

had in mind was the failure of French scholars to discharge their political responsibilities. The failure I apprehend in our present runaway world is a failure by scholars to meet their intellectual responsibilities: a retreat—not any longer into what seems to them pure, objective scholarship, but into the elaboration of theories about literature instead of accepting their role as interpreters of texts.

To accept this responsibility is uncomfortable for those who would prefer a stable world, who can look back nostalgically to what seems in retrospect a stable world. In our runaway world of ideas as well as technology, stability is too much to expect. If there is a source of consolation for those who find the intellectual life increasingly confusing, it is that the intellectual life shows signs, for the first time for a hundred years, of hanging together. During that hundred years, one new exciting (or more or less exciting) subject after another has come into existence; the practitioners of that subject have worked out their subject matter, their methods and procedures. For a time it seemed, indeed, that they would then go off by themselves, to explore and conquer the new territory, never to be seen again. That is not what happened: the new subjects proved to have common problems, problems to which a method evolved in one seemed to offer a solution in another. We are beginning to realize the interdependence of the social sciences—to realize that literature (like language) is a social science. The intellectual life will never be, in the foreseeable future, the neat, tidy thing Housman tried to pretend to himself it was. If we feel any real impulse to understand the human condition—I almost said, if we have any sense—we must come to terms with our world, or abandon touch with reality.

REWRITING AND REREADING THE *FASTI*: AUGUSTUS, OVID AND RECENT CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP

Elaine Fantham

May I begin by thanking you sincerely for inviting me to give this Todd Memorial Lecture? I am sensible of the honour, not only in memory of the pioneer Australian Latinist whose name it bears, but in view of the roll-call of Classical scholars who have spoken before me. I am particularly conscious of my own debt to two predecessors here, the unforgettable Sir Ronald Syme and my former teacher Gordon Williams,¹ who from their different viewpoints have had a considerable influence on present day approaches to Augustan—and some would say un-Augustan—poetry.

I shall be talking today about two kinds of *fasti* or calendar, the public, inscribed, *fasti* of Augustan Rome, and the poetic *Fasti* of Ovid, the last great poet of the age of Augustus. But I should first introduce both calendar and calendar poem, before moving on to discuss the interpretative battle which has recently developed over Ovid's complex but fascinating work.

Rome's official *fasti* were given their name after the working days on which it was right (*fas*)² for the magistrates to function,

¹ Sir Ronald Syme, *A Roman Post-Mortem: An Inquest on the Fall of the Roman Republic* [Todd Memorial Lecture, 3] (Sydney, 1950), and Gordon Williams, *What is Happening to Interpretation of Virgil's Aeneid?* [Todd Memorial Lecture, 9 (1976)] published with 10 (1981) (Sydney, 1982) and republished in this volume.

² The fullest recent account of the different categories of days in the calendar can be found in A.K. Michels, *The Calendar of the Roman Republic* (Princeton, 1967), 31–59; for a more concise account, with an explanation of the changes imported by the Julian calendar first

adjudicating lawsuits and hearing criminal cases. We do not know enough about the earliest records of the legal and political calendar, but they seem to have been systematised, perhaps for the first time, in the first quarter of the second century B.C. when the victorious general Fulvius Nobilior either posted or stored a version in his temple to Hercules and the Muses.³ The calendar itself could be publicly displayed, like our own calendar, in a tabular form based on accepted conventions of layout; unlike our months, the Roman months seem to have been written up in parallel vertical rows. These retained as a mark of their origin in the lunar month the alignment of the holy days marking the lunar phases—Kalends, Nones and Ides, although the last two holy days occurred on different dates (5th or 7th; 13th or 15th) from month to month. Each day of the month was numbered according to its relationship to the next lunar holy day, and carried one of the letters A to H marking its position in the recurring sequence of eight days between the *nundinae* or market days; finally it was distinguished by its status as available or unavailable for legal and political business.⁴

Set off in larger capitals at irregular intervals throughout the year were the *feriae* or *dies festi*, the great religious commemorations whose rites and origins were associated with legends from remotest history. It was these festivals that gave their special character to the months—February as a month of commemorating the dead, March as the opening of the military year, April as the month of festivals in the racecourse and theatrical spaces of Rome.⁵ Largely unchanged for centuries, the

in place for 45 B.C., see pages 15–20 of Geraldine Herbert-Brown's *Ovid and the Fasti* (Oxford, 1994) discussed below.

³ Reported by Macrobius, *Sat.* 1.12.16 (using the verb *posuit* rather than *proposuit*, which would definitely imply posting a document). Ovid ends his poem with a reference to Hercules and the Muses as homage to a predecessor (*F.* 6.811–12).

⁴ For an illustration see the fold-out in Michels (above, n.2) based on the *Fasti Antiaties Maiores*.

inaccurate republican calendar that operated with intermittent supplementary days⁶ until around 50 B.C. became the object of both study and change with the dominance of Julius Caesar. In turn Caesar exploited his scientific reform of the calendar in self-glorifying appropriation, as he marked off *Quintilis*, the old 'fifth month', with Victory Games and his own family name to become *mensis Iulius*, our present July. But Caesar's behaviour was only a foretaste of the continued rewriting of the public *fasti* by his adoptive son C. Iulius Caesar Octavianus, whom we call Augustus, to perpetuate his own and his father's victories and public honours. We can go through the historical landmarks of our textbooks and find them there in the calendar: 7 January, Octavian's first command; 16 January (13th in Ovid), his restoration of the *respublica* and acceptance of the title of Augustus; 5 February, his new title of *pater patriae*; 6 March, his election as Pontifex Maximus; 16 April, his first salutation as Imperator—and there are many more anniversaries of Augustan temple dedications. Such multiple occasions of public rejoicing not only changed citizens' experiences; they were effectively a redesigning of the public year and provoked the reinscribing of the stone and bronze *fasti* of many Latin and Italic communities.⁷

Beside these urban ingredients of Roman religion and public achievement, most Italians would be more familiar with a different, simpler kind of calendar, the rising and setting of stars which prompted farmers to start their ploughing and sowing and

⁵ Besides the one-day festivals, such as the founding of Rome on 21 April, the *Megalensia* of 4–10 April and *Cerialia* of 12–19 April were holidays with stage plays (*ludi scaenici*) followed by a climactic day of chariot races in the Circus (*ludi circenses*). The next games, the *Floralia*, began on 28 April.

⁶ Only the Pontifices were authorised to decide when an 'intercalary' month of eleven days needed to be inserted at the end of February. There might be political reasons for reluctance to declare such an intercalation.

