cut of *difficilior lectio*, this will be the text we choose. Moreover, though the phrasing is not close to any individual instance, *oblectat* fits with Ovid's diction elsewhere:

Rem. 169 *rura quoque oblectant animos studiumque colendi*
Ex Ponto 4.2.44 *oblectat cultu terra nouata suo*

⁵ Available on line at https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Reg.lat.1709.pt.A.

⁶ So Alton-Wormell-Courtney 1977.

⁷ I am not certain what the brackets are intended to imply in this instance; according to A-W-C norms it should mean that of the later MSS some are closer to *prolectat* than *delectat*, but that not all have the form in full: *prolectet*, e.g.?

In addition, it turns out that S is not alone in this reading: both of the 12th-century copies in the Vatican (Vat. Lat. 1604, Vat. Lat. 3265) have *oblectat*, and so originally, it seems, did G, the 11th-century Brussels MS, which is subsumed under Z in the Teubner apparatus, even though *delectat* is only a correction in G.

At least in this case the sense does not suffer, but at 1.512 our standard edition for once gives us a most implausible text. Here is Carmentis' address to the deities of her new home as she is rowed up the Tiber in her son's ship:

dique petitorum dixit, saluete locorum,
 tuque, nouos caelo terra datura deos, 510
 fluminaque et fontes quibus utitur hospita tellus,
 et nemorum siluae Naiadumque chori, ...

Heinsius wanted to read *et nemora et siluae*; but the Teubner apparatus ignores that and adduces *Culex* 381-2 *tu cole fontes | et uiridis nemorum siluas et pascua laetus*: even if this text is right itself, it is in two respects easier — *nemorum* may qualify *uiridis*, and the phrase comes in a passage where the focus is on places, not divinities: in Ovid's passage a prayer follows, in 513-14. What the apparatus also fails to tell us is that a number of 12th-century MSS (including S and both Vatican MSS) have not *siluae*, but *nymphae*: of course this can be a conjecture, but these are not MSS that are prone to such changes. And *nymphae* is surely what Ovid wrote. For the corruption, cf. Vergil, *Ecl.* 10.55 *nymphis* Pωγ: *limphis* M, ΣBern.: *siluis* Ra. There are tens, perhaps scores, of such cases where modern editors hide what seems to me the correct reading.⁸

Furthermore, though this is not a badly transmitted text like the *Heroides*, or Propertius, say, there are places where conjecture is called for: I've found myself printing conjectures by Watt, Delz, and Murgia⁹ in the text of Book 3 for example, as well as older ones from the likes of Heinsius, Gronovius, Merkel.¹⁰ There remain puzzles too, and not just where the Teubner has obeli. Consider 3.239, for example:

quaeque diu latuit, nunc, se qua tollat in auras,
 fertilis occultas inuenit herba uias?

If anyone can see a reason why Ovid would have placed the unemphatic reflexive *se* in advance of *qua*, I should like to hear it. The placing misleads the reader into thinking that the pronoun looks ahead to the main clause, as it does when it precedes subordinating conjunctions elsewhere in Ovid, e.g. at 5.395:

nec se, quin horrens auderent tangere saetis
 uellus, Achilleae continuere manus.

As O. elsewhere writes *qua se* (e.g. 4.291 *ostia contigerat, qua se Tiberinus in altum | diuidit*), and pairs of monosyllables often get confused in transmission (e.g. 3.209 *sint pro] pro sint* F;¹¹ *ex P.* 4.6.3 *tu quod] quod tu m p*), there is a strong case for re-ordering here. The fact that the Munich manuscript D omits *se* may be a trace of the disordering.

⁸ E.g. 2.286 *concitat* DW; 3.195 *externis* D; 3.316 *regna* Q; 3.399 *ignes* W; 4.24 *praetulit* S; 4.160 *numine corda* BCDSW. Bömer has some of these in his apparatus, but prints none; Frazer did print *nymphae* in his 1929 *editio maior*.

⁹ 3.229 *Kalendas] quotannis* Watt 1995, 844; *et hoc] ut in* Watt 1995; 557-8 before 575 Murgia 1987; 643; †*super ausa*†] *suspensa* Delz 1994.

¹⁰ 3.200 *canet* Gronovius; 500 *tua; at hic laudi est* Heinsius; 517 *demerserit* Heinsius; 829 *fere] breui* Heinsius; 656 *se] rem* Merkel.

¹¹ I.e. Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 280.

As for places where the Teubner obelizes, let us consider Ovid's account of the Liberalia (17th March: 3.713-90). The festival is approached through a negative hymn, listing the topics that the poet shall not deal with here (3.715-24):

Tertia post Idus lux est celeberrima Baccho:	
Bacche, faue uati, dum tua festa cano.	
nec referam Semelen, ad quam nisi fulmina secum	715
Iuppiter adferret, †paruus inermis eras†;	
nec, puer ut posses maturo tempore nasci,	
expletum patrio corpore matris opus.	
Sithonas et Scythicos longum narrare triumphos	
et domitas gentes, turifer Inde, tuas.	720
tu quoque, Thebae mala praeda, tacebere, matris,	
inque tuum furiis acte Lycurge genus.	
ecce libet subitos pisces Tyrrhenaque monstra	
dicere; sed non est carminis huius opus:	
carminis huius opus causas exponere quare	725
uitisator populos ad sua liba uocet.	

The third day after the Ides is thronged with celebrations of Bacchus: Bacchus, favour the poet while I am singing your festival. I shall not tell of Semele; unless Jupiter brought his weapons with him to her, you were little, unarmed; nor the mother's role fulfilled by the father's body so that you could be born a boy at full term. It would be tedious to tell of the triumphs over Sithonians and Scythians, and the conquest of your races too, incense-producing Indian. You also will be passed over in silence, the unfortunate prey of your Theban mother, and you, Lycurgus, driven by the Furies to attack your own offspring [or knee]. No, it pleases to tell of the fish that suddenly appeared, the extraordinary metamorphosis of the Etruscans; but that is not the business of this work: the business of this work is to explain why the vine-father summons the people to his cakes.

As a hymn to Bacchus this corresponds to *Metamorphoses* 4.11-32, which emerges from an account of the god's rites and merges back into description towards the end. Particularly close to the Liberalia passage is the core of the hymn, 4.18-24:

tu puer aeternus ¹² , tu formosissimus alto	
conspiceris caelo; tibi, cum sine cornibus ¹³ adstas,	
uirgineum caput est; Oriens tibi uictus adusque	20
decolor extremo qua tingitur India Gange.	
Pentheia tu, uenerande, bipenniferumque Lycurgum	
sacrilegos mactas, Tyrrhenaque mittis in aequor	
corpora, tu biiugum pictis insignia frenis	
colla premis lyncum.	25

You are seen as an eternal boy, you as the most beautiful in heaven above; when you stand without your horns, your face is that of a maiden; by you the East was

¹² Cf. *Fasti* 3.773 *puer semper iuuenisque uidebis*.

¹³ Cf. *Fasti* 3.789 *mite caput, pater, huc placataque cornua uertas*, which associates the paternal Bacchus with horns.

conquered as far as where India is dyed dark by the most distant Ganges. You, a god to be worshipped, sacrifice the sacrilegious Pentheus and Lycurgus with his double-axe, and you send the bodies of Etruscans into the sea, you weigh down the spotted necks of yoked lynxes with decorated reins.

Verses 20-1 are (ironically) a shorter version of *Fasti* 3.719-20 (*longum narrare*); Lycurgus appears only here in the *Met.*, but an extended account is given in book 3 of Pentheus' resistance and consequent death at the hand of his mother (527-731; cf. *Fasti* 3.721-2). The tragedy of Pentheus replaces the First Messenger speech of Euripides, *Bacchae* (677-776) with the story told by Acoetes, the god's avatar (582-691). This is where Ovid 'chooses' to tell the tale of the transformation of the Etruscan pirates into dolphins (*libet subito pisces Tyrrhenaque monstra | dicere*, *Fasti* 3.723-4).

My focus, however, is on 3.715-18, where the poet passes over the god's birth myth. The Teubner obelizes the second half of 716: *paruus inermis eras/erat*¹⁴ in the pentameter is clearly corrupt, but there are further problems. If the couplet is to be one sentence (as the continuation in 717 implies), the grammar should link the relative pronoun to the apodosis, not the *nisi* clause; Wormell-Courtney saw this in suggesting *a qua* to lead into Alton's *parturiendus eras*: 'from whom you were going to be born unless Jupiter brought his thunderbolts with him'. However, as they note, this anticipates the next couplet, and to little effect. Moreover, the gerundive (like the gerund) is nowhere attested. If *nisi ... Iuppiter adferret* is correct, *fulmina secum* can hardly be right: Jove did take thunderbolts with him, and there is nothing plausibly pointed to say in the second half of the pentameter about what would have happened had he not done so. One approach to solving the problem would be to suppose that the poet is already here reflecting on the account of the birth that introduces the Bacchus sequence in *Metamorphoses* 3 and 4. *Met.* 3.259-315 tells the story familiar in outline from Euripides, *Bacchae*, of how Juno jealously tricks Semele, the Theban princess impregnated by Jupiter, into getting his promise to visit her in the full regalia of the thunder god. Though he moderates the strength of his weaponry, the mortal woman is still destroyed by the fire of the storm, and Bacchus has to be brought to term in his father's thigh (3.302-12):

qua tamen usque potest, uires sibi demere temptat
nec, quo centimanum deiecerat igne Typhoea,
nunc armatur eo: nimium feritatis in illo est.
est aliud leuius fulmen, cui dextra Cyclopus
saeuitiae flammaeque minus, minus addidit irae:
tela secunda uocant superi. capit illa domumque
intrat Agenoream. corpus mortale tumultus
non tulit aetherios donisque iugalibus arsit.
imperfectus adhuc infans genetricis ab aluo
eripitur patrioque tener (si credere dignum est)
insuitur femori maternaque tempora complet.

¹⁴ *eras* in the majority of 12th- and 13th-century MSS (and A after correction), *erat* in AUG and others, perhaps through reminiscence of 440 *primo tempore inermis erat*, of the small Jupiter (*fulmina nulla tenet*, 438), as A-W-C suggest.

¹⁵ This and the following line and a half are cited by Seneca, at *Nat.Q.* 2.44.1, in his discussion of different kinds of thunder and lightning.

However, as far as he can, he tries to take away his own power, and does not arm now with the fire by which he threw down hundred-handed Typhoeus: there is too much fierceness in that. There is another lighter thunderbolt to which the hand of the Cyclopes added less savagery and flame, less anger: the gods call them second-rank weapons. These he takes and enters the home of Agenor. The mortal body could not endure the heavenly storm and burned with the conjugal gifts. The still unfinished child is snatched from the womb of his mother and the poor thing (if it is right to believe it) is sewn in his father's thigh and completes his maternal gestation.

What Jupiter takes with him are lighter *fulmina*, *tela secunda* as the gods call them (307). If he had not taken those, Bacchus himself would have died too: that would make a worthwhile gloss on the tale in the *Met.* Hence my conjecture: *quacum, nisi tela secunda | Iuppiter adferret, tu periturus eras*: 'along with whom, unless Jupiter brought his second-rank weapons, you were going to perish'. Though O. rarely has hexameter endings like *tela secunda* (Holmes 1995), he has more in poetry published from exile, and *secunda* is stressed. *fulmina* appears as a gloss on *tela* in FS at 343, e.g. I imagine that the corruption originated in such a gloss, and that *secunda* was reduced to *secum* in an attempt to correct the metre.) Such a conjecture is *exempli gratia*, of course, and I would welcome further attempts.

Date and Form (1)

Ovid first mentions the *Metamorphoses* at the end of *Tristia* 1.1. He instructs his new book on what to do when it reaches Rome, ending with arrival in the library of his own home (1.1.105-22), where it will see its brothers, among them the three books of the *Ars amatoria*, skulking away in a dark corner, but also the fifteen rolls of the *Metamorphoses* (117-18):

sunt quoque mutatae, ter quinque uolumina, formae,
nuper ab exequiis carmina rapta meis.

There are also fifteen volumes of the *Metamorphoses*, poetry recently snatched from my funeral procession.

The poet instructs his book to tell the *Metamorphoses* to add the change in Ovid's own fortunes to their tales, an intention fulfilled in poem 7. Here he tells anyone who has a bust of him to remove the garland from his head (*temporibus*¹⁶ *non est apta corona meis*, 1.7.4), and to read his poems, especially the *Metamorphoses*, instead (*Tristia* 1.7.11-14):

grata tua est pietas, sed carmina maior imago
sunt mea, quae mando qualiacumque legas,
carmina mutatas hominum dicentia formas,
infelix domini quod fuga **rupit opus**.

Pleasing is your affection, but my poetry is a greater image of me, and I ask you to read that, whatever its quality, the poetry telling of the changed forms of men, the unlucky work which was broken by the exile of its master.

¹⁶ *temporibus* 'temples' plays on the alternative sense 'times', and evokes the first word of the still unpublished *Fasti* (Hinds 1999: 56-7; pages 53-7 deal with a number of plays on *tempora*, including *Met.* 1.4).

This poem he tried to burn¹⁷ as he was departing, but there were several other copies, and now he prays that it survive, give pleasure to readers and remind them of him; and he offers a six-line epigram explaining the poem's unfinished state. He thus tells his reader that the poem circulating in Rome is authorized by the poet. Work on the *Fasti* was also interrupted by the bolt from the blue, as he reveals at *Tristia* 2.549-52, near the end of his long letter to Augustus, arguing his innocence and pleading for lenience:

sex ego Fastorum scripsi totidemque libellos,
cumque suo finem mense uolumen habet,
idque tuo nuper scriptum sub nomine, Caesar,
et tibi sacratum sors mea **rupit opus**.

I have written six books of *Fasti*, plus the same number, and with its month each volume finds its end, and this was recently written under your name, Caesar, and my fate broke a work dedicated to you.

These lines announce the existence of the *Fasti*, but as a poem that consists of six books plus six. They then emphasize the way the poem is divided into discrete books, name Caesar as the poem's dedicatee, and describe it as 'broken' by his lot. It is tempting to read *rupit* as 'broken in two', implying the separation of one half from the other, but the verb does not clearly mean this, for the same expression has been used at 1.7.14 — and there is no other reason to think that the 15 books of the *Met.* are only half of the original plan (charming though that notion may be). On the other hand the division of the *Fasti* into two groups of six books looks significant: though circumlocutions have to replace *duodecim* in dactylic verse, Ovid normally uses *bis sex* for 'twelve' (10 instances), and the other two occurrences of *sex* + *totidem* both evoke the *Fasti* itself: the closural count of the number of days left in June (and the poem) at *Fasti* 6.725 *iam sex et totidem luces de mense supersunt*, and the arrangement of the signs of the zodiac on the doors of the Sun's palace at *Met.* 2.18 (*signaque sex foribus dextris totidemque sinistris*). Perhaps Ovid was already planning his publication of January to June; at the very least he has allowed later decisions to increase the significance of the phrase. The following verses (2.553-60) briefly mentions the poet's tragic output, and then encourage Augustus to have the end of the *Metamorphoses* read to him, thus confirming that the poem is available in Rome:

et dedimus tragicis sceptrum regale tyrannis,	
quaeque grauis debet uerba cothurnus habet;	
dictaque sunt nobis, quamuis manus ultima coeptis	555
defuit, in facies corpora uersa nouas.	
atque utinam reuoces animum paulisper ab ira,	
et uacuo iubeas hinc tibi pauca legi,	
pauca, quibus prima surgens ab origine mundi	
in tua deduxi tempora, Caesar, opus.	560

and we have given a royal sceptre to tragic kings and the heavy buskin has the words it needs; and we have told the *Metamorphoses*, although the final touch was

