ABSTRACT

The Pseudo-Ovidian *Consolatio ad Liviam de Morte Drusi*: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary

Walker Christian Bailey

Director: Alden Smith, Ph.D.

This thesis constitutes a fresh treatment of the first third (vv. 1-127) of the *Consolatio ad Liviam*, a Latin elegy of unknown date and authorship which seeks to console the wife of Augustus, Livia, on the death of her second son, Drusus, in 9 BC. The commentary places a special emphasis on the Ovidian nature of the poem, particularly the manner in which the poet seems to utilize erotic Ovidian imagery to describe Livia's love for her lost son and the poet's strange admixture of masculine and feminine encomiastic terms to describe Livia, a phenomenon closely matched in Ovid's letters *Ex Ponto*.

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESIS:

_____

Dr. Alden Smith, Department of Classics

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM:

_____

Dr. Elizabeth Corey, Director

DATE: _____

THE PSEUDO-OVIDIAN *CONSOLATIO AD LIVIAM DE MORTE DRUSI*: INTRODUCTION, TRANSLATION, AND COMMENTARY

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Baylor University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Honors Program

By

Walker Bailey

Waco, Texas

May 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

Composing this thesis has been one of the longest, most challenging, and most rewarding projects I have ever undertaken. I am deeply thankful to my faculty mentors, namely Julia Hejduk, Alden Smith, Timothy Heckenlively, Simon Burris, Jeffrey Fish, Joseph and Meghan Diluzio, Ralph Wood, and Junius Johnson. Together, these men and women have left me with a deep, keen, and indelible love for language and poetry. Additionally, I want to express special thanks to James O'Hara for flying down to Texas to sit on my defense panel. I also owe my deepest gratitude to my dear friends who have been at my side and helped me bear the weight of this work: namely, Andrew and Nathaniel Eberlein, Hogan Herritage, Colton Towns, Christian Brandon, Cynthia Liu, Josephy Lloyd, William Stover, Clayton Mills, Aaron Carter, Kara Kopchinski, and Madeleine Sullivan. I also want to express my deepest thanks to the priest and parishioners of St. Andrews Orthodox Church, who have consistently kept me on my feet with their constant warmth, support, and prayer. Over all these wonderful people I must thank my parents, Mika and Michael Bailey, who have always showered me with unwavering love and support. There is one woman, however, who deserves thanks and praise above and beyond all those listed thus far, the pinnacle of earthly beauty and a wellspring of grace, with whom I will spend even my dying day; this thesis is dedicated to her.

Uxori Futurae

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The Poem

The *Consolatio ad Liviam de Morte Drusi* is a consolatory poem comprising 474 lines of elegiac verse. The addressee of the consolation is Livia Drusilla, Augustus' third wife and the mother of Tiberius Claudius Nero and Nero Claudius Drusus, the children of the empress' previous marriage to statesman Tiberius Claudius Nero.[1] The occasion of Livia's consolation is the death of Livia's second son, Drusus; returning from a campaign to Germany, Drusus fell from a horse and suffered injuries which quickly led to his death. Tiberius, rushing to Drusus' side, was able to briefly convene with his brother before he died.[2] Tiberius transported the body to Ticinum where he met Augustus and Livia. Drusus, as the poet emphasizes (vv. 95-100), died absent from his mother, who encountered her son's body only after it had undergone a significant journey. After the funeral rites in Rome—which, as multiple sources elaborate,[3] had the aspect of a triumph—Drusus' ashes were interred in the *Mausoleum Augusti*.

My treatment of the *Consolatio* covers the first 127 lines of the poem, a portion of the work which exhibits much of the poem's characteristic oddity and mournful energy.

---

[1] For a thorough discussion of Livia's divorce and marriage to Octavian, see Freisenbruch 2010:12-17.

[2] For the details of Drusus' death and funeral, see Dio 55.2.1-3 and Levick 1993:11.

[3] See comment ad vv. 25-28

The *Consolatio* is an extremely dynamic poem, rapidly alternating between consolatory commonplaces, encomium, and plaintive speech. To account for these complexities, I have developed the following organizational scheme for the work:

1-12: Programmatic statement of the poem as a *miserabile carmen*, direct address to Livia

13-20: Introduction to Drusus and *res gestae* of his military feats

21-30: Image of Livia's reversed expectations: a funeral, not a triumph, awaits Drusus

31-36: Livia's first mournful speech, elaborating on her reversed expectations

37-58: Encomium of Livia, censure of Fortuna

59-74: Direct address to Augustus and catalogue of burials in the *Mausoleum Augusti*

75-82: Direct address and encomium of Drusus

83-94: Elaboration of Tiberius' brotherhood with Drusus and presence at Drusus' death

95-104: Elaboration on Livia's absence from Drusus death and description of grief

105-112: Mythological *exempla* describing Livia's grief

113-120: Extended description of Livia's tears

121-127: Initiation of Livia's speech

Multiple aspects of the poet's[4] style are peculiar and noteworthy. The collective work of commentators Witlox and Schoonhoven—to which many of the interexts cited in my commentary are indebted—have thoroughly catalogued the Ovidian nature of the poem. In my own study of the poem, I have observed that this Ovidian diction oftentimes seems to carry Ovid's characteristic eroticism. Indeed, C seems to consistently apply vocabulary appropriate to a bereaved lover, such as one of the *Heroides,* directly into the

[4] For convenience, I will refer to the author of the *Consolatio* below as "C."

speeches of Livia. Accordingly, I have devoted a good deal of my commentary to the explication of this phenomenon.

As readers will observe even in the poem's introductory lines, C seems quite fond of elaborate—if not overly complicated—syntactical constructions. The poem is rife with anaphora and apostrophic rhetorical questions, two qualities which contribute to what seems to be an exasperated—but meditative—tone. Additionally, in vv. 83-85, the poet produces a short gamma acrostic, