OVID'S *FASTI* IN EXILE*

ABSTRACT

This article takes as its starting point the frequency with which Ovid refers to his earlier works in his Tristia *and* Epistulae ex Ponto. *Alongside his treatment of the* Metamorphoses *in the exile poetry, it is suggested that Ovid refers, on a number of occasions, to his* Fasti *and the progress he is making on it. He does so by using the incipit of his calendar poem,* Tempora; *this term is sometimes combined with* signa *('stars'), which are also mentioned in the opening couplet of the* Fasti. *It is proposed that Ovid's attitude toward his* Fasti *changes over the course of his exile, during which time he is, at various junctures, editing his calendar, and that some of these changes are discernible in the exile poetry; they result in part from his entertaining the possibility of using his* Fasti *as leverage in securing a mitigation of his punishment. Poems discussed in detail are* Tristia *1.1, 1.7, 2.547–52, 5.3;* Epistulae ex Ponto *2.1, 4.8.*

Keywords: Ovid; exile poetry; *Tristia*; *Epistulae ex Ponto*; *Fasti*; Augustus; Germanicus

Ovid's continuous renegotiation of his relationship with his poetic corpus, and of the relationships between the works of which it is constituted, has been the subject of considerable scholarly attention in recent years. From the earliest parts of his literary output, it is clear that Ovid's works are in a state of flux, and that he revisits and edits his works when they might have been deemed complete.[1] We may, for example, consider the poet's amatory works. The epigram which heads the three books of the *Amores* as they now stand tells us that there were once five. That the editing of this work, moreover, involved the drafting of new poems and rearrangement of others is suggested by *Amores* 2.18, in which Ovid claims to have started writing a tragedy,[2] though such an undertaking is prospective in *Amores* 3.1, which 2.18—despite appearing in a previous book—thus seems to postdate. Consider also that the third book of the *Ars amatoria* is presented as an afterthought in the light of the closing sequence of *Ars amatoria* Book 2: *finis adest operi: palmam date, grata iuuentus,* | *sertaque odoratae myrtea ferte comae* (2.733–4).[3] Furthermore, the relationship between parts of the poet's amatory verse—amongst which I include the single *Heroides*—is characterized by shared themes, images and language

---

[1] Important discussions of Ovid's editorial practice to have appeared in recent years include L. Jansen, 'Ovidian paratexts: editorial postscript and readers in *ex Ponto* 3.9', *MD* 68 (2012), 81–110; L. Jansen, 'Modern covers and paratextual strategies in Ovidian elegy', in L. Jansen (ed.), *The Roman Paratext: Frames, Texts, Readers* (Cambridge, 2014), 262–81; F.K.A. Martelli, *Ovid's Revisions: The Author as Editor* (Cambridge, 2013); T.S. Thorsen, *Ovid's Early Poetry: From his Single* Heroides *to his* Remedia Amoris (Cambridge, 2014).

[2] *Am.* 2.18.13–14 *sceptra tamen sumpsi curaque Tragoedia nostra* | *creuit, et huic operi quamlibet aptus eram.*

[3] See the discussion at R.K. Gibson, *Ovid Ars Amatoria Book 3* (Cambridge, 2003), 37–9.

which complicate attempts at establishing the primacy of one of these works over another: there is every reason to suppose that a number of the *Amores* (of which 2.18 must be one) postdate some of the single *Heroides*, and that the reworking of the five books of the *Amores* into three will have been affected by the intervening composition of (a number of) the heroines' epistles.[4] Moreover, Ovid indicates that he was composing the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* simultaneously for some time before his relegation (see the discussions of *Tristia* 1.7 and 2 below). The readings achieved by setting passages of these two poems, which share themes and stories, beside one another suggest a process of composition that would have consisted of the frequent editing and re-articulation of a given episode in one of the works in the light of developments in the other.[5]

   The poet's preoccupation with his relationship to his poetic corpus, and the relationship between its constituent parts, becomes more conspicuous after his relegation. It has been plausibly argued that the closing verses of the *Metamorphoses* are a product of exile,[6] and has even been suggested that the poem's four-verse proem belongs to this period too.[7] *Tristia* 1.7 famously provides a mournful preface for the *Metamorphoses* in a poem in which Ovid complains of his hexameter-poem's incomplete state, and in part realizes his desire, expressed in *Tristia* 1.1, for space to be made for his transmogrified appearance amongst the stories of his *ter quinque uolumina*. This first poem of his exilic œuvre—through its description of the contents of the *scrinia curua* that Ovid tells his first book of *Tristia* it will encounter in Rome—thematizes the relationship between the poet and his poetry (particularly the *Ars amatoria* and the *Metamorphoses*) and the treatment of the pre-exilic works that is to follow in the *Tristia* and in the Pontic epistles;[8] more will be said on this passage later. The status of the *Heroides* is recast by the poet in *Tristia* 1.6 when he adds his wife to their number,[9]

---

   [4] Thorsen (n. 1) goes further, arguing that the *Amores*, the *Ars amatoria*, the *Remedia amoris*, the *Medicamina* and the single *Heroides* were all (re)issued together in A.D. 2; if true, this would have provided another opportunity for the editing of the poems.
   [5] Cf. the seminal treatment in S. Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse* (Cambridge, 1987).
   [6] See C. Segal, 'Myth and philosophy in the *Metamorphoses*: Ovid's Augustanism and the Augustan conclusion of Book XV', *AJPh* 90 (1969), 275–92, at 289–92 for the argument and for earlier bibliography. On the continued recasting of the epilogue to the *Metamorphoses* through Ovid's exilic corpus, see S. Hinds, 'After exile: time and teleology from *Metamorphoses* to *Ibis*', *PCPhS* 23 (1999), 48–67, at 48–50.
   [7] D. Kovacs, 'Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.2', *CQ* 37 (1987), 458–65, at 462–5. It has been suggested that a number of other episodes in the *Metamorphoses* were revised, if not written, after the poet's relegation. We may consider the possible addition of 3.141–2 (*at bene si quaeras, Fortunae crimen in illo, | non scelus inuenies; quod enim scelus error habebat?*) to the Actaeon-episode: the huntsman, to whom Ovid explicitly compares himself at *Tr.* 2.103–8, like the poet, saw something by accident and was (unjustly?) punished; the diction used is reminiscent of the modes of expression employed by Ovid to speak of the charges laid against him in his exilic œuvre. Likewise, Philomela, silenced by having her tongue cut out, manages to communicate with Procne by weaving a tapestry described as a *carmen miserabile* (6.582); Ovid too was silenced in a sense, though his sad poems (*Tristia*) gave him a voice with which to speak to his readers (note that Procne does not 'look at' the tapestry, but 'reads' it [*legit*, 6.582]). Augustus, like Tereus, could also be described as a *saeuus tyrannus* (6.581), and Philomela prepares the warp on a foreign loom (*barbarica ... tela*, 6.576), just as Ovid wrote from an alien country. Whether such revisions or additions were in fact made to the *Metamorphoses*, it is clear that, for those reading retrospectively, episodes such as that of Philomela's silencing have a particular resonance with Ovid's exilic situation. Such a reading, indeed, is encouraged by the closing couplets of *Tristia* 1.1 (119–22) and 1.7 (35–40).
   [8] On the *scrinia curua* in *Tristia* 1, see Jansen (n. 1 [2014]), 271–4.
   [9] Cf. E.J. Kenney, 'The poetry of Ovid's exile', *PCPhS* 11 (1965), 37–49, at 39–42; S. Hinds, 'First among women, *Tristia* 1.6 and the traditions of "exemplary" catalogue', *PCPhS* 22 (1999), 123–42.

and our appreciation of these poems is altered by the eventual penning of the double epistles.[10] Ovid also frequently casts himself as one of his own literary heroines in the course of his exile, inevitably resulting in a rereading of the single *Heroides* in a changed light.[11] Given that the *Ars amatoria* constitutes the *carmen* that the poet claims caused his relegation, his treatment of his amatory corpus is—unsurprisingly—extensive, as he attempts, at times playfully and at others apparently less so, to vindicate his writing of erotodidactic works (notably in *Tristia* Book 2), while also defiantly asserting his desire to be remembered as a poet of love, a *tenerorum lusor amorum* (*Tr.* 3.3.73, 4.10.1). As to the *Fasti*, it is perhaps surprising that few traces of its treatment by the poet in his *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* have been discerned, given that it is the only pre-relegation work of Ovid's that we know for certain he revised in exile.[12] It is my contention that Ovid evokes his calendrical work far more frequently than has hitherto been recognized in his exilic corpus, and that, in doing so, he outlines his changing attitudes toward the *Fasti* through the course of his relegation. In what follows, I shall discuss a number of these passages, though I make no claim to exhaustiveness.

TRISTIA BOOK 2

The only explicit reference to Ovid's composition of his calendrical poem in his exilic poetry is made toward the end of *Tristia* Book 2, where he claims 'to have written twelve books of a work dedicated to Augustus', and to imply that they will be published once his punishment has been lessened and he has been allowed to move nearer to Rome:[13]

> ne tamen omne meum credas opus esse remissum,
>   saepe dedi nostrae grandia uela rati.
> sex ego Fastorum scripsi totidemque libellos,
>   cumque suo finem mense libellus habet,
> idque tuo nuper scriptum sub nomine, Caesar,
>   et tibi sacratum sors mea rupit opus.   (*Tr.* 2.547–52)

Only six books survive. When Ovid first started writing the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, there seems no reason to doubt that he intended to see both works through to

---

[10] On *Heroides* 16–21 as exilic works, see S.J. Heyworth, 'Authenticity and other textual problems in *Heroides* 16', in R. Hunter and S.P. Oakley (edd.), *Latin Literature and its Transmission: Papers in Honour of Michael Reeve* (Cambridge, 2016), 142–70, at 143–8 and K. Vuković, 'The lover and the rebel: reading the double *Heroides* as an exilic text', in T.E. Franklinos and L. Fulkerson (edd.), *Constructing Authors and Readers in the* Appendices Vergiliana, Tibulliana, *and* Ouidiana (Oxford, 2020), 242–61.

[11] For Ovid as Ariadne, for example, see the discussion of *Tristia* 5.3 below.

[12] The calendrical poem was, in all likelihood, originally dedicated to Augustus, though the proem to *Fasti* Book 1 as we have it is addressed to Germanicus; see the discussion below. Germanicus is also apostrophized in the proem of *Fasti* Book 4, in the only explicit reference to Ovid's relegation in this work (4.79–84): *huius erat Solimus Phrygia comes unus ab Ida,* | *a quo Sulmonis moenia nomen habent,* | *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.* The poem also has two polysyllabic pentameter endings—a feature only found in Ovid's post-relegation verse—at *Fast.* 5.582 (*fluminibus*) and 6.660 (*funeribus*) in two episodes which appear, in the light of their content, to be exilic too; see S.J. Heyworth, 'Editing and interpreting Ovid's *Fasti*: text, date, form', in L. Rivero, M. Consuelo Álvarez, R.M. Iglesias and J.A. Estévez (edd.), *Viuam! Estudios sobre la obra di Ovidio* (*ExClass Supplementum* 10 [Huelva and Murcia, 2018]), 103–20, at 116–20.

[13] J. Ingleheart, *A Commentary on Ovid,* Tristia *Book 2* (Oxford, 2010), 392.

completion. His relegation interrupted both, though 'the *Metamorphoses* were more finished, and the *Fasti* less [so]'.[14] In *Tristia* Book 2, indeed, Ovid tells his reader that work on the *Fasti* was halted by a change in his circumstances (*sors mea rupit opus*, 2.552); in doing so, he recalls the diction with which he had described the interruption to his *Metamorphoses* at *Tr.* 1.7.13–14 (*carmina mutatas hominum dicentia formas, | infelix domini quod fuga **rupit opus***).[15] One may reasonably suppose, I think, that Ovid had drafted an initial version of the twelve-book *Fasti* early on prior to his relegation in A.D. 8 or 9;[16] the references to the second half of the work within the extant books may lend credence to the idea that such a draft existed.[17] Though entirely speculative, it also seems plausible to assume that, in the course of his penning an initial draft of his calendrical work, Ovid would have circulated parts of it within his circle, and might have recited sections too. Such a notion would allow contemporary readers of his *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* to recognize some of the gestures to the *Fasti* for which I shall argue in what follows, even if one accepts the probable view that several moments in the extant calendar-poem may also refer back to Ovid's other exilic verse.[18] The idea that sections of Ovid's *Fasti* were reasonably advanced at the time of his relegation is lent weight by the mutual influence which parts of it enjoy with his *Metamorphoses*.

That *Fasti* Books 1–6 was recast as an incomplete fragment by Ovid at some point after his relegation is more than likely. As we have it—in its post-relegation state—the concluding sequence of *Fasti* Book 6 is dense with closural markers (more even than one might expect at the end of a hexad),[19] and Ovid seems to present his own narrative authority as in decline;[20] it is as if he cannot go on writing. The decision, moreover, to stop the progression of his calendar before July and Augustus, two months renamed to honour the imperial house and replete with dates significant to the *domus Augusta*,[21] is fittingly marked for a poet who has fallen foul of imperial censorship of some sort. Ovid's reshaping of his work, indeed, is signalled through the probable recasting of

---

[14] A. Barchiesi, *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse* (Berkeley, 1997), 259–60; cf. Hinds (n. 5), 10–11.

[15] In recalling the phrase *rupit opus*, Ovid seems to be 'correcting' his earlier assertion on the state of the *Metamorphoses*: whilst work on the *Fasti* really had been interrupted, the hexametrical poem was much nearer to completion, and, as he goes on to note in *Tristia* Book 2, only required a finishing touch: *quamuis manus ultima coeptis | defuit* (2.555–6). S.J. Heyworth, *Ovid Fasti Book III* (Cambridge, 2019), 7 notes that the use of *rupit opus* to speak of both poems encourages one to consider how else these works may relate to one another.

[16] G.O. Hutchinson, 'Some new and old light on the reasons for Ovid's exile', *ZPE* 203 (2017), 76–84 argues for A.D. 9 as the date of Ovid's relegation, as opposed to the usually accepted A.D. 8.

[17] e.g. *Fast.* 3.57–8 and 199–200; cf. D.C. Feeney, '*Si licet et fas est*: Ovid's *Fasti* and the problem of free speech under the Principate', in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus* (London, 1992), 1–25 (= P. Knox [ed.], *Oxford Readings in Ovid* [Oxford, 2006], 464–88), at 17–18 on prolepses.

[18] On the attractiveness of reading the extant *Fasti* as alluding to the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, as well as of the epistolary corpus referring back to the version of the *Fasti* drafted before Ovid's relegation, see Heyworth (n. 15), 10–13 and Heyworth (n. 12), 116–20.

[19] On closural aspects of the end of *Fasti* Book 6, see Barchiesi (n. 14), 259–71 and C.E. Newlands, *Playing with Time: Ovid and the* Fasti (Ithaca and London, 1995), 209–36. Feeney (n. 17), 15 suggests that 'important sections of the poem were re-written from exile so as to make the *Fasti* read like a poem whose *licentia* has been suppressed' (15).

[20] See Newlands (n. 19), 51–86 (especially 73–86).

[21] On the potential attractiveness of Augustus of the month of August in particular on account of the number of dates which were significant to him, see R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978), 34; cf. A. Barchiesi, 'Endgames: Ovid's *Metamophoses* 15 and *Fasti* 6', in D.H. Roberts, F.M. Dunn and D. Fowler (edd.), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature* (Princeton, 1997), 181–208, at 199.

parts of the original pre-relegation proem of the *Fasti* and their integration into the opening of the extant *Fasti* Book 2: it is striking that, as the poet opens his *second* book, he claims that his elegies treat *maiora* for the *first* time (*nunc primum*, 2.3). The similarities between the proem to *Fasti* Book 2 and the passage treating the calendrical poem at *Tr.* 2.547–52 (cited above) suggest that contemporary readers of Ovid's letter to Augustus would have been expected to recognize allusions to the opening of the first book of the pre-relegation *Fasti*, as well as to the closing pentameter of that same book.[22] As has been noted, it seems likely that a version of the *Fasti* previous to the one familiar to us was known in Rome by the time Ovid was sent to Tomi.

The poet's relegation may well have made him less inclined to complete a work consecrated (*sacratum*, *Tr.* 2.552) to the Caesar responsible for this fate; and yet the almost paradoxical assertion that he has drafted a work (*scripsi*, *Tr.* 2.549) which nevertheless remains incomplete (*rupit opus*, *Tr.* 2.552) hints at the notion that his poem could be worked up were the hindrance to that process, viz. his distance from Rome, removed. As his poetic epistle to Augustus draws to a close Ovid hopes that the arguments advanced in his open letter will move the emperor to show clemency and to invite the poet to move nearer to Rome, if not back altogether. One implicit corollary of this, Ovid seems to promise, is that he will release his calendrical work—a work which will appeal to Augustus—in a polished-up form:[23]

> his, precor, atque aliis possint tua numina flecti,
>   o pater, o patriae cura salusque tuae!
> non ut in Ausoniam redeam, nisi forsitan olim,
>   cum longo poenae tempore uictus eris:
> tutius exilium pauloque quietius oro,
>   ut par delicto sit mea poena suo.   (*Tr.* 2.573–8)

Ovid implicitly hopes that the promise of publication of the *Fasti* will, along with the *Metamorphoses*, sway the *numina* of the emperor: he has, he claims, written of Augustus with warmth—with *fauor animi* (2.562)—and has not sought to harm another with his verses (2.565–6).[24] Note too that *Tr.* 2.574 (*o pater, o patriae cura salusque tuae*) may point to the fulsome treatment given to Augustus as *pater patriae* at *Fast.* 2.119–44, thereby lending plausibility to the poet's implied promise. The *princeps* is said to be unto humankind what Jupiter is to the gods (*Fast.* 2.131–2) and comes,

---

[22] The maritime imagery of *Tr.* 2.548 recalls *Fast.* 2.3 (*nunc primum uelis, elegi, maioribus itis*), and the idea that the poet's work might be thought an *opus ... remissum* (*Tr.* 2.547) may look to *Fast.* 2.5–6; note also *credas* (*Tr.* 2.547) picking up *crederet* at *Fast.* 2.8. Mention of Caesar's *nomen* at *Tr.* 2.551 answers to the *nomina* of *Fast.* 2.16, and Augustus is addressed as *Caesar* in both passages. The final pentameter of *Fast.* 1 *cumque suo finem mense libellus habet* (1.724) is quoted *uerbum pro uerbo* at *Tr.* 2.550. The use of an earlier work's beginning, (middle) and end to refer to it in a later work is also made by Ovid apropos the *Metamorphoses* in *Tristia* 1.7; cf. S. Hinds, 'Booking the return trip: Ovid and *Tristia* 1', *PCPhS* 31 (1985), 13–32 (= P. Knox [ed.], *Oxford Readings in Ovid* [Oxford, 2006], 415–40).

[23] So, for example, Hinds (n. 5), 137 and Ingleheart (n. 13), 392.

[24] The poet makes passing mention of his *Medea* (*Tr.* 2.553–4) between more extensive treatments of the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*; given the likely absence of material from the tragedy that would be related to Augustus as explicitly as in the other poems, Ovid's decision to subordinate it here is perhaps unsurprising. On possible motives for including the *Medea* in this catalogue, see Ingleheart (n. 13), 393–4.

then, in a sense, to have a *numen* to which Ovid's poetry may be dedicated and on which it may work (*tua numina flecti*, *Tr.* 2.573).

   In the course of *Tristia* Book 1, Ovid makes it clear that he wants his *Metamorphoses* to come to serve as his literary memorial: if *Tristia* 1.7 is to be believed, his hexameter-poem was in circulation in Rome; he wished for it to be read (*Tr.* 1.7.25–6) and to serve as his *maior imago* (*Tr.* 1.7.11). The *Metamorphoses* also appears as the fifteen-book work with which readers are expected to be familiar at *Tr.* 1.1.117–18. It has not hitherto been recognized, however, that Ovid also treats his incomplete calendrical poem on a number of occasions in the first book of the *Tristia*, juxtaposing it with mention of the *Metamorphoses*. As I will argue later on, Ovid comments on the unfinished state of the *Fasti* in *Tristia* 1.1, before setting it aside as an inapposite poetic monument in *Tristia* 1.7. In *Tristia* Book 2, however, Ovid employs his calendrical poem as a bargaining-chip with the emperor, and, while encouraging Augustus to read the *Metamorphoses* (*Tr.* 2.557–60), countenances working on the completion of the *Fasti* after an amelioration of his circumstances has been vouchsafed. The poet continues to revisit his calendrical poem in this vein throughout his *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*. Before considering *Tristia* Book 1 in any detail, however, let us turn our attention to a later poem in order to set out some of the ways in which Ovid gestures to his *Fasti* in his post-relegation works.

TRISTIA 5.3

The hope that Augustus Caesar's *numen* might be moved to alleviate the relegated poet's suffering in the closing verses of *Tristia* Book 2 (*possint tua numina flecti*, 573) is recalled later in the *Tristia* in another poem that looks to the *Fasti* (and to which aspects of the calendrical poem as we now have it may look). In *Tristia* 5.3, Ovid reminds Bacchus that he—the poet—had once been accustomed to fête him on the appropriate day, and claims, in the light of this, that the god ought to have supported him (15–16), and should now come to his aid. Since there is intercourse between the gods, Ovid asks that Bacchus exert his influence on Augustus, and that he seek to move (*flectere*) the *Caesareum numen* (45–6):[25]

> Illa dies haec est, qua te celebrare poetae,
>   si modo non fallunt **tempora**, Bacche, solent,
> festaque odoratis innectunt **tempora** sertis,
>   et dicunt laudes ad tua uina tuas.
> inter quos, memini, dum me mea fata sinebant,
>   non inuisa tibi pars ego saepe fui.
>
>   …
>
> siue mihi casus siue hoc dedit ira deorum,
>   nubila nascenti seu mihi Parca fuit,

---

[25] The verb *flectere* is also used in the Pontic epistles to refer to Augustus being prevailed upon. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.2, Ovid hopes that Fabius Maximus will mollify the emperor on his behalf (115–18); in 1.6, personified Hope tells the poet that tears suffice to move the *principis ira* (43–4); at 2.3.67–8, Ovid notes that Cotta Maximus' letter gave him hope that Augustus' godhead could be swayed; and, at *Pont.* 4.9.127–34, Ovid hopes that the deified Augustus may be prevailed upon, even after his death.

> tu tamen e sacris hederae cultoribus unum
>   numine debueras sustinuisse tuo.
>   …
> sic micet aeternum uicinaque sidera uincat
>   coniugis in caelo Cressa corona tuae:
> huc ades ut casus releues, pulcherrime, nostros,
>   unum de numero me memor esse tuo.
> sunt dis inter se commercia: flectere tempta
>   Caesareum numen numine, Bacche, tuo.   (*Tr.* 5.3.1–6, 13–16, 41–6)

He claims (1–6) that he was once amongst the number of those poets who used to gird their festive brows (*tempora*, 3) with garlands and utter the praises of Bacchus amid wine-drinking. The specificity of the day on which such lauding used to occur—*illa dies haec est*—is important to Ovid. The collocation *illa dies* is commonplace in the *Fasti*,[26] and, when it is read in conjunction with the verb *celebrare*, which occurs frequently in the calendrical work,[27] it seems likely that Ovid is pointing his reader in the direction of a poem with which familiarity may be assumed through the circulation of, or recitation from, a pre-relegation version; compare the earlier discussion of *Tristia* Book 2. The poet claims that he bases his knowledge of which *dies* it is on the *tempora*: *si modo non fallunt tempora* (2).[28] The first instance of *tempora* in the poem refers, *prima facie*, to 'time', but this is surely not all that is referred to here. Ovid is speaking of his calendrical poem which opens with, and will thus have been known as, *Tempora cum causis*:[29]

> Tempora cum causis Latium digesta per annum
>   lapsaque sub terras ortaque signa canam.   (*Fast.* 1.1–2)

That Ovid himself thus used *tempora* to refer to his calendrical poem is clear from his near repetition of this opening distich in the proem of *Fasti* Book 4, in which Venus, whose month occupies this book, blesses Ovid's brow (*tempora*) with a myrtle garland, apt for a poet of love, and thus also endows his *Tempora*, the *Fasti*, with the benediction suitable for a work about to speak of her month:

> '… **tempora** cum causis, annalibus eruta priscis,
>   lapsaque sub terras ortaque signa cano.
> uenimus ad quartum, quo tu celeberrima mense:
>   et uatem et mensem scis, Venus, esse tuos.'

[26] There too the collocation is often, though not always, combined with *haec* and/or some third-person part of *esse*, for example *Fast.* 2.195 *haec fuit illa dies*, 2.429 *nam fuit illa dies*, 4.379 *'haec' ait 'illa dies'*, 6.713 *haec est illa dies*.

[27] For *celebrare* used of deities and their festivals in the *Fasti*, see 1.393; 2.639, 657; 3.229, 328, 656, 813; 4.865; 5.183, 597; 6.55, 775.

[28] Matthew Leigh has suggested to me that the use of an open condition with *fallere* here, in a passage concerned with dating, may look to *Aen.* 5.49 (*iamque dies, nisi fallor, adest*) and to Aeneas' hesitation about the precise date of the anniversary of his father's funeral. Servius' comment *ad loc.* suggests that it is the possibility of calendrical confusion which causes Aeneas doubt: NISI FALLOR *non quasi nescius dixit, sed propter anni confusionem, quae erat apud maiores. nam ante Caesarem qui nobis anni rationem conposuit, quam hodieque seruamus, intercalabantur decem dies … scilicet lunae non congruente ratione.*

[29] Cf. the important discussion of aspects of this poem's relationship with the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*, as well as with Propertius 4.6, in J.F. Miller, 'Bacchus and the exiled Ovid (*Tristia* 5.3)', in F. Mac Góráin (ed.), *Dionysus and Rome: Religion and Literature* (Berlin and Boston, 2020), 177–92, especially at 181–2 on intertextuality between *Fasti* Book 3 and *Tristia* 5.3.

mota Cytheriaca leuiter mea **tempora** myrto
   contigit et 'coeptum perfice' dixit 'opus'.   (*Fast.* 4.11–16)

This pun on *tempora* is also recalled by Ovid in *Tr.* 5.3.2–3 and, aided by the
Alexandrian footnote, *memini* (5.3.5), points the reader to a particular moment in the
Fasti in which Bacchus is associated with garlanded *tempora*,[30] as Ariadne complains
that she has been abandoned a second time—first by Theseus, now by Bacchus—and
that the latter is more *leuis* (3.481) than the garlands with which he girded her brow:

'en iterum, fluctus, similes audite querellas.
   en iterum lacrimas accipe, harena, meas.
dicebam, memini, "periure et perfide Theseu!"
   ille abiit, eadem crimina Bacchus habet.
nunc quoque "nulla uiro" clamabo "femina credat";
   nomine mutato causa relata mea est.
o utinam mea sors qua primum coeperat isset,
   iamque ego praesenti tempore nulla forem.
quid me desertis moritura, Liber, harenis
   seruabas? potui dedoluisse semel.
Bacche leuis leuiorque tuis, quae **tempora** cingunt,
   frondibus, in lacrimas cognite Bacche meas,
ausus es ante oculos adducta paelice nostros
   tam bene compositum sollicitare torum?'   (*Fast.* 3.471–84)

The deity is chastised by Ariadne for interfering in her lot (*sors*, 477), then forgetting
about her, and taking up, she supposes, with some *paelex* (483). This is not dissimilar
to the way in which Ovid reproaches Bacchus in *Tristia* 5.3.[31] The god ought (*debueras*,
16) to have sustained one of his *cultores* by the power of his *numen* (perhaps, even,
owed it to him to do so), and not to have forsaken Ovid in his adversity;[32] Bacchus,
the reader is told at *Tr.* 5.3.44, should be mindful (*memor*) of the relegated poet, and
count him amongst his entourage (*unum de numero … tuo*). He should now use what
influence his *numen* has in seeking to change Augustus' mind about Ovid's situation (46).

    It is no coincidence that, in *Tristia* 5.3, the aretalogy and the petition to Bacchus
(19–44) culminate in the mention of the conspicuous radiance of Ariadne's *corona*
amongst the stars of the firmament (41–2). Bacchus remembered and honoured his
beloved by changing her name (from Ariadne to Libera) so that it was more like his,
and with the katasterism of her *corona* (*Fast.* 3.509–16);[33] she had believed herself
bereft of the god's love and promises (*illa ego sum cui tu solitus promittere caelum.
| ei mihi, pro caelo qualia dona fero*, 3.505–6), but they end up finding fulfilment.
So too, runs Ovid's logic, Bacchus will remember the poet who had been accustomed
to sing his praises but now thinks himself abandoned by the god, and will attempt to
bring about an amelioration of the circumstances of the relegated poet by prevailing
upon Caesar. This is not the first time that Ovid has cast himself as one of his abandoned
heroines in the course of the *Tristia*, but it is marked in this poem by the presence of
memini at *Tr.* 5.3.5. As the poet recalls that he used often to sing of Bacchus, he

---

[30] Cf. S. Hinds, 'Generalising about Ovid', *Ramus* 16 (1987), 4–31 (= P. Knox [ed.], *Oxford
Readings in Ovid* [Oxford, 2006], 15–50), at 20–2.
   [31] Cf. the use of *sors* of Ovid's lot at *Tr.* 5.3.28.
   [32] For *cultor* as evocative of the *Fasti*, cf. 1.395, where it fortuitously occurs in another Bacchic
context.
   [33] Note the use of *micare* of Ariadne's *corona* at *Fast.* 3.516 and *Tr.* 5.3.41.

remembers a particular moment—the story of Ariadne's plaint—in *Fasti* Book 3, in which his heroine also remembers that she has been abandoned before: *dicebam, memini, 'periure et perfide Theseu!'* (473). In Ovid's calendrical poem, *memini* points to an earlier poetic moment too. Ariadne, now believing herself abandoned by Bacchus, remembers the words that she uttered in Catullus 64 when Theseus left her:

> 'sicine me patriis auectam, **perfide**, ab aris,
> **perfide**, deserto liquisti in litore, **Theseu**?'   (Catull. 64.132–3)

This poetic recollection is mirrored by Ovid as he recalls, at *Tr.* 5.3.5–6, a time when he was favoured by Bacchus as a *non inuisa … pars* of his band of poets.[34] Ovid hopes that he may regain such a position (43–4) by reminding the deity of the attentions he had often received from the poet in the past, with the implication, perhaps, that, through an amelioration of circumstances, the poet may once again be able to look to his *Tempora*.

   The familiarity of a reader of *Tristia* 5.3 with an earlier version of the *Fasti* than with the exilic text known to us has been assumed in the discussion thus far. It is likely, however, that Ovid, in eventually revisiting the *Fasti*, would have had an eye on his exilic works too. The possibility, for example, that *sollicitare torum* (*Fast.* 3.484) may recall Ovid's tongue-in-cheek insistence on his own virtue at *Tr.* 2.345–6[35] and *Pont.* 3.3.49–50[36] casts Bacchus in an even more negative light than would be the case were this moment in the *Fasti* read in isolation.[37] Such a reading would also further align Ariadne's characterization with Ovid's as innocent. One may even wonder whether *tam bene **compositum** … torum* (*Fast.* 3.484) nods to the accounts of Ariadne's and Bacchus' love written by Ovid (and others) that she accuses the deity of disturbing here.[38] It is possible, moreover, reading forward or backward, that Ariadne's remark on her past at *Fast.* 3.505–6 (cited above) relates her more closely still to Ovid, who opens his autobiographical poem thus: *Ille ego qui fuerim, tenerorum lusor amorum, | quem legis, ut noris, accipe posteritas* (*Tr.* 4.10.1–2).[39]

TRISTIA 1.7

The idea that Ovid represents his calendrical poem as a work concerned with Bacchus will gain further support from an allusion to the poet's *Fasti* earlier in the *Tristia*. The salient point of *Tristia* 1.7 is rightly held to be the poet's re-articulation of his relationship with the *Metamorphoses* through the provision of a new preface, which

---

[34] Cf. *Fast.* 3.713–14 *tertia post Idus lux est celeberrima Baccho: | Bacche, faue uati, dum tua festa cano* and 6.483–4 *Bacche racemiferos hedera distincte capillos, | si domus illa tua est, derige uatis opus.*

[35] *haec* [*littera*] *tibi me inuisum lasciuas fecit ob Artes, | quas ratus es uetitos **sollicitare toros**.*

[36] *scis tamen et liquido iuratus dicere possis | non me legitimos **sollicitasse toros**.*

[37] Cf. Heyworth (n. 15), 12.

[38] Stephen Heyworth has suggested to me that *Fast.* 3.482 (*in lacrimas cognite Bacche meas*) may point to the deity's appearance in *Tristia* 5.3 (amongst other places in the exilic poetry); for *lacrimae* as indicative of the *Tristia*, cf. *Tr.* 5.1.5–6 and 35 ('*quis tibi, Naso, modus lacrimosi carminis?' inquis*); for the physical effect of Ovid's tears blurring the text of his exilic œuvre and damaging its legibility, see, for example, *Tr.* 1.1.13–14 and 3.1.15–16.

[39] On the significance of the opening of *Tristia* 4.10, see J. Farrell, 'Ovid's Virgilian career', *MD* 52 (2004), 41–55.

builds on Ovid's desire in *Tristia* 1.1 that his hexameter-poem come to include the *uultus* of his changed *fortuna* (*Tr.* 1.1.119–20).[40] The poet explains that his metamorphic work—interrupted as it was by his relegation—is, nevertheless, a greater representation of him (a *maior imago*, 1.7.11) than any mimetic image that a friend may possess, and asks that the three distichs given at 1.7.35–40 be appended to its start so that readers may forgive its imperfect state:

> quae [ora Nasonis] quotiens spectas, subeat tibi dicere forsan
>   'quam procul a nobis Naso sodalis abest!'
> grata tua est pietas, sed carmina maior imago
>   sunt mea, quae mando qualiacumque legas,
> carmina mutatas hominum dicentia formas.
>
>   …
>
> hos quoque sex uersus in primi fronte libelli,
>   si praeponendos esse putabis, habe:
> 'orba parente suo quicumque uolumina tangis,
>   his saltem uestra detur in urbe locus.
> quoque magis faueas, non sunt haec edita ab ipso,
>   sed quasi de domini funere rapta sui.
> quidquid in his igitur uitii rude carmen habebit,
>   emendaturus, si licuisset, erat.'   (*Tr.* 1.7.9–13, 33–40)

It seems to me, however, that there are also implications for our understanding of Ovid's view of his 'less finished' *Fasti* in the opening couplets of this selfsame poem:

> Si quis habes nostri similes in imagine uultus,
>   deme meis hederas, Bacchica serta, comis.
> ista decent laetos felicia **signa** poetas:
>   **temporibus** non est apta corona meis.   (*Tr.* 1.7.1–4)

Ivy garlands are to be removed from a bust of the poet, as such a *corona*, such *Bacchica serta*, are poorly suited to the *tempora* of a poet who is not *laetus*,[41] nor, for that matter, are they fitting for his drafted calendrical poem which touches on themes perhaps no longer to Ovid's taste after his relegation. The *Fasti*, it seems possible to suggest, are to be set to one side. Ovid had once been one of the *sacri cultores hederae* (cf. *Tr.* 5.3.15), but he no longer views himself as such at this juncture.[42] It has been suggested by Hinds that the *tempora* at stake here represent the *Metamorphoses*, owing to the collocation *mea ... tempora* in the proem of Ovid's epic (*Met.* 1.4 *ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen*), and the 'sustained and explicit revaluation of the *Metamorphoses* in the wake of exile' that follows in the rest of *Tristia* 1.7.[43] While that may well be the case, mention of *signa* at *Tr.* 1.7.3 in such close proximity to *temporibus* (1.7.4) seems more pointedly, I would suggest, to direct readers to the

---

[40] The seminal discussion of these passages is Hinds (n. 22); this treatment is developed by Jansen (n. 1 [2014]) and P.E. Knox, 'Metamorphoses in a cold climate', in L. Fulkerson and T. Stover (edd.), *Repeat Performances: Ovidian Repetition and the Metamorphoses* (Madison, WI, 2016), 176–95.

[41] Ovid frequently uses *aptus* to flag generically loaded passages, whether in reference to a poet's suitability for his/her undertaking, to the aptness of poetic material, or to the fittingness of a given audience (e.g. *Am.* 1.1.19, 2.1.4, 2.18.14; *Her.* 15.6; *Ars am.* 1.5; *Tr.* 2.331–2, 3.7.9–10, 4.10.25, 5.1.17–18). At *Tr.* 1.7.4, the adjective seems to function a little differently, as it is not generic propriety which is at stake; its status as a marker of metapoetic comment, however, is secure.

[42] For an explicit statement of ivy as Bacchus' plant, see *Fast.* 3.767–70.

[43] Hinds (n. 6), 56.

Fasti,[44] a poem concerned not only with *tempora* but also with *signa* ('stars' as opposed to the 'signs' or 'symbols' of *Tristia* 1.7):

> **Tempora** cum causis Latium digesta per annum
> lapsaque sub terras ortaque **signa** canam.　　　　(*Fast.* 1.1–2)

The semantic polyvalence of *signa*, like that of *tempora*, is demonstrated by the poet with another pun in the proem of *Fasti* Book 4, where Ovid says to Venus that he has never left her standards (*signa*),[45] and implies that, by singing of the rising and setting of *signa* ('stars'), he remains loyal to her ensigns in the course of his aetiological and astronomical poem:

> 'saucius an sanus numquid tua **signa** reliqui?
> 　tu mihi propositum, tu mihi semper opus.
> quae decuit primis sine crimine lusimus annis;
> 　nunc teritur nostris area maior equis.
> **tempora** cum causis, annalibus eruta priscis,
> 　lapsaque sub terras ortaque **signa** cano.'　　　　(*Fast.* 4.7–12)

The *Fasti*, Ovid seems to imply in *Tristia* 1.7, are not worthy of the trappings (*signa*) of happy and successful poets; his calendrical poem is not worthy of the *Bacchica serta*, of that *corona* which we see in *Tristia* 5.3 shining brightly and outdoing the constellations that surround it:

> sic micet aeternum uicinaque sidera uincat
> 　coniugis in caelo Cressa corona tuae.　　　　(*Tr.* 5.3.41–2)

Ovid's *Fasti* should, he suggests, be set aside by his reader; it is not (yet) in a fit state for wider circulation. The poet is clear, however, that the *Metamorphoses* can serve as a *maior imago* of him in his transmogrified state (*Tr.* 1.7.11; cf. *Tr.* 1.1.119–22), even if he would have preferred for it not to have been published in its present state (*Tr.* 1.7.37), afflicted as it is by occasional infelicities (*quidquid … uitii*, 1.7.40).

TRISTIA 1.1

The disjunction between the poet's stance regarding the 'more finished' *Metamorphoses* and the 'less finished' *Fasti* in *Tristia* 1.7 is adumbrated in *Tristia* 1.1. In his first poem from exile, Ovid explicitly and programmatically thematizes the encounter between his exilic poetry and his earlier works, and their interaction, as he has his *paruus liber* visit the *scrinia* in which his *Ars amatoria* and *Metamorphoses* are to be found. The poet tells his first book of *Tristia* that it will see its poetic siblings on the shelves (*aspicies illic positos ex ordine fratres*, *Tr.* 1.1.107), and, in doing so, provides us—his readers— with a focalizing lens through which to view his earlier corpus: we are made to see, and thus encouraged to read, his pre-relegation works through the eyes of his personified

---

[44] The possibility of a nod to the *Fasti* in *temporibus* at *Tr.* 1.7.4 is mentioned in passing by Hinds (n. 6), 56–7 and Heyworth (n. 15), 6; such a notion is explored at greater length by Miller (n. 29), 183–4.

[45] This itself recalls Ovid's claim at *Am.* 2.9.3 that he had never abandoned Cupid's standards: *qui miles numquam tua signa reliqui.*

first book of exilic poetry; Ovid's editorial hand is at work without his having to change a single word of his earlier works.

In the course of his *liber*'s journey to Ovid's *domus*, the poet suggests that it may encounter a reader or critic, a *iudex*, whose responsibility it is to consider not only the work at hand (*res*) but also the circumstances of that work (*tempora rerum*):

> iudicis officium est, ut res, ita **tempora** rerum
>   quaerere; quaesito tempore tutus eris.
> carmina proueniunt animo deducta sereno:
>   nubila sunt subitis **tempora** nostra malis.
> carmina secessum scribentis et otia quaerunt:
>   me mare, me uenti, me fera iactat hiems.　　　　(*Tr.* 1.1.37–42)[46]

Hinds has suggested that the *tempora nostra* in line 40 refers not only to the poet's circumstances but also to the *mea ... tempora* which Ovid promises that his epic will reach in the proem to the *Metamorphoses* (1.4). He also remarks that the poet may be hinting at 'that other, unfinished *carmen*, the *Fasti*' too.[47] I am inclined to agree that *tempora* here evokes the *Fasti*, the writing of which came to a sudden halt with the gloomy change in the poet's situation, but am less convinced that Ovid meant to refer his reader to his *Metamorphoses*. Later in *Tristia* 1.1, it is clear that the completed fifteen-volume *Metamorphoses* already exists (and is known), though it now needs revising in the light of the poet's changed circumstances (cf. *Tristia* 1.7):

> sunt quoque mutatae, ter quinque uolumina, formae,
>   nuper ab exequiis pignora rapta meis.
> his mando dicas, inter mutata referri
>   fortunae uultum corpora posse meae;
> namque ea dissimilis subito est effecta priori,
>   flendaque nunc, alio tempore laeta fuit.　　　　(*Tr.* 1.1.117–22)

It seems to me, indeed, that Ovid refers to his epic in *Tr.* 1.1.39, rather than in the pentameter that follows it. He explains that it is from a clear and calm mind (*animo ... sereno*) that *deducta carmina* proceed. These finely spun *carmina* look to the *Metamorphoses*: in the proem of his epic, Ovid asserts that his *animus* is undertaking a new task and invokes the inspiration of the gods, asking that they spin out (*deducite*) a *perpetuum carmen*.[48] Following a sudden turn of events (*subitis ... malis*, 1.1.40), however, and since he is now buffeted by the elements (1.1.42), his circumstances have taken on a gloomy air (*nubila*, 1.1.40) and his mind lacks the quietude needed to write (1.1.41): his finishing of the 'less complete' *Fasti*—his *Tempora*—has, on account of this, been impeded.[49] The absence of his calendrical work from the *scrinia*

---

[46] 40 *tempora* : *pectora* Heinsius. Little is added to the sense of the verse by *pectora*, whilst the paradosis *tempora* allows for a (number of) metapoetic reading(s); the collocation of the noun with *nubila* is paralleled at *Tr.* 1.9.5–6, in a couplet—*donec eris sospes, multos numerabis amicos:* | *tempora si fuerint nubila, solus eris*—which echoes another moment in *Tristia* 1.1 (*donec eram sospes*, 53). See also Hinds (n. 6), 54 n. 8.

[47] Hinds (n. 6), 54–5.

[48] On the force of *deducere* and *perpetuum carmen* here, see E.J. Kenney, 'Ovidius prooemians', *PCPhS* 22 (1976), 46–53 (= P. Knox [ed.], *Oxford Readings in Ovid* [Oxford, 2006], 265–73), and Kovacs (n. 7).

[49] Hinds (n. 6), 55 attractively notes that the 'clouded times' of *Tr.* 1.1.40 may also suggest that Ovid's penning of his astronomical *Fasti* has been hampered by his inability to see and record the constellations because of the inclement weather he is experiencing (cf. *Tr.* 1.1.42).

curua of *Tr.* 1.1.105–18 is thus marked: Ovid's poem is incomplete as a result of his relegation.[50]

EPISTVLAE EX PONTO 2.1

The place afforded to the *Fasti* in the *Epistulae ex Ponto* is not dissimilar to that noted in *Tristia* Book 2 and *Tristia* 5.3, where the poet hints that he may be entertaining a return to his calendar poem: the hope is that the promise of his work's completion will result in the mitigation of his punishment. Ovid's aetiological and, perhaps more pertinently, astronomical poem is apt for such an approach to the Caesars, as Germanicus, who was enjoying greater influence in the later years of Ovid's exilic career, was himself an astronomical poet.[51] The idea that Ovid might rededicate the *Fasti* to Germanicus is aired by the poet in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.1.

In this poem, Ovid describes the Pannonian triumph celebrated by Tiberius and, in the concluding lines of the poem, turns his attention to Germanicus, to whom—in *Pont.* 2.1.49–52—the conquest of a number of *oppida* is attributed:

> di tibi dent annos; a te nam cetera sumes,
>   sint modo uirtuti **tempora** longa tuae.
> quod precor, eueniet (sunt quiddam oracula uatum),
>   nam deus optanti prospera **signa** dedit.
> te quoque uictorem **Tarpeias** scandere in **arces**
>   laeta coronatis Roma uidebit equis,
> maturosque pater nati spectabit honores
>   gaudia percipiens quae dedit ipse suis.
> iam nunc haec a me, iuuenum belloque togaque
>   maxime, dicta tibi uaticinante nota.
> hunc quoque carminibus referam fortasse triumphum,
>   sufficiet nostris si modo uita malis.   (*Pont.* 2.1.53–64)

The poet asks that the gods grant the young Caesar long life (*anni*), asserting that he will achieve all else himself, were *tempora longa* afforded to his *uirtus* (53–4). The collocation *tibi dent annos* with the gods as the subject of the verb (53) also occurs in a passage of the *Fasti*, where it refers to Augustus as a builder and restorer of temples, and comments on the hoped-for reciprocity of the latter's relationship with the gods:

> templorum positor, templorum sancte repostor,
>   sit superis opto mutua cura tui.
> **dent tibi** caelestes, quos tu caelestibus, **annos**,
>   proque tua maneant in statione domo.   (*Fast.* 2.63–6)

By addressing the words *di tibi dent annos* to Germanicus and glancing to this passage of *Fasti* Book 2, Ovid implies that the young Caesar ought to benefit from a mutually

---

[50] In the proem to *Fasti* Book 4, Venus instructs Ovid to see the work which he has begun through to its end (*'coeptum perfice' dixit 'opus'*, 4.16); the lexis used here is recalled at the end of Book 6, when Ovid notes that July is nigh and asks the Pierides to add the final touch to his beginnings (*tempus Iuleis cras est natale Kalendis:* | *Pierides,* **coeptis** *addite summa meis*, 6.797–8). As Feeney (n. 17), 17 suggests, however, the *Fasti* never makes it to the end—it is never a *perfectum opus*—but remains in 'the *coepta* stage … at the end of the work as we have it, we are still at the end of the beginning'.

[51] On Germanicus as a poet and Ovid's probable acquaintance with him, see E. Fantham, 'Ovid, Germanicus and the composition of the *Fasti*', *PLLS* 5 (1985), 243–81 (= P. Knox [ed.], *Oxford Readings in Ovid* [Oxford, 2006], 373–414), at 254–6.

felicitous relationship with the gods, and that he should, thanks to this, enjoy long life—*tempora longa*—like Augustus. The deity on whom the poet had called, indeed, has answered favourably, giving *prospera signa* (*Pont.* 2.1.56). These *signa* are fittingly providential for the scion of the Caesars who wrote of stars, that is, *signa*, in his *Aratea*, and the times—the *tempora*—will be his too. I do not believe that it is going too far to suggest that Ovid, evoking the opening of his calendrical and astronomical poem that speaks of *tempora* and *signa*, is considering the rededication of his *Fasti* to Germanicus. The poet hopes, perhaps, that Tiberius' and Germanicus' clemency, like that shown to their conquered enemies, may affect their treatment of him too: *cur ego posse negem minui mihi numinis iram, | cum uideam mitis hostibus esse deos?* (*Pont.* 2.1.47–8).

   In the subsequent verses, Ovid speaks of the poetic celebration and monumentalization of Germanicus. The image is one of triumph, as Ovid looks forward to a time when the young Caesar will climb the Capitoline.[52] The language used to describe the location (*Tarpeias … arces*, 2.1.57) recalls a collocation used on a number of significant occasions with reference to the divine and imperial associations of the Tarpeian *arces* (notably at the end of the *Metamorphoses*), and to the rituals surrounding consular accession, as in *Fasti* Book 1 and *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.9:[53]

> et cum Caesarea tu, Phoebe domestice, Vesta,
> quique tenes altus **Tarpeias** Iuppiter **arces**.   (*Met.* 15.865–6)

> uestibus intactis **Tarpeias** itur in **arces**,
>   et populus festo concolor ipse suo est.   (*Fast.* 1.79–80)

> at cum **Tarpeias** esses deductus in **arces**,
>   dum caderet iussu uictima sacra tuo,
> me quoque secreto grates sibi magnus agentem
>   audisset, media qui sedet aede, deus.   (*Pont.* 4.9.29–32)

The thought that there may be some metapoetic comment at play in the address to Germanicus in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.1 is encouraged by Ovid's use of the verb *scandere* (57). In the context of climbing to the Tarpeian *arces*, it is not easy to dissociate this word from Horace's *sphragis*-ode, where, in a poem in which triumphal imagery is readily discernible and is used to suggest literary success, the lyric bard explains that he will be praised for as long as the *pontifex* continues to climb the Capitol (*usque ego postera | crescam laude recens, dum Capitolium | **scandet** cum tacita uirgine pontifex*, *Carm.* 3.30.7–9).[54] Moreover, that Germanicus' putative military triumph (*Pont.* 2.1.63–4) may also be a poetic one—both for himself and for Ovid—is not implausible in the light of the triumphal imagery used in a metapoetic vein both by Virgil in the proem to *Georgics* 3, where that poet styles himself a *uictor* (9, 17),

---

and by Propertius in 3.1, from where the garlanded horses of *Pont.* 2.1.58 derive.[55] We may add to this that the collocation *tempora longa* is elsewhere used by Ovid to comment on the renown secured for him by his poetry, conspicuously in *Tristia* 3.3. After he has provided himself with an epitaph (3.3.73–6), Ovid explains that a literary monument is more enduring, and notes that, although some of his poems have precipitated his relegation (*quamuis nocuere*, 3.3.79), he nevertheless remains sure that they will provide him with lengthy *post mortem* renown (3.3.80):

> hoc satis in titulo est: etenim maiora libelli
>   et diuturna magis sunt monimenta mihi;
> quos ego confido, quamuis nocuere, daturos
>   nomen et auctori tempora longa suo.   (*Tr.* 3.3.77–80)

Is it, perhaps, such renown that he hopes to be able to provide for himself, and for Germanicus, not only through writing of the putative triumph of the young Caesar but also through the rededication of the *Fasti* to him?[56]

Where previously at the close of *Tristia* Book 2 Ovid had implied that, were his situation ameliorated, he would consider a return to the *Fasti*, a work dedicated (*sacratum*, *Tr.* 2.552) to Augustus, he explains to Germanicus in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.1 that he will sing the praises of the latter's triumph if only his own life proves equal in length to the magnitude of the evils he has endured (63–4). The collocation *modo uita* underscores the idea that Ovid hopes to praise a Caesar, as it recalls the proem of *Georgics* 3 and Virgil's claim that he would achieve literary triumph through a poem in which a Caesar took centre stage, were his life long enough to do so (*G.* 3.9–10 *primus ego in patriam mecum, **modo uita** supersit, | Aonio rediens deducam uertice Musas*). The idea of replacing Augustus as dedicatee of the *Fasti* with Germanicus—perhaps a more malleable Caesar from Ovid's point of view in the light of their shared interest in star-filled poetry—seems to have been entertained when the poet penned *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.1. Ovid returns to the notion of celebrating Germanicus in a poem in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.8.

EPISTVLAE EX PONTO 4.8

In the final book of his Pontic epistles, considerable emphasis is given to the idea of *officium*, the duty which Ovid needs to discharge to those who have supported him.[57] In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.8, he explains that the bounden duty of poets (*officium*) is rendered through song, and, in this poem, the central panel of which is addressed to Germanicus, he asserts that nothing is more suitable for the benefit of *principes* than the discharge of this office:

---

[55] The collocation *coronatis ... equis* is first attested at Prop. 3.1.10 to refer to the elegist's poetic triumph; it is used of an imagined triumph at *Tr.* 2.178 (*inque **coronatis** fulgeat altus **equis***); of Tiberius' German triumph at *Tr.* 4.2.22 (*ante **coronatos** ire uidebit **equos***); and of triumphs in general at *Fast.* 5.52 (*illa **coronatis** alta triumphat **equis***).

[56] The possibility that (a version of) the proem to the *Fasti* as we have it could have been written at around the time of the composition of *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.1 is entertained below. It may, of course, have been composed later, perhaps as Ovid thought his way back into his calendrical poem whilst he wrote *Epistulae ex Ponto* Book 4 (see below).

[57] On the role of *officium* in *Epistulae ex Ponto* Book 4, see T.E. Franklinos, 'Ovid, *ex Ponto* 4: an intratextually cohesive book', in S.J. Harrison, S. Frangoulidis and T.D. Papanghelis (edd.), *Intratextuality and Latin Literature* (Berlin and Boston, 2018), 289–306.

> nec tamen officio uatum per carmina facto
> 　　principibus res est aptior ulla uiris.　　　　　(*Pont.* 4.8.43–4)

As he explains why this is the case in the following lines, Ovid juxtaposes the completed *Metamorphoses* with a promised work which we may read as the *Fasti*.[58] After making reference to the *Iliad* and the cyclic *Thebaid* as examples of the power of literature to memorialize mortals (4.8.51–4),[59] he asserts that it is even the case that gods come into being as a result of the verses sung by poets: *di quoque carminibus (si fas est dicere) fiunt, | tantaque maiestas ore canentis eget* (4.8.55–6).[60] In the subsequent couplets, the poet goes on to provide a very compressed overview of the *Metamorphoses* which, after touching on moments in the first book (57–60), focusses on figures who achieved immortality in part through their deeds:[61]

> sic Chaos ex illa naturae mole prioris
> 　　digestum partes scimus habere suas;
> sic adfectantis caelestia regna Gigantas
> 　　ad Styga nimbiferi[62] uindicis igne datos;
> sic uictor laudem superatis Liber ab Indis,
> 　　Alcides capta traxit ab Oechalia,
> et modo, Caesar, auum, quem uirtus addidit astris,
> 　　sacrarunt aliqua carmina parte tuum.　　　　(*Pont.* 4.8.57–64)

Through Ovid's hexameter-poem we know of the separation (*digestum*) of Chaos from the shapeless *moles*,[63] of the Gigantomachy,[64] of Bacchus' conquest of India,[65] and of Hercules' capture of Oechalia.[66] It is also through this poem, Ovid implies, that the now-deified Augustus has been (proleptically) celebrated; the cause for the late emperor's apotheosis was even advanced, it is suggested, by Ovid's *carmina*. As is clear from the verses following this summary of the completed *Metamorphoses*,

---

[58] Several of the ideas in the discussion here have been lucidly treated in K.S. Myers, 'Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.8, Germanicus, and the *Fasti*', *CQ* 64 (2014), 725–34, an article to which I refer frequently in what follows.

[59] On the *Iliad* as a work which immortalizes its author and the people of which it speaks, cf. Prop. 3.1.25–34; for the coupling of the *Iliad* and the *Thebaid* as typical of the tradition of hexameter-epos, see Prop. 1.7.1–3, 2.1.21 and 3.9.37–42.

[60] These verses seem to point to the *Fasti*: a concern with what is *fas* and whether it is *fas* to speak permeates Ovid's calendrical poem; cf. Feeney (n. 17). In the context of the creation of gods, moreover, the idea that *maiestas* is in need of a bard's voice pointedly gestures to Ovid's treatment of *Maiestas* as a goddess and the account of her birth at *Fast.* 5.11–52; on this passage, see Fantham (n. 51), 266–73, who argues that this section of *Fasti* Book 5 looks to have been reworked at a similar time to the drafting of *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.8. See also M. Pasco-Pranger, *Founding the Year: Ovid's* Fasti *and the Poetics of the Roman Calendar* (Leiden, 2006), 227–40 and M. Garani, 'The advent of *Maiestas* (Ovid, *Fasti* 5.11–52)', in A.N. Michalopoulos, S. Papaioannou and A. Zissos (edd.), *Dicite, Pierides: Classical Studies in Honour of Stratis Kyriakidis* (Newcastle, 2017), 266–97.

[61] For the use of Hercules and Bacchus (amongst others) as examples of such figures, cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.9–15.

[62] *nimberiferi* is Hall's conjecture for the transmitted *nimbifero*: it is the *uindex* who brings rain-storms, not his lightning (*ignis*).

[63] Cf. *quem dixere* **Chaos**; *rudis* **indigestaque moles**, *Met.* 1.7. The use of *digestum* in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.8 to point to the opening of the *Metamorphoses* is perhaps a little surprising, since the term appears in the opening line of the *Fasti* (*Tempora ... Latium digesta per annum*); cf. Barchiesi (n. 14), x: the poet has both works on his mind.

[64] Cf. **adfectasse** *ferunt* **regnum caeleste Gigantas**, *Met.* 1.152.

[65] Cf. **uicta** *racemifero lyncas dedit* **India Baccho**, *Met.* 15.413.

[66] Cf. **Herculis** *...* | *uictor* **ab Oechalia** *Cenaeo sacra parabat* | *uota Ioui*, *Met.* 9.135–7.

moreover, at the time of the writing of *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.8, it is Germanicus' turn to benefit from Ovid's talent (*Pont.* 4.8.65–6, cited below).[67]

Ovid notes that he will devote whatever remains of his *ingenium* to serving Germanicus (65–6), as one poet is not able to spurn the *officium*, the dutiful service, of another (67):[68]

> si quid adhuc igitur uiui, Germanice, nostro
>   restat in ingenio, seruiet omne tibi.
> non potes officium uatis contemnere uates:
>   iudicio pretium res habet ista tuo.
> nam[69] nisi te nomen tantum ad maiora uocasset,
>   gloria Pieridum summa futurus eras.
> sed dare materiam nobis quam carmina mauis;[70]
>   nec tamen ex toto deserere illa potes.
>
>   …
>
> sic tibi nec docti desunt nec principis artes,
>   mixta sed est animo cum Ioue Musa tuo.
> quae quoniam nec nos unda summouit ab illa,
>   ungula Gorgonei quam caua fecit equi,
> prosit opemque ferat communia sacra tueri
>   atque isdem studiis imposuisse manum:
> litora pellitis nimium subiecta Corallis
>   ut tandem saeuos effugiamque Getas,
> clausaque si misero patria est, ut ponar in ullo,
>   qui minus Ausonia distet ab Vrbe, loco,
> unde tuas possim laudes celebrare recentes
>   magnaque quam minima facta referre mora.   (*Pont.* 4.8.65–72, 77–88)

The young Caesar would have been the *summa gloria Pieridum* (70) had he not been called to loftier things (*ad maiora*, 69), but, since he is for the most part otherwise engaged, poets—in whose number Ovid counts himself (*nobis*)—will sing of his pursuits in his stead (71). It is through engaging in their *communia sacra* (81)—a collocation used elsewhere in the Pontic epistles in appeals to fellow poets for support—through his writing verse, the poet claims, that he hopes to achieve a change in his situation (81–4).[71] Should he find himself nearer to Rome, Ovid asserts that he would be able to proclaim Germanicus' praises and relate his mighty deeds in a timelier manner (85–8; cf. the promised treatment of Germanicus' putative triumph in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.1). Ovid's offering, however, is not to be akin to the metaliterary *templum* of epic proportion promised by Virgil to Octavian in the proem to *Georgics* 3:[72]

---

[67] Cf. Myers (n. 58), 730–1.

[68] Cf. Prop. 4.1.59–60 for the collocation *seruiet omne* in a metaliterary context: Propertius intends to use his every breath to serve his *patria*.

[69] Stephen Heyworth has suggested reading *nam* or *et* here in place of the transmitted *quod*. (The former is preferable to my mind.)

[70] *mauis*, transmitted in a handful of younger manuscripts, is an attractive alternative to the *maius* of the *uetustiores*.

[71] For *communia sacra*, see *Pont.* 2.10.17 with M. Helzle, *Ovids Epistulae ex Ponto Buch I–II: Kommentar* (Heidelberg, 2003), 387, 395 and *Pont.* 3.4.67 with C. Formicola, *Epistulae ex Ponto libro III. P. Ovidio Nasone* (Pisa, 2017), 145–6; note also the *studia communia* that Ovid shares with Perilla at *Tr.* 3.7.11. On *sacra* here, cf. Prop. 3.1.1 *Coi sacra Philitae* with D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956), 135–6.

[72] Cf. Myers (n. 58), 727–8.