¹⁷ We may take this story as a moment of homage to Vergil, whose dying wish demanded the burning of the *Aeneid*; but there is a contrast: Vergil's will is countermanded by Augustus, whereas Ovid changes his own mind.

lacking to the poem I began. Would that you might recall your mind from anger a little and order a few lines of this to be read to you, when you have the time, the few lines in which I led the work beginning from the first beginning of the world down to your own times, Caesar.

Nothing has been said, however, about reading the *Fasti*: that text has been written, but apparently not published. Yet the use of the same phrase, *rupit opus*, to describe the damage done to both works draws attention to the fact that they were being composed at the same time.

The *Fasti* promises *Tempora cum causis*, where *causis*, just like *origo* (*Met.* 1.3), is a Latin equivalent to *aetia*; and both poems are full of aetiological tales, explanations of the origins of species (in the *Met.*), of constellations, of rituals, and of names (in the *Fasti*). They both begin with creation out of chaos, the *Fasti* with the two-faced Janus's self-identification as a world without proper place and order, kept at the start of the Roman year as a memorial of creation (1.103-12). Each poem tells its *aetia* by narrating myths, mainly Greek in the *Met.*, a rough balance of Greek and Roman in the *Fasti*. They thus have much that is fundamental in common. But how differently they construct their universal histories: the *Metamorphoses* begins at the beginning, and pursues its onward flow, with many a meander, and many a splitting of its stream, on down to the present, and its final announcement of the poet's immortality (*per omnia saecula ... uiuam*, 15.878-9). The poem is designed to keep the reader going over book divisions, following Phaëthon on his journey from 1 to 2, Europa from 2 to 3. The end of 3, an obvious imitation of the *Bacchae*, is apparently closed (3.733-4):

talibus exemplis monitae noua sacra frequentant
turaque dant sanctasque colunt Ismenides aras.

Warned by such examples the women of Thebes attend the new rites, give incense, and worship at the holy altars.

The denial of Bacchus has ended; with Pentheus dead, resistance is over, the situation resolved. However, as soon as we read on into book 4, this impression is corrected: *at non Alcithoe* ... ('but not Alcithoe'). And so it continues.

The *Fasti* has rather more about the poet's own time, with reminiscences of his dialogues with old soldiers and innkeepers, gods and Muses, as well as descriptions of the many alterations to the calendar perpetrated by the Caesars. But here the narrative gives not even the illusion of onward flow towards an end. The absolute model from which this poem diverges would divide the events of all history into the months in which they occurred, and then into days. This division into discrete units is emphasized by the final lines of book 1 (722, almost identical to *Tristia* 2.550, where *uolumen* replaces *libellus*) *cumque suo finem mense libellus habet* ('and with its month each book finds its end') and 2.863-4

uenimus in portum libro cum mense peracto.
nauiget hinc alia iam mihi linter aqua.

We have come into port, the book completed along with the month. Let my boat now sail from here on another stretch of water.

The point is already quietly expressed in the opening couplet:

Tempora cum causis Latium **digesta** per annum
lapsaque sub terras orta que signa canam.

Times spread through the Latin year I shall sing, together with their explanations,
and the constellations setting beneath the earth and rising.

Barchiesi (1997a: x) rightly suggested that *digesta* ('distributed') should be read as the *Fasti*'s equivalent to *perpetuum* at *Met.* 1.4. If Ovid allowed his calendrical structure to determine his narrative, he would first record all the events relevant to 1st January, and then 2nd January, and so on. Though he avoids this, just as he avoids ever downward movement in the *Met.*,¹⁸ yet he still tells eight episodes from the life of Romulus in the order: fight against the brigands; exposure in the Tiber; apotheosis; conception; initiation of the calendar; rape of the Sabines; foundation of Rome and killing of Remus; the shade of Remus: 3, 2, 8, 1, 5, 7, 4, 6.¹⁹ Nothing could more be more injurious to narrative continuity.

As the prologue to the *Fasti* announces, the poem will be concerned with a plurality of topics, even more varied than the notion of change in the *Met.*: besides *tempora cum causis* (itself a plurality), and *annus, menses, dies*, the poem sings *sidera, stellae, signa, astra; sacra* and *aras*. It has rightly been a concern of research in recent decades to explain this variety: it would for example have been entirely possible to write a poem on the Roman calendar without including any star-myths.²⁰ It may be that the contribution to variety is the essential point. A further oddity about the *Fasti* as a narrative poem is the choice of elegiacs: 'not on the face of it ideally suited to continuous story-telling' as Kenney puts it.²¹ Ovid's couplets are normally end-stopped, unlike the hexameters of the *Metamorphoses*, which regularly run on. The difference is enhanced by the contrast between the hexameter's end, where ictus and accent coincide, and the iambic close of Ovid's pentameter, where they necessarily clash. But the choice of metre is clearly deliberate, part of the wider pursuit of discontinuity in the poem: *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* share much, but the narrative flow is ongoing in the latter, and persistently broken in the former, between books, days, stories, and couplets).²² Ovid, in choosing the intensely political subject matter of the calendar, was determined to create an image of the varied reality of the Roman year. When he describes the day on which Augustus became *pontifex maximus* (3.415-28), it is as just one of seven separable passages in a sequence of 66 lines, sandwiched between Ampelos, beloved of Bacchus, and Veiovis, a junior, unarmed form of Jupiter. The honorific election of Augustus, which in other hands²³ might have provided a significant climax, here leads out of nothing and into nothing; it plays

¹⁸ E.g. in *Met.* 2.531-41, where the narrative goes back to the metamorphosis of the raven from white to black, an event said to be contemporaneous with Juno's adorning of the peacock with the eyes of the dead Argus at 1.722-3. The sense of temporal disorder is increased by reference to the geese that will save the Capitol in 2.538-9 and the tales of the past told by the crow in 2.549-95.

¹⁹ So Barchiesi 1997a: 154, though not including the calendar: 3.49-78 gives an overview of the life, which complicates the picture still further.

²⁰ See Newlands 1995: 27-50, and especially Gee 2000, who finds significant the studied difference from the universalizing stoicism of Aratus' *Phaenomena*.

²¹ Kenney 2002: 50.

²² So e.g. Newlands 2000: 171-7.

²³ Compare Augustus himself in *Res Gestae* 10.

as large a part in Ovid's version of the Roman calendar as Minerva Capta (3.835-48), and rather less than the partying of the *plebs* on the Ides of March (3.523-42).

Date and Form (2)

Tristia 1 and 2 present the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* as both fully drafted and in the later stages of composition when Ovid received the sudden edict dismissing him into distant exile. He authorizes the publication of the *Met.*, but the *Fasti* has not been made available to the public. It seems improper therefore to speak, as Ovidians sometimes do, of the *Fasti* having appeared twice, with our version the second, a partial revision, produced some time into the principate of Tiberius. The extant *Fasti* shows its lateness through the dedication to Germanicus, nephew and adopted son of Tiberius, presumably thought a more sympathetic figure than the emperor himself, perhaps because of his translation of Aratus's *Phaenomena*, the poem about the constellations, and their relationship to time and weather. Late details appear also in the prophecy of Carmentis (1.509-36), and the account of Concordia's temple, opened by Tiberius on the lower slopes of the Arx in A.D. 10. At 4.79-84 Germanicus is addressed for the first time since book 1, and reference to Scythia's distance from Sulmo points directly to Ovid's exile:

huius erat Solimus Phrygia comes unus ab Ida,
a quo Sulmonis moenia nomen habent, 80
Sulmonis gelidi, patriae, Germanice, nostrae.
me miserum, Scythico quam procul illa solo est!
ergo ego tam longe — sed supprime, Musa, querellas:
non tibi sunt maesta sacra canenda lyra.

One companion of his [i.e. Aeneas], from Phrygian Ida, was Solimus, from whom the city of Sulmo has its name, chilly Sulmo, our homeland, Germanicus: alas, how far that is from the soil of Scythia. Thus I, so distant—but suppress complaints, Muse: you are not to sing rites on a sad lyre.

The point is compounded by *maesta lyra*: there is a danger that the *Fasti* (*sacra*) will be desecrated by the tone suited to the *Tristia*. These lines serve as an announcement that it is not merely the opening book that Ovid has tweaked between exile and publication. For the observant reader, the point is compounded by the presence of polysyllabic pentameter endings at 5.582 *fluminibus* and 6.660 *funeribus*. In general these can be seen as markers of composition in exile;²⁴ and *funeribus* comes in the passage on the exile of the *tibicines* — they go only as far as Tibur, and we can plainly hear the voice of another exile in verse 666 *exilium quodam tempore Tibur erat*. Later in the passage Ovid plays on the name of the *Ars*; at 6.701 Minerva says of her creation of the *tibia*, '*ars mihi non tanti est; ualeas, mea tibia*', phrasing that recalls Ovid's frequent rejection of his own *Ars*. At 5.582 *fluminibus* appears on the natal date of the temple of Mars Ultor, in the passage on the recovery of the legionary standards from the Parthians, which is presented as the second reason for the *cognomen*

²⁴ Ovid keeps to disyllabic words in *Amores*, *Ars*, *Remedia*, and the single epistles. In *Tristia* 1 he admits quadrisyllabic proper names 1.3.6 *Ausoniae*; 1.4.20 *Italia*; 1.10.34 *Cyaneas* (the first two marking banishment from Italy, the third his boat's Argonautic journey), and gradually he expands the range as time passes. See Courtney 1997-8: 160-1; Heyworth 2015: 143-8.

‘Avenger’ (5.579-96). Much is made of the shame involved in the standards being in the hands of the enemy; but in A.D. 9 Augustus’ legions themselves lost three standards, in the Battle of Teutoburg Forest. By marking the composition of this passage as exilic Ovid thus gives a sharpness to his talk of *pudor* (587, 594).

We are thus invited to see all parts of the text as issued by a man living, against his will, in Tomi. Even without changes to the words, this may change the poem's meaning: Elaine Fantham’s commentary on book 4 is willing to point out possible revisions, but misses this more basic point; Stephen Green, in the second half of the introduction to his commentary on book 1, rightly sees the involvement of the reader as a way of opening up a greater range of meaning, though he does not take the further step of regarding the Ovid who revises the poem in exile as himself necessarily such a reader. The most profound change that has been wrought by publication in exile concerns the fundamental form of the poem: books 7-12 do not exist. It can hardly be coincidence that the books published take us up to, but not past the boundary of, the first of the two Caesarian months. It is almost as if the poet is inviting a return from exile, so that, once more in Rome, he can finish his researches and produce polished expositions of July and August. At 4.16 Venus says *coeptum perfice ... opus* — in contrast to her descendant Caesar, who fails to get the work completed. On the one hand, there is a dense collection of closural material at the end of book 6.²⁵ But we also find references to episodes to be narrated in non-existent later books: 3.57-8 on the Larentalia in December, 3.199-200 on the rape of the Sabine maidens at the Consualia (25th August or 15th December), 5.147-8 on the Genius Augusti in August; and 6.797 talks of the Kalends of July — *cras*, a ‘tomorrow’ that never arrives. The poet wants us to regard the poem as both finished and unfinished, written in Rome and written in Tomi, composed both before exile and years later, after the death of Augustus.