⁷ The bulk of the inscribed *fasti* were intended to acquaint local communities with Caesar's calendar reform, but the habit continued into the principate.

formed the seasonal markers of the eight-phased agricultural year known to us from Varro's manual of agriculture.⁸ These phenomena had a double appeal for Ovid: their traditional role in poems of the farmer's year from Hesiod's *Works and Days* to the *Georgics* and the mythological identities associated with the constellations from Homer to Aratus, whose *Phaenomena* Ovid himself translated—though only a few fragments now survive. The star-myths, or 'Catasterisms', celebrated in Hellenistic poetry⁹ offered the calendar poet a foil to patriotic Roman legend, a decorative background that could be introduced on demand to space out the dramatic Roman scenes, providing interludes in a lighter and less respectful tone and varying the solemnity of Augustan anniversaries.¹⁰

Thus when Ovid began his elegiac poem centred on the Roman calendar, he could hope to combine familiar elements of Greek myth, Roman legends, and traditional ritual and festivity with recent Julian and Augustan commemorations that would please the now aging and susceptible first citizen turned emperor.¹¹ He tells his public as much in his opening table of contents.

⁸ See Varro, *De re rustica* 1.28; the same division is observed by Columella, *Res rusticae* 9.14, and by Pliny in the agricultural book of his *Natural History*, N.H. 18.59.

⁹ 'Catasterism' deifies former humans such as Callisto, but only honours non-human entities such as Aries, whose golden fleece carried Phrixus and Helle, or Ariadne's crown, supposedly set in the heavens by Bacchus to honour his consort. It was the incidental naming of stars and their associated mythology in many Alexandrian poems that provoked as a secondary phenomenon the naming of a newly discovered starcluster after a living queen, Berenice, discussed below.

¹⁰ The first Roman example, however, is a translation: Catullus 66, a modified translation of Callimachus' 'Lock of Berenice'.

¹¹ Ovid did not begin the *Fasti* until after 2 B.C. when Augustus, aged 60, took the official title of Father of his Country.

Instead of the program proposed by Propertius for his fourth book of elegies twenty years earlier, consisting of rites, days and ancient naming of places,¹² Ovid opens his *Fasti* with the word *tempora*—evoking days and months of the lunisolar calendar, or seasons, or dates, or anniversaries, or moments of historic crisis, or generations—spread over the Roman year and Roman history. He also promises to explain their origins and record the risings and settings of stars:

*Tempora cum causis Latium digesta per annum
lapsaque sub terras orta que signa canam* (F. 1.1-2).

Then comes the element of personal appeal to his imperial dedicatee: 'you will find your own family festivals, now matter for public celebration'—

invenies illic et festa domestica ... (F. 1.9).

Although the poem has come down to us with a new dedication to the prince Germanicus, composed after Augustus' death, only the details of his poem have changed, not the principle of selection and emphasis. This can be seen by comparing the original address to Augustus which is now set at the opening of Book 2 (2.3-18).

There was a famous and much-admired model for Ovid's collective poem, without his formal basis of organisation but also parading selected legends and myths. This was the Greek *Ἄγρια*, 'Explanations'—a better word than origins or causes—of curious rites and customs. Callimachus' *Ἄγρια* in its final version was a composite poem of elegiac sequences grouped in four books, combining in loose succession rites and myths from all over the Greek world. Working in the new city of Alexandria about fifty years after the death of Alexander the Great, Callimachus had royal patronage in Ptolemy Philadelphos and his son Euergetes,

¹² *Sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum* is how Propertius announces his new program in 4.1.69.

with Berenice his queen, and actually framed the second half of his four-book poem with elegies in homage to the queen, celebrating her victory in the Nemean chariot races, and her dedication of a lock of hair on behalf of her brother-husband's successful campaign: this is the famous lock which magically disappeared to be recognised in the skies as a new constellation by the great astronomer Conon.

The difference was that Callimachus' stories were not so much patriotic tales as curiosities from a widely scattered range of antiquarian books and communities. These strange or marvellous tales Callimachus framed by personal statements of poetic principle, and supposedly personal experiences of encounters with both human and divine informants. Thus the poem begins by reporting his authorisation by Apollo who appears to him in a dream. Indeed it is generally believed that most of the surviving fragments from the first two books of this poem are not direct statements by the poet *ex persona*, but reported communications of the Muses themselves in conversational exchanges with him.¹³

Even before Ovid's time Rome was becoming a Hellenistic city, emulating the conquered Alexandria in its poetry and its scholarship, as the physical city emulated Alexandria's monuments. Callimachus provided models of self-presentation and narrative for virtually every poet writing in the two generations before Ovid. He is named, praised and translated by Catullus, and traces of his attitudes and techniques can be found in Vergil, Horace and the elegists, including Ovid's own body of amatory elegy, first narrative and then didactic. For by the age of forty Ovid had written apparently personal elegies about his love life, dramatic monologues impersonating the abandoned heroines of the past, a tragedy centred on the vengeance of Medea, and four

¹³ On Callimachus' poetry and the *Αἴτια* in particular see P. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), 720-32, 754-60, and A.W. Bulloch in P.E. Easterling and E.J. Kenney (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (Cambridge, 1982-5), 1.553-62.

books of didactic poetry: two of these *Artes*, or manuals, taught men how to win and keep their chosen women; a third instructed women how to keep their men¹⁴ while a fourth treated itself as a subdivision of medicine, advising men how to cure their love or be rid of their beloved.

So Ovid was again ready to claim new poetic territory for himself and Rome, to face the challenge of adapting Callimachus' mixed genre combining aetiological and celebratory elegy—and to echo the iridescent tonal flexibility of his admired Hellenistic predecessor. By 2 B.C. Augustus had largely rewritten the public *fasti*, and the scholar Verrius Flaccus, tutor to the young princes Gaius and Lucius, was completing the preliminary research for his new public calendar, finally set up in the forum of his home town, Praeneste, in A.D. 10. Ovid would be able to make this renewed Roman public calendar the basis of elegiac variations of his own, embodying the artistic principles he had learned from Callimachus.

But the task entailed some rethinking. The very names of the months had changed since Ovid became a man, about the time Octavian became Augustus in 27 B.C. We saw that just before Ovid's birth, *Quintilis* had been renamed as *mensis Iulius* to honour Caesar.¹⁵ Next *Sextilis* dropped from the calendar, either when the Senate first proposed its renaming after the Princeps in 27 B.C., or at least by 8 B.C. This month was an obvious choice, for it contained anniversaries of many of Augustus' achievements: Augustus had entered his first consulship on 19 August 43 B.C.; had entered Alexandria on 1 August 30, and in the following year

¹⁴ 'Keep attractive, sympathetic, sweet tempered and obliging, but not too obliging' ... nothing has changed.

¹⁵ Our first evidence for this is a resentful letter of Cicero to Atticus after Caesar's assassination, on 8 July 44 B.C. But this results from the date itself; no doubt it had been planned as early as 46: S. Weinstock, *Divus Iulius* (Oxford, 1972), 156 shows that Caesar had moved his Victory games back to July in 45 as part of his 'take-over' of the month.

celebrated his triple triumph on the 13–15th, dedicated the temple of his Divine Father on the 18th and erected the statue of Victory in his new Senate House on the 28th.¹⁶ No other month lists more Augustan commemorations on the official calendar for the Romans to celebrate with public sacrifices. But the whole year was now dotted with new Augustan red-letter days, marking offices, victories, and in due course family births and honours received. As Andrew Wallace-Hadrill has made us realise in a brief and brilliant paper, Augustus had remodelled the year and remodelled time itself as he remodelled the space of Rome; the Great Sundial was co-ordinated with the Great Altar of Peace and the future greatness of the Mausoleum which the emperor had erected for himself and his own.¹⁷ Here then, looming ever larger, are the *domestica festa* we and Ovid anticipate as he begins his poem.

Now we may regret the old currency, the old weights and measures, and perhaps only too soon the present monarchy of our countries: even if we do not, we would probably resent strongly any attempt to call our months after the current Head of State. Did Ovid, over forty when he began the poetic *Fasti*, resent the new Augustan calendar? And if so, did he suppress his instinctive resentment in order to compose a courtly poem, as Callimachus had done before him? Or did he use his wit and skill with words to encode subversive messages into the praises of Augustus and his family and the gods he cultivated, for the entertainment of the smart circles of his friends?

¹⁶ For the evidence see Jean Gagé, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (Paris, 1930), 178–9 'Le Calendrier d'Auguste'.

¹⁷ 'Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus and the *Fasti*' in P. Hardie, M. and M. Whitby (edd.), *Homo Viator: essays presented to John Bramble* (Bristol, 1987), 221–30. A similar point is made specifically for Ovid's version of the *fasti* by Mary Beard's study 'A Complex of Times', *PCPS* 33 (1987), 1–15.

This has become the dominant issue in recent studies of Ovid's learned and extraordinarily ambitious poem—a poem intended to cover twelve books averaging over 800 lines each, comparable to the *Aeneid* itself, if shorter than the new epic *Metamorphoses* which Ovid had begun about the same time. And politically oriented critics have taken their cue from Ovid's failure to finish the proposed twelve books, dedicated, as he tells his emperor in A.D. 9, to Augustus himself.¹⁸ But it was not always so. There is a watershed, the year of 1978.

Before this time, as recently as my own schooldays, Ovid's poetic *Fasti* were mined for edifying legends of early Rome—the story of Romulus for the boys, of Lucretia, perhaps, for the girls to emulate. There can still be found in second-hand shops little blue *Selections from Ovid* that draw almost exclusively on the *Fasti*—nothing there to put ideas into schoolboys' heads. At a more serious level, nineteenth-century scholars of Roman religion like Warde Fowler mined the *Fasti* for details of the Roman festivals, and comparative religionists like the great Sir James Frazer and Georges Dumézil extrapolated primitive mythmaking, leaving us Frazer's monumental five volume edition, three of which are commentaries replete with parallel rituals from the Trobriand Islands or even his native Scotland.¹⁹ Franz Bömer's great commentary of 1957–58 was a landmark only for the most determined seekers after learning, an ordered but blinding array of parallels and references to Pauly–Wissowa, to Müller's *Handbuch*, to articles on religion and the archaeology and topography of Rome itself. Bömer notes in his foreword that Ovid's poem has usually been consulted for matters of fact, *Realien*, and claims he has kept to his objective recording of

¹⁸ *Tristia* 2.551–2: *idque tuo nuper scriptum sub nomine, Caesar, / et tibi sacratum sors mea rupit opus.*

¹⁹ See W. Warde Fowler, *Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic* (London / New York, 1899); J.G. Frazer, *Ovid: the Fasti* (London, 1929); G. Dumézil, *La religion romaine archaïque* (Paris, 1966, 1974).

scholarly resources to provide a foundation for such serious and specific problem solving. But one can endorse E.J. Kenney's gentle complaint in his original review:

'Commentary' is almost a misnomer: this is a reference book to which Ovid's text serves as a convenient index ... It is not for the tyro: the discussions are allusive, polemical and thickly sown with references and presume readers already acquainted with the special problems of Roman religion. It cannot be recommended, like Frazer, as a bedside book ... but to a vast erudition Bömer adds modesty, caution and a sober judgment ... The consequence sometimes is that his readers, expecting a solution, may simply have the evidence dumped in their laps.²⁰

While Bömer made it his business to deal with linguistic and metrical matters, tracing Ovid's formal debt to his predecessors and the continuity of the *Fasti* with the poet's earlier work, he deliberately stopped short of anything like literary interpretation. His foreword ends in fact with a protest at the unpopularity of work like his own that does not deal with intellectual history—lamenting this as a sign of the times. Literary criticism can of course be subjective, and the issues I shall be rehearsing today demonstrate clearly the disparate subjectivities of critics from different countries and generations—but Bömer's commentary does nothing to help the people who delight in Ovid's love poetry and *Metamorphoses* to enjoy or understand his great calendar poem. This kind of antiquarian documentation is in some ways little better than the neglect or disparagement which Ovid suffered in British Universities before Patrick Wilkinson restored the faith.²¹ It was generally felt at Oxford in my student days that Ovid himself had been read at

²⁰ CR 9 (1959), 255–8, here 257.

²¹ *Ovid Recalled* (Cambridge, 1955) and its abridgment *Ovid Surveyed* (Cambridge, 1962).

school, and could be omitted from the University syllabus; besides, everyone knew that Roman religion lacked the depth and significance of cult as practised in Greece. The corollary and curse of being a school text was neglect at the more adult level of the University.

How things have changed! Maybe this is a benefit—the only one—from the reduced access of schools and their students to Latin; at least men and women are now older and more curious when they read Ovid. But by the late 1970s distinguished scholars were again concerning themselves with all of Ovid's work, not least with his *Fasti*, and it is to these—to Sir Ronald Syme, to Gordon Williams, that I now return.

Others too had been busy with the poem. 1978 was the year in which the new refined Teubner text of the Irish trinity Alton, Wormell and Courtney appeared, a text with whose readings I do not always agree, but to which every student of the *Fasti* will be indebted.²² Back in the United States the eloquent Ralph Johnson published a paper called 'The Desolation of the *Fasti*' arguing that, despite some brilliant episodes, Ovid fell between two stools.²³ His innate flippancy offended the emperor, and his would-be serious poem was already failing before he abandoned it, because his heart was not in it. Sir Ronald agreed, damning the poem, in his *History in Ovid*, with one of his ultra-Laconic verbless sentences, as *Not a good idea*.²⁴ Of course Sir Ronald was reading the poem in his way and for his purpose, to understand contemporary history and dynastic politics, and the great historian's study offers a powerful analysis, one that has shaped subsequent writing, of the change in the character of Augustus' long reign while Ovid was engaged on the *Fasti*. It was in these years that the deaths of both Augustus' grandsons forced him to adopt

²² A revised and corrected edition appeared in 1988.

²³ CJ 73 (1978), 7–17.

²⁴ *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978), 105.

Tiberius as his heir in A.D. 4—a year then followed by a chain of disasters: famine, revolt, and military defeat, from A.D. 5 to 9. Sir Ronald, noting that no event in the main body of Ovid's poem can be dated after Augustus' reconstruction of the temple of Cybele in A.D. 3,²⁵ uses this negative evidence in support of his belief that Ovid abandoned the poem after Tiberius' adoption, and did so because he could not *or would not* praise the future ruler. But Sir Ronald's special perspective on the poem may distort his evaluation. He more than once reproaches Ovid because the poet in his interview with Janus in the first book fails to identify the three occasions when Augustus closed the gates of Janus' temple to mark peace throughout the empire. This is surely not the kind of information Ovid wanted to spell out, if only for aesthetic reasons: even if the poet could recall or research the records, he might well feel they detracted from the impact of Janus' generalised benevolence and the glory of the present imperial peace. Historians should perhaps tell all they know, and seek out what they do not; but even with a handy archive poets are entitled to artistic selection and omission.

But it was Gordon Williams who opened up the issue of Ovid's poetic position, as opposed to his private political stance, in what has become an ongoing debate. His Sather Lectures, published in 1978 under the title *Change and Decline*, set out the nature of courtly poetry and the problems of panegyric and tried to dispel the libertarian and republican prejudices which had led Americans in particular to deny that Ovid could either mean or wish to seem to mean such shameful flattery of a fretful autocrat like Augustus. Williams' argument is one I still hold valid; that what Ovid personally felt about his Princes was irrelevant to the skilful composition of a courtier's poem: indeed that he would accept and even enjoy the challenge of this kind of pose as successfully as the pose of a wronged but faithful lover, or heartless seducer. As a professional the poet could assume

²⁵

At F. 4.348 Ovid notes that the *auctor* or founder of the temple is now Augustus, marking the new inauguration.

whatever persona he required. It is indeed inconsistent of critics who have been shrewd to detect the angry persona of Juvenal or the dispassionate Epicurean persona of Horace, that they are so reluctant to imagine a loyal or courtly persona for Ovid. Granted the persona, however, critics can still argue that the frivolous or disaffected poet would want to slip in ambiguous and ironic phrases to undercut the flattery and amuse his sophisticated readers at the emperor's expense. In a subtle version of this approach, a highly influential paper by Stephen Hinds²⁶ maintains that the poet was skilful enough to compose a text that bore loyalty on its face but could be read differently by other readers, according to their taste. The onus, he claims, would be on the reader. Here Williams' caution is probably nearer the truth. Augustus and his friends, and the poet's enemies, whom he clearly had in abundance, were quite capable of seeing any alternative message encoded in the text, and Ovid would be foolish to risk such provocation.

I would go further. Since the whole apparatus of Augustan commemoration and dynastic celebration was in place by 2 B.C., Ovid need never have begun this poem if he disliked the role of imperial celebrant. His choice must have been based on the belief that he could celebrate the emperor while writing a good poem—artistic, complex, varied in pace, tone and content, and still entertaining. But wit was endemic in his nature, and like rhythm—he lisped in numbers for the numbers came—he could not help committing some acts of irony and wit: this was how Ovid talked, of himself, of his beloved, and even of serious things like imperial glory. Freud has schooled us to believe that all wit is aggressive, but Freud also taught us to recognise the Freudian slip, the verbal lapse that exposes our suppressed unconscious. Those who look for subversive implications in Ovid's allusivity will find some meanings that sprang unwittingly from Ovid's habitual patterns of thought, but many others that depend on so extended a

²⁶

'Generalizing about Ovid' in *The Imperial Muse* (= *Ramus* 16 [1987]), 4–31.

chain of associative devices that they can honestly be said not to be there at all. Like the proverbial Frenchmen whom everything reminded of sex, there are many critics now to whom everything suggests subversion and dissent.

But I am anticipating my case. Our sense of Ovid's tone in the *Fasti* depends on both literary and historical understanding of his world and circumstance. The reader must appreciate the complexity of the Augustan poetic book—a subject that will be freshly illuminated by the forthcoming monograph of Nita Krevans, who has studied the influence of Callimachus' book form on Roman poets from Vergil's *Eclogues* and Augustan lyric and elegiac books to the *Fasti*.²⁷ He or she must recognise Callimachean devices, such as imagined interviews with the divine, the claim of autopsy or documentation, with the interweaving of astronomical and antiquarian lore, and must study the flexible Alexandrian narrative technique—something we can learn from John Miller's articles and his book *Ovid's Elegiac Festivals*.²⁸ Students of Ovid's *Fasti* also need to take into account both the inherited manners of the elegiac genre and elegiac narrative—something we have owed to Heinze long since;²⁹ they should give special consideration to Ovid's ambidextrous activities in the first decade of our era as he composed his epic *Metamorphoses* and elegiac *Fasti* alternately and even perhaps side by side. Variety and complementarity dictate some of the poet's choices: Stephen Hinds' splendid comparative analysis of Ovid's epic and elegiac Persephone narratives³⁰ has shown how

²⁷ *The Poet as Editor: the Poetic Book from Callimachus to Ovid* (Princeton, 1996). I thank Dr Krevans for letting me read her important manuscript.

²⁸ [Studien zur klassischen Philologie, 55] (Frankfurt, 1991).

²⁹ 'Ovids elegische Erzählung', reprinted in *Vom Geist des Römertums* (Tübingen, 1960), 308–402.

³⁰ *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse* (Cambridge, 1987).

Ovid composed an account of Demeter's search and coming to Eleusis in Book 4 of the *Fasti* that closely adhered to the Homeric hymn, while he gave to the Muse's competition hymn in *Metamorphoses* 5 a new, highly artificial narrative set entirely in Sicily, replete with transformations and almost parodic in its over-use of rhapsodic devices. Each version contrasts with the other in both manner and content, but it is characteristic of Ovid that neither of these versions goes uninfluenced by the more ironic hymn to Demeter of Callimachus.

Our poet was working ambidextrously in genre, and in choice of model: he also knew how to be both neo-classical and post-Hellenistic within the same work. The Trojan and Italian books of *Metamorphoses* and the six books of *Fasti* overlap and converge; for instance, both poems offer versions of the deification of Romulus, and the principle of complementarity seems to have prompted Ovid to assign the coming of Asclepius' divine serpent to Rome to *Met.* 15.622–744 precisely as a counterpart to the coming of that other foreign deity Cybele in *Fasti* 4.249–347. Their voyages and their reception narratives gain from mutual comparison. But it is the later, Augustan, episodes, such as the deification of Julius Caesar in *Fasti* 3.697–710 and *Met.* 15.760–851, which are of most interest to the present politically oriented readership and to them we will return. My point here is that those who wish to judge Ovid politically must be sure first that they have considered all the circumstances of his work.

It seems that Williams' judgment of Ovidian 'panegyric' was a lone voice, and politicised readings for the subtext of Ovid and other imperial poets proliferated. Only the rearguard action of Jim McKeown, a scholar steeped in Ovidian poetry, renewed the argument for Ovid's primary literary motivation for composing the *Fasti*, while acknowledging the poet's hope of conciliating his emperor.³¹ More powerful voices spoke against him during the six

³¹ 'Fabula proposito nulla tegenda meo: Ovid's *Fasti* and Augustan Politics' in A.J. Woodman and D. West (edd.), *Poetry and Politics in*

individual London University seminars of 1988–9³² and at the week-long 1990 Cambridge University Laurence Seminar which I attended. Among the dozen or so speakers from Britain, France, Italy, the USA and Australia, a new emphasis on Ovid's treatment of cult and theology was contributed by John Scheid,³³ Mary Beard, and Australia's Geraldine Herbert-Brown, but ideologically the traditional interpreters who gave priority to literary motivation were outnumbered by the brilliant presentations of Philip Hardie and Sandro Barchiesi³⁴ and the vociferous obligato of the professional heretic John Henderson. For myself I found the most impressive case for the *Fasti* as a poem of protest in the opening chapter of the London volume, that of Denis Feeney. Taking his epigraph from the *Fasti*, 'Si licet et fas est' (F. 1.25), Feeney argues powerfully for Ovid's thematisation of enforced silence, and the punishment of speech out of turn, and ultimately his refusal to continue the *Fasti* (omission has become refusal) as a gesture of political protest: significantly, however, Feeney allows for the possibility that a high proportion of the *Fasti* was revised or composed in exile.³⁵ There could hardly be a stronger case than his for a defensive political reading, but it is to some extent countered by Duncan Kennedy's subtle metaliterary argument that accusations of anti-Augustanism ignore the instability of language and privilege intentionality and reader response, when both author and reader are engaged willy-nilly in constituting the Augustan discourse they seem to resist.³⁶ While I

the Age of Augustus (Cambridge, 1984), 169–87.

³² Now published as A. Powell (ed.), *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus* (London, 1992).

³³ Scheid's paper has since appeared as 'Myth, Cult and Reality in Ovid's *Fasti*', *PCPS* 38 (1992), 118–31.

³⁴ Hardie's paper was published as 'The Janus Episode in Ovid's *Fasti*', *MD* 26 (1991), 47–64; Barchiesi's as 'Discordant Muses', *PCPS* 37 (1991), 1–21.

³⁵ 'Si licet et fas est: Ovid's *Fasti* and the problem of free speech under the Principate' in *Roman Poetry* (above, n.32), 1–25.

think I have now understood Kennedy's position, I am not willing to abandon either the power of language to be held stable or the will of an author to express a point of view.

Let me mention just one more collective assault on rereading the poem—the panel organised by Carole Newlands for the American Philological Association meeting in December 1988. Here too a politicised double reading was favoured by Newlands herself—whose stimulating book-length study of the *Fasti* is now available³⁷—and by Stephen Hinds, whose discussion of Ovid's handling of Mars, as god of March, of Rome and of Augustan vengeance, is the most memorable ingredient in the *Arethusa* volume of these revised papers.³⁸

I hope it will be clear that I very much admire the scholarship and critical skills of men like Hinds, Feeney and Hardie, not to forget Barchiesi, whose immensely readable book *Il Poeta e il Principe* appeared this year. Barchiesi is perhaps the most subtle and cautious of the new Ovidian scholars, and he has adopted the wise policy of organising and presenting objectively the many passages in this poem where he believes Ovid's silence or his emphasis invites the thoughtful reader to question the loyal and optimistic message of the text. In the face of such subtle analysis, such wit, and ingenuity, conservative 'literary' interpreters like myself are inevitably at a disadvantage. Our Ovid is less complex and ingenious—but also I hope less disingenuous. If Ovid's Janus is two faced, must this be a signal that Ovid too is sending double messages? Must we honour Ovid's wit at the expense of his good faith? Or is it perhaps that Ovid's misgivings over particulars repeatedly break the surface of his celebratory poem? Is this in the end an insoluble disagreement over the phantom of intent?

³⁶ 'Augustan and anti-Augustan: reflections on terms of reference' in *Roman Poetry* (above, n.32), 26–58.

³⁷ *Playing with Time* (Ithaca, 1995).

³⁸ 'Arma and the *Fasti*', *Arethusa* 25 (1992), 81–153.

In our remaining time I would like first to review the approaches available for reading this complex poem, then offer a fuller illustration of one aspect—Ovid's treatment of the gods and cults favoured by Augustus.

How then can and should we supplement our reading of the *Fasti*? Ovid was far from strait-jacketed by the formal structure of the calendar: thus he operated as he always did by selection, combination, modification and choice of scale to emphasise or de-emphasise at will. So here is the agenda:

- 1) We should examine his choices historically, against the versions of sources like Livy, on whose first pentad Ovid clearly drew again and again, but also against the *Res gestae*, Dio, Suetonius and the epigraphical record of Augustus' religious restorations and foundations.
- 2) We must read him against the previous poetic tradition, never letting out of our sight Vergil's 'Augustan' poetry—the *Georgics* as much as the *Aeneid*. On this of course scholars agree, even those who see Vergil's poetry as a poetry of dissent, finding in his distaste for warfare a rejection of empire and even human 'progress'. Of course Ovid writes in reaction to Vergil's dominant fame, and delights to 'make it other', to present a different narrative of Aeneas' colonising achievement, to counter it with other founder figures like Evander and Romulus, and to outdo the divine patrons of the *Georgics* with the claims of lesser, and less Augustan, deities. Emulation is not dissent.
- 3) We cannot forget Ovid's earlier work, and such 'digressions' as the rape of the Sabines, or the Propempticon for Gaius Caesar and anticipation of his triumph that never was, in the first book of the *Ars Amatoria*. Decades of amatory elegy left Ovid with the mindset of an erotic poet and a sympathy for sexual enjoyment that may be out of place in the *Fasti* without being intended as provocation. Rome's developed elegiac

tradition also left his readers with an expectation of eroticism as a feature of any elegiac composition.

- 4) We must take into account that the text before us is only partly revised; Book 1 was almost entirely rewritten to meet the death of his august dedicatee and appeal to a new patron, but other books too show traces of rewriting in exile: there are significant allusions to exile in later books, in association with the Argei, the fugitive Evander, or the banished pipers of Book 6. The actual exile poems, too, provide close parallels for ideological elements in the poem to Book 5 that suggest its later revision.³⁹

With such preparation a return to Ovid's handling of more overtly ideological themes—of the deities closely associated by Augustus with himself and their renewed cults and of the Princeps' own growing sacred and secular status—should be more open to an informed neutral reading.

Like the ancient poets, including Ovid himself (*Ab Iove surgat opus*: F. 5.111), let us start from Jupiter:

Hoc tu per terras quod in aethere Iuppiter alto
nomen habes; hominum tu pater, ille deum. (2.131–2)

Augustus took no personal initiative to enhance the cult of Jupiter Optimus Maximus or his own association with Jupiter, yet decades before the *Fasti* Horace had paralleled the responsibility of god and ruler in *Odes* 1.12 and again in the *Epistles*. Long before the wrath of Jove became the exile's code for Augustus' refusal to pardon him, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* had portrayed an Olympian Council summoned by an angry Jupiter (*dignas Iove concipit iras*) in terms of Augustus and the Senate (*Met.* 1.166–252), leaving it open to the reader to decide how far Jupiter's autocratic approach to

³⁹ This may be an obsession of the present writer; see however her papers in *HSCP* 87 (1983), 185–216, *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5 (1986), 243–81, *Arethusa* 25 (1992), 155–71.

conspiracy applied to the ruler. But nothing links Jupiter's seductions in the first three books of *Metamorphoses* to his earthly vicegerent. So it is surely unnecessary to infer from Ovid's parallel between father of gods and father of men, honouring the *pater patriae* in *F.* 2.131-44, that the astronomical notice which follows, identifying Aquarius as the Idaean or Trojan youth (that is, Ganymede), if it is intended to reflect on Jupiter as a seducer, is also intended to reflect on Augustus. Sex was a privilege of power, not a disqualifier as it seems to be in our democracies.

There is more room for conjecture in the forced comparison in this passage between Augustus and Romulus, Rome's first founder, as first father of his country. Wallace-Hadrill claimed that part of Ovid's trouble was his lack of respect towards Romulus, his inability to share Augustus' sentimental primitivism. Others have seen all criticism of Romulus as obliquely affecting Augustus, despite the fact that the Princeps in 27 B.C. chose *not* to take Romulus' name as his title. Certainly Romulus comes out badly in the comparison between them here: his rape of the Sabines is contrasted with the Augustan marriage law, and the death of Remus is treated first as neglect of the city's defences then as grounds for reproach (*F.* 2.134; 144). Why, Ovid adds, Romulus even depended on his father Mars for deification, whereas Octavian-Augustus bestowed divinity upon his father. In fact Caesar had put his own statue in the temple of Quirinus, the old republican deity identified with Romulus, but Augustus, who ensured Caesar's divinity, did nothing to enhance the ancient cult.

Ovid's celebration of the founding of Rome will actually provide an exoneration for Remus' death (at the hands of a too hasty subordinate, *F.* 4.843-4), though a pointed Vergilian allusion may seem to cancel the disclaimer.⁴⁰ But though Romulus,

⁴⁰ See on this A. Barchiesi, *Il Poeta e il Principe* (Roma, 1994) 19-53. Romulus' instruction to Celer: 'whoever dares to cross the wall or ditch consign him to slaughter' (*dede neci*, *F.* 4.840) echoes the advice of Vergil to his beekeeper on eliminating contending 'kings' that distract the swarm in *G.* 4.90. Does this mean Romulus knows

like Augustus, was descended from both Mars and Venus, he was neither a Julian nor an ancestor of the Princeps himself, as Augustus showed by setting Rome's first King *not* in the Julian sequence of the great Augustan forum, but in the opposite line of Roman worthies.

Augustus himself had claimed the protection of Apollo, and poets like Horace and Vergil had taken the cue. But there is little scope between January and June for Ovid to treat Apollo, whose principal festival occurred in July and whose great Actian temple was dedicated in October. There is more to interpret in Ovid's treatment of the ancestral gods of the Iulii Caesares, Mars and Venus, whose months and festivals belong to the first half of the year.

It could be a delicate conjunction: since Homer the adultery of Mars with Venus had been the best known celestial scandal (*fabula ... notissima caelo*: *A.A.* 2.561). Ovid himself told the story with as much relish in the *Metamorphoses* as in the elegiac *Art of Love*, and elegy itself would foster expectations of some eroticism in the handling of these sexually active deities. But in *Fasti* Ovid keeps silence on their shared adultery and speaks euphemistically of their separate adventures.

In *Ars Amatoria* 2.563-4 Ovid speaks of Mars in love as false to his heroic warrior function and generally as an erotic poet he privileges the metaphorical warfare of love over the real thing. In *Fasti* 3.1-2, where his theme is not love but religion (*sacra*), Ovid urges Mars to disarm before he enters the poem: he repeatedly associates Mars and his sphere of power with the uncouth and treats Romulus and his military victories as primitive in comparison with Numa (3.277 f.). On the other hand neither Mars' rape of Silvia nor his attempt to seduce virgin Minerva need alarm us, since the second is aborted and the first

his instruction will kill his rival? Or does it signal to the reader that the instruction, like that of Vergil's beekeeper, is for the good of the hive?

produced the heroic founder. Indeed Silvia's rape is tactfully introduced: 'Mars, you were disarmed when the Roman priestess took your heart' (3.9), 'Ilia was pleasing to Mars and gave birth to you, Romulus' (3.55); with Mars' proud boast 'Ilia was a successful mother by me' (3.233), these far outweigh the less inhibited machismo of 'Mars saw her and desired her, and took the woman he desired' (3.21). Yet there is much in Mars' version of the conception and early career of Romulus to support Hinds' detection of Ovidian distaste for Mars and his *arma*, perhaps also in favour of Byron Harries' argument that Ovid marks as the 'official version' whatever we hear from the divine interviewee.⁴¹ Even so Mars is Rome's champion: he spoke for Rome in the Ennian deification of Romulus-Quirinus in Book 2 (483–8), and he will act and speak again for Rome in Books 5 and 6, where his last appearance is at a council of the gods in the finest Ennian tradition (6.349–82).

One might also note Ovid's skill when he needs to bring together Mars and Venus in Book 4, through their roles as immediate and remote ancestors of both Augustus' Julian family and Rome's first founder. Ovid opens his appeal to Venus as Nourishing Mother, *alma*, in language that recalls Lucretius' opening *Aeneadum genetrix ... / alma Venus*, and swiftly turns to her role as Julian ancestress, linked through her union with prince Anchises to Aeneas, Romulus and ultimately Caesar. But Venus is equally hymned in *Fasti* 4.90–132 for her power over animal and human fertility and her role as a civiliser. As in *Ars Amatoria* 2 we are shown how she created human families and communities through sexual desire, but the emphasis is now on faithful monogamy: only in the sly suggestion that she created the arts of poetry and oratory by inspiring the locked out lover to serenade

⁴¹ Byron Harries, 'Causation and the Authority of the Poet in Ovid's *Fasti*', *CQ* 39 (1989), 164–85, an important study of the role played by Ovid's divine interlocutors in distorting narrative that concerns them.

his girl and plead his case does the old amorous Naso rear his head.⁴²

Two festivals in April are hers; the *Veneralia* and the *Vinalia*. The women of pleasure are represented at both celebrations, and there is a minor interlude which suggests that Ovid is still challenging orthodox sexuality. After the offering to Venus Verticordia, a respectable form of sexual patroness who turns women back to chaste behaviour and protects their morals and reputation (4.156, *mores et bona fama*), Ovid turns to the Pleiades, which rise on the next day, and allows himself a provocative explanation of the hidden sister, before returning to Roman mythical orthodoxy. The unseen star could be Electra veiling her head in grief for Troy, but it could also have been Merope ashamed to have been the mere wife of a mortal king when her sisters were all glorified by bedding with gods.

But Ovid has just told us that Venus conceived Aeneas with a mortal—and no hint of marriage. In the great Apologia of *Tristia* 2 he defended himself by pointing to the birth of Aeneas out of wedlock, not to reproach Venus for living up to her name, but to demonstrate the incongruity of Augustan fears for female virtue. In *Fasti* he is even more circumspect: Venus did not bed with (*concubuisse*, the usual term) Anchises; 'she deigned to take the name of parent in common with him' (*F.* 4.35–6); 'she was called Assaracus' daughter-in-law' (*F.* 4.123). Here too we will expect any irony to be at the expense of women's snobbery, against human respectability rather than drawing attention to Venus' divine sexual licence. Barchiesi is ambivalent about the Pleiades passage, arguing that it offends the ideological principle that ἀῖτια should add moral value to the rites and features they explain, or they do a disservice to Augustan discourse. A heavy responsibility, surely, for six lines of Hesiodic erudition quickly

⁴² I should acknowledge here a debt to Barchiesi (above, n.40), 209–16.

replaced by the patriotic alternative in Electra's grief for fallen Troy.

Now for one last deity, Vesta, and with her a load of Augustan, or Julian, baggage. Once again we will see Ovid's Augustanism contested. Vesta has only one traditional feast, the June *Vestalia*, within Ovid's six month sequence, but she is prominent in two other, more Augustan, contexts. In the first Ovid has her intervene to make him retell the assassination of Caesar on the Ides of March. *Praeteriturus eram*, he says—'I was going to pass over ... the assassins' swords'—and with remarkable literalness of mind several recent scholars explain this, not as a rhetorical figure affecting tactful avoidance of the tragic, but as a subtle disloyalty. Vesta it is (not Venus as in the parallel scene of *Metamorphoses* 15) who swoops down to rescue the soul of her priest and kinsman and set him in heaven and in his consecrated temple; Vesta too who affirms the rightness of vengeance by the new Caesar who earned his spurs at Philippi. Thus this symbolic tableau (*F.* 3.697–710) anticipates the celebration of Mars Ultor that will follow in Book 5. But before that, Vesta will return to end the book of April (*F.* 4.949–54) with the inauguration of the new cult of Palatine Vesta in the home of her kinsman Augustus, as sanctioned by the Senate. Now the Palatine residence has three gods: Vesta, Phoebus and *ipse*—Augustus, who needs no naming, since 12 B.C. the Pontifex Maximus, supreme in religious as in temporal authority.

In June Vesta dominates Ovid's book of the month, with a composite tribute of over two hundred lines. The poet rises to a new level of metaphysics in establishing the goddess' transcendent nature—as a divine power with no anthropomorphic image, and identifying this spirit of the ancestral hearth with the two most important elements—purifying fire and nourishing earth, both based on Varronian etymologies. At the centre of his celebration, in reporting the cult of Vesta and Jupiter Pistor, 'The Baker', Vesta joins with Mars, Venus and Romulus in pleading to Jupiter at a council of the gods to ensure Rome's survival of the

Gallic siege. Mars' extended speech of twenty lines, and the very elaboration of this scene on Olympus—recalling Mars' pleas for Romulus in *F.* 2.481–90—seems designed to cap the honours paid to previous Augustan deities. But it is in the *Vestalia* just *before* this climax that we meet what many have found an unconscionable lapse—the αἴτιον of the garlanded donkeys in Priapus' attempted rape of the goddess (*F.* 6.319–49)—a goddess whose chastity the poet has reiterated. Is he deliberately destabilising Vesta? I have argued elsewhere that the duplication of this comic frustration of Priapus in Book 1 (391–440) represents Ovid's *rewriting*, because he had recognised the unsuitability of his fiction (*mendacia vatium*) to the dignity of Vesta—and surely to the official standing of the goddess who maintained the generative continuity of Rome. Embarrassed by his own fiction of the failed assault on Vesta, Ovid redirected Priapus' lust in a palpably similar narrative when he began to revise the first book of his poem.⁴³

Let me end with an example of Ovid's tactful treatment of the dynasty. Not for the *Fasti* the heavy irony of the claim in *Tristia* 2 that if Livia had not existed Augustus (the much-married) would have had to remain a bachelor. Taking a leaf from the sixth book of the *Aeneid*, Ovid's Carmenta acts as Sibyl and Anchises rolled into one, foretelling the future greatness of Rome, and of Carmenta's counterpart as mother, Livia Augusta:

Burn, then, victorious flames, Neptune's fair Troy:
these ashes shall rise high above the globe,
Aeneas soon shall bring two holy things,
her gods and his own father: Vesta, welcome them.
The time shall come when one protector guards
them and this world, a god himself shall serve

⁴³

Since I argued this point in *HSCP* 87 (1983), 201–210, Gareth Williams has offered a defence of the Priapus episode in 'Vocal Variation and Narrative Complexity in Ovid's *Vestalia*: *Fasti* 6.249–468', *Ramus* 20 (1991), 183–204: but on this issue in his otherwise excellent paper I am not convinced.

their worship and our fatherland's good care
 stay with the Augusti. Let it be right and meet
 for this their house to hold the reins of state.
 Then, though he hesitates, the god's own son
 shall bear his father's load with mind inspired;
 just as unceasing altar-fires shall burn for me.
 Julia Augusta too shall be divine. (F. 1.525-36)

I apologise for this uninspired translation, and realise you may well feel that the thought too lacks inspiration. This is the exiled Ovid writing, at least the last few lines when Tiberius and Livia have outlived Augustus.⁴⁴ But the orthodoxy of his tone and authority of his speaker soften the shocking novelty of the imperial deification here sanctified by Carmenta's prophecy.

Perhaps the tide is turning, and we shall be able to appreciate the skill of Ovid's courtly *Fasti* without hankering to find a second and subversive reading. Ovid's essential posture of loyalty to Augustus and his house before and during his exile has been powerfully reaffirmed by Fergus Millar in his recent Presidential address to the Roman Society,⁴⁵ and this year another salutary voice has been raised by the Australian historian, Geraldine Herbert-Brown, in her religious and historical study, *Ovid and the Fasti*. Herbert-Brown examines Ovid's treatment of Augustus' own self-presentation, and of the emerging dynasty—of Livia, Tiberius and Germanicus—as well as of Augustus himself. She shows how Ovid was able to transcend the formal *Fasti*, using the anniversary of a long decayed temple to celebrate Augustus' role as temple builder and restorer; how he could be helpfully selective, importing memories of Father Julius where it served Augustus' role as avenger, while omitting Caesar's unloved civil war victories: in such delicate passages there is great skill in the way that

⁴⁴ For a slightly different assessment see Herbert-Brown (above, n.2), 159-62.

⁴⁵ 'Ovid and the *domus Augusta*: Rome seen from Tomi', *JRS* 83 (1993), 1-17.

allusive poetic language meets the ideological problems arising from the Julian heritage. Above all Herbert-Brown demonstrates clearly how Ovid understood and expressed Augustus' transformation of the role of Pontifex Maximus for which he had waited so long. By his creation of a second, domestic shrine of Vesta—the Trojan, now Julian Vesta—in the Palatine precinct, the emperor reinterpreted the office and the goddess. In his turn, in passages like the one I have quoted above, the poet identified Augustus' priestly service with the perpetuation of Rome and her empire.

Others may speak of the emperor's new trappings, and in republican or libertarian spirit seek to make of Ovid the little boy who saw the nakedness beneath the sham. He certainly was not blind, and there is evidence in his national and celebratory poem that he was not comfortable with all that Augustus had changed around him. But it has been my contention today that those who see only hostility and subversive innuendo have misunderstood both the poet's choice and his skill in giving what was due to his art and his emperor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1957-8

P. Ovidius Naso: *Die Fasten*, I and II, ed. F. Bömer (Heidelberg) 1978

P. Ovidi Nasonis *Fastorum Libri Sex*, ed. E. Alton, D. Wormell, E. Courtney (1985²) (Leipzig)

R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford)

G.W. Williams, *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (Berkeley)

1979

W.R. Johnson, 'The Desolation of the *Fasti*', *CW* 74, 7-18

1984

J. McKeown, 'Fabula proposita nulla tegenda meo: Ovid's *Fasti* and Augustan Politics' in A.J. Woodman and D. West (edd.), *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus* (Cambridge) 169–87

1987

A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus and the *Fasti*' in P. Hardie, M. and M. Whitby (edd.), *Homo Viator* (Bristol) 221–30

S. Hinds, 'Generalizing about Ovid' in A.J. Boyle (ed.), *The Imperial Muse* (= *Ramus* 16) 4–31

1989

B. Harries, 'Causation and the Authority of the Poet in Ovid's *Fasti*', *CQ* 39, 164–85

1991

P. Hardie, 'The Janus Episode in Ovid's *Fasti*', *MD* 26, 47–64.

A. Barchiesi, 'Discordant Muses', *PCPS* 37, 1–21

1992

D. 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) 1–25

D. Kennedy, 'Augustan and Anti-Augustan: Reflections on Terms of Reference', *ibid.* 26–58

S. Hinds, 'Arma and the *Fasti*', *Arethusa* 25 (*The Rediscovery of Ovid's Fasti*) 81–149

[See also the papers in this volume by Fantham, Johnson, Newlands, Miller and Phillips.]

1994

A. Barchiesi, *Il Poeta e il Principe: Ovidio e il Discorso Augusteo* (Roma–Bari)

G. Herbert-Brown, *Ovid and the Fasti: A Historical Study* (Oxford)

1995

C. Newlands, *Playing with Time: a Study of Ovid's Fasti* (Ithaca)

1996

N. Krevans, *The Poet as Editor: the Poetic Book from Callimachus to Ovid* (Princeton)

POETRY AND PHILOSOPHY IN FIRST-CENTURY B.C. ROME:
LUCRETIUS AND THE NATURE OF THE UNIVERSE

H.D. Jocelyn

It is my task this evening to honour the memory of Frederick Augustus Todd. No easy task, for Todd belongs to a period of our history which is too far away to be understood readily and yet not far enough to be discussed calmly. He was a product of the Sydney High School and the University of Sydney of the last decade of the nineteenth century. After two years of further study in the Universities of Leipzig and Jena he returned to Sydney in 1903 to devote the remaining 41 years of his life to the study of Greek and Latin literature, to the teaching of the Latin language to the young, to the administration of the University, and to various educational activities then more closely linked to the University than they are now. He married fairly late in life the daughter of an Anglican clergyman. He served as a military censor in the 1914–1918 and 1939–1945 wars with Germany. Through the socially and politically troubled 1920s and 1930s he supported with vigour a conservative view of how the Commonwealth of Australia and the State of New South Wales should be made to function. Despite his relatively humble origins—he was the son of an Alexandria bootmaker—he became, like his teacher Thomas John Butler (1857–1937)—the son of a Windsor draper—, a member of the University's professoriate. The best of his pupils, George Pelham Shipp (1900–1980), also devoted the whole of his working life to the University.

Todd's part in the founding in 1909 of the Classical Association of N.S.W. and his long service as an officer of that society require mention on an occasion like this. What he effected brought him many admirers. The English and Welsh parent body united at a time of educational ferment (1903) teachers of Greek and Latin from the schools and universities and lay people who had had themselves a classical education and wanted one for their own children. The two bodies wrestled in a similar way