> tunc ego tura feram rapidis sollemnia flammis,
>   et, ualeant quantum numina, testis ero;
> nec tibi de Pario[73] statuam, Germanice, templum
>   marmore; carpsit opes tanta[74] ruina meas.
> templa domus facient uobis urbesque beatae;
>   Naso suis opibus, carmine, gratus erit.   (*Pont.* 4.8.29–34)[75]

> primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas,
> et uiridi in campo templum de marmore ponam.   (Verg. *G.* 3.12–13)

The poet's work is to be rather more understated; it is to be, I would suppose, an elegiac calendar.[76]

   There is good reason to suppose that Ovid was thinking his way back into his *Fasti* and civic *tempora* whilst he was writing the final book of his *Epistulae ex Ponto* (see below), and so it is unsurprising that one is able to discern traces of his calendrical work in the programmatic poem in which he promises to celebrate Germanicus.[77] The proem of *Fasti* Book 1 as we now have it shares with *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.8 a number of aspects of diction and theme:[78]

> Tempora cum causis Latium digesta per annum
>   lapsaque sub terras ortaque signa canam.
> excipe pacato, Caesar Germanice, uoltu
>   hoc opus et timidae derige nauis iter,
> officioque, leuem non auersatus honorem,
>   en tibi deuoto numine dexter ades.
>
>   …
>
> Caesaris arma canant alii: nos Caesaris aras
>   et quoscumque sacris addidit ille dies.
> adnue conanti per laudes ire tuorum
>   deque meo pauidos excute corde metus.
> da mihi te placidum, dederis in carmina uires:
>   ingenium uoltu statque caditque tuo.   (*Fast.* 1.1–6, 13–18)

In his epistle, Ovid seeks to mollify the young Caesar's godhead (*tua numina placa*, *Pont.* 4.8.23), and in the *Fasti* it is with a pacific mien (*pacato … uoltu*, *Fast.* 1.3; cf. *placidum*, 1.17) that Germanicus is asked to receive Ovid's *opus* and to direct the

---

[73] Cf. also the **Parii** *lapides, spirantia signa* at Verg. *G.* 3.34.

[74] *tanta* Franklinos : *illa* Ω. The pronoun *illa* adds little to the sense and sits awkwardly. Ovid refers to his relegation as *tanta ruina* elsewhere (e.g. *Pont.* 1.4.6 *aetatis facta est tanta ruina meae*; *Tr.* 5.12.13); Stephen Heyworth has suggested that one might consider *nostra*, though this is perhaps uncomfortable in the light of the singular *meas* at the line-end.

[75] The diction and the imagery used here are reminiscent of those at *Tr.* 2.73–6 *te celebrant alii quanto decet ore, tuasque | ingenio laudes uberiore canunt, | sed tamen, ut fuso taurorum sanguine centum, | sic capitur minimo turis honore deus.*

[76] It seems unlikely that Ovid's now almost entirely lost *Phaenomena* is intended; this work, apparently only translating the opening of Aratus' work on the fixed stars (up to Aratus, *Phaen.* 453; see E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* [Oxford, 1993], 308–9 with the two extant fragments), seems likely to belong to Ovid's youth; see E. Gee, *Ovid, Aratus and Augustus: Astronomy in Ovid's* Fasti (Cambridge, 2000), 68–70.

[77] On *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.8 as a 'proem in the middle', see L. Galasso, '*Pont.* 4, 8: il "proemio al mezzo" dell'ultima opera ovidiana', *Dictynna* 5.1 (2008) <http://dictynna.revues.org/395>, who also suggests that Germanicus is the presiding deity of the poem; cf. Gee (n. 76), 67, who shows how Ovid, by riffing off the invocation to the Muses early on in Aratus' *Phaenomena*, casts Germanicus as 'the Muse of astronomical didactic poetry' and a 'proemial god' in the *Fasti*.

[78] See also Myers (n. 58), 725–9.

path of his poetic boat (*derige nauis iter*, *Fast.* 1.4).[79] The poet's work is described as an *officium* on a number of occasions in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.8 (43, 67), and likewise at *Fasti* 1.5. Others are to sing of the *arma Caesaris*, Ovid declares in the proem to the *Fasti* (1.13–14), whilst he is to concern himself with *arae* and *dies*, and at *Pont.* 4.8.24 emphasis is put on Germanicus' altar at which Suillius must offer *preces*, and from which the poet hopes the amelioration of his circumstances will come. Whether Ovid is working on the *Fasti* simultaneously with his fourth book of Pontic epistles, or is looking back to a version of the proem to the *Fasti* drafted some time before (perhaps around the time at which the poet wrote *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.1?), it seems more than likely that Ovid has his calendrical work in mind.

<p align="center">***</p>

The thematization of time coming to halt for the relegated Ovid has been acutely discussed by Hinds, in terms of both its seemingly static nature in the inhospitable climate of Tomi and the relative insignificance of civic time for one so far from the City. In his treatment of *Tristia* 5.10, Hinds suggests that we may also be able to discern 'an arch reference to the compositional standstill of Ovid's actual unfinished *tempora*-poem itself, its feet halting between the completed *Fasti* 6 and the unwritten *Fasti* 7': *adeo procedunt tempora tarde* (*Tr.* 5.10.5).[80] These words could also refer to the stagnated process of editing and redrafting the *Fasti* through the course of the poet's relegation.[81]

Hinds goes on to touch on a 'new Tomitan connectedness with Roman time' in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, and notably in the fourth book. He convincingly suggests that the three poems concerned with consular accession and the start of a new year (*Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.4, 4.5 and 4.9) demonstrate Ovid's attempts at 'thinking himself back into Book 1 of his own *Fasti*'.[82] This is assuredly the case. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.4, in particular, Ovid not only engages with the description of the celebrations on the Kalends of January found in his own calendrical poem,[83] thus again marking civic time, but also acknowledges the onward movement of time in his own Tomitan life—*proximus annus erit* (4.4.18)—and even goes as far as to assert, rather uncharacteristically, that the horrors of the Pontic climate which he has had to endure

---

[79] Myers (n. 58), 726–7 helpfully notes that the maritime imagery of *Pont.* 4.8.27–8 is more closely aligned to the metaliterary language of *Fast.* 2.3–4 than to *Fast.* 1.4. This may be because the contemporary reader of *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.8 would have been expected by Ovid to have been familiar with the pre-relegation opening of the *Fasti* (aspects of which we can discern from what is now the proem to *Fasti* Book 2), rather than the post-relegation proem to *Fasti* Book 1, and would have recognized the gestures toward the former as signalling Ovid's rekindled interest in working on the *Fasti*. Cf. the earlier discussion of *Tristia* Book 2 and its intertexts with *Fasti* Book 2.

[80] S. Hinds, 'Dislocations of Ovidian time', in J.P. Schwindt (ed.), *La représentation du temps dans la poésie augustéenne/Zur Poetik der Zeit in augusteischer Dichtung* (Heidelberg, 2005), 203–30, at 213–18 (quotation at 215); Hinds also shows how strikingly the density of temporal markers in the autobiographical *Tristia* 4.10 functions on account of their contrast with the seeming time-lessness of the rest of the exile poetry.

[81] Cf. Ovid's complaining, at *Tr.* 3.3.11–12, about the lack of a friend who can comfort him in Pontus, with whom he can while away in conversation the slowly moving hours: *non qui soletur, non qui labentia tarde | tempora narrando fallat, amicus adest*. Here, the *labentia tarde | tempora* surely refer to the lack of progress being made by Ovid in writing his *Fasti*, alongside the *prima facie* reading that boredom may make the passage of time seem slower.

[82] Hinds (n. 80), 225–30 (quotations at 226 and 227).

[83] M. Helzle, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto liber IV. A Commentary on Poems 1 to 7 and 16* (Hildesheim, 1989), 105–7.

(4.4.1–4) are not so bad as to destroy any chance of pleasure: *nil adeo fortuna grauis miserabile fecit, | ut minuant nulla gaudia parte malum* (4.4.5–6).[84]

This conspicuous re-engagement of the poet with his *Tempora* and with those of Roman civic life in his fourth book of Pontic epistles seems partly to be a result of the increasing influence of Germanicus after Augustus' death, and the poet's apparent belief in his shared bond with this scion of the imperial family as another *uates*. Ovid points in this direction in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.8, a poem which, taken alongside *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.9, occupies the central—and a programmatic—position in its book. It may be the case that Ovid is finding his way back into his calendrical poem, but the three poetic attempts at beginning the year in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.4, 4.5 and 4.9 are also suggestive of an inability to move beyond the month of January: Ovid seems to be stuck on loop at the start of his *Fasti*. The implication is that, were he recalled, he would have the chance to polish up and publish the work to which he has once again turned in earnest; since a return to Rome is not permitted, however, and he is not to be allowed to move closer, his work will remain unfinished.

Ovid speaks of the *Fasti* more frequently than has hitherto been recognized in the exile poetry; this is, in part, prompted by his apparent desire—conspicuous in his later works—to guide the reading and reception of his poetry, and to effect his own canonicity. Of the works completed or undertaken before his relegation, his calendrical poem is perhaps the one about which his attitude is the most changeable. This is, I have suggested, because of its unfinished state, and his realization that it could be construed within his works (if not actually used) as a means of bartering for the mitigation of his punishment. As a merely drafted poem addressed to Augustus, Ovid chooses to set it aside in *Tristia* 1.1 and 1.7; in *Tristia* Book 2, and thereafter, the *Fasti* resurfaces from time to time: the possibility of its publication—plausibly desired by members of the *domus Augusta*—is cast as a means of influencing the powers that be (cf. *Tristia* 5.3). Its eventual rededication to Germanicus—hinted at in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.1 and alluded to in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.8—is the acme of Ovid's attempted exploitation of the *Tempora* as leverage in his exilic verse.

Oriel College, Oxford   T.E. FRANKLINOS
                                                        tristan.franklinos@classics.ox.ac.uk

---

[84] For a discussion of *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.4 and its place in Book 4, see Franklinos (n. 57).