Stories of exile necessarily have allegorical force in the writings of an exile, and the *Fasti* is full of them: I have already mentioned the *tibicines*, sent all the way to Tibur in protest over the treatment of their guild, and returned to Rome unawares after a drunken party — what a fantasy for the man banished as far as Tomi! But we also have those whose exile brings them to Rome: Carmentis and Evander (1.461-586; Hercules arrives at 543-84), Anna the sister of Dido (3.545-656, a story that includes Aeneas); the Argei, followers of Hercules (5.621-62); Ino and Melicertes (6.481-550, including Hercules and Carmentis again); and in other tales of absence too Ovidian resonances may be heard, e.g. Arion (2.83-116), and Persephone (4.417-618). Let me present a couple of examples from the story of Carmentis. In his commentary on 1.539-40:

puppibus egressus Latia stetit exul in herba:
felix exilium cui locus ille fuit!

The exile disembarked from the boat and stood on the earth of Latium: happy the man for whom that place was exile!

Green mentions the notion that ‘this is a personal comment from the poet himself, who ... unhappy with his own place of exile ..., hails the luck of Evander at being exiled in Italy’, but continues ‘Though this is possible, we should also note that it is an Ovidian tendency to end an exile’s story with a statement of happiness’, and ‘an authorial interjection praising Rome is entirely consistent with the nationalistic, laudatory tone of the episode’. But this

²⁵ Well examined by Barchiesi 1997b, among others.

misses the consequence of the delayed publication — every competent reader knows, because Ovid tells us, that he is already in Tomi.

Carmentis' first speech begins with advice to Evander to man up (*fortuna uiriliter ... ista ferenda tibi est*, 1.479-80); she goes on to explain that his lot was fated, that he is an innocent victim of divine will (1.481-2):

sic erat in fatis, nec te tua culpa fugavit,
sed deus: offenso pulsus es urbe deo.

This was established in your fates, and it is not your fault that has exiled you, but a god: you have been driven from the city after offending a god.

The echoes of Ovid's history are for me unavoidable, and the pentameter was surely written after his banishment by Augustus. Green notes *Tristia* 3.2.1 among other Ovidian passages that include the phrase *in fatis*, but does not cite the text: *Ergo erat in fatis Scythiam quoque uisere nostris*. This may well be a case where a passage of the *Tristia* alludes to the *Fasti* and the same passage of the *Fasti* alludes to the same passage of the *Tristia*. There are, I believe, many more, as my forthcoming commentary on book 3 will illustrate. Another place where we can see such developments is in the *aetion* for the Salii and the *ancilia* in *Fasti* 3.259-92. King Numa is depicted as a man of peace, author of a calendar, keen to promote legal and religious order, dealing with thunderbolts, and engaging in conversation with various gods: he offers numerous analogies for Ovid, the peaceful poet, erstwhile *decemvir*, and author of the *Fasti*. When banished, Ovid is himself the victim of a lightning strike;²⁶ and in exile he writes *Tristia* 2 and other passages addressed to Caesar, and thus becomes, like Numa, a 'man not to be excluded from conversation with the gods' (3.344):

caede caput, dixit; cui rex, parebimus, inquit:
caedenda est hortis eruta caepa meis. 340
addidit hic hominis; sumes, ait ille, capillos.
postulat hic animam; cui Numa, piscis, ait.
risit et, his, inquit, facito mea tela procures,
o uir colloquio non abigende deum.

He nodded in acquiescence to the prayer, but hid the truth in distant evasion and terrified the man with an ambiguous utterance: Lop a head, he said; to which the king replied, We shall obey: a head of garlic [*literally* an onion] dug from my garden shall be cut up. The god added, of a man — you will get the hair, said the other. He demands a life; to which Numa replies, of a fish. He laughed and said, make sure you use these to deal with my weapons, o man not to be driven from conversation with the gods.

Numa's Jupiter mitigates his thundering speech and deadly demands in response to a witty conversation; but having *fas* and legality on your side is insufficient in the world of Augustus.

S. J. Heyworth
Wadham College, Oxford

²⁶ *Tristia* 1.1.72, 2.179, 5.3.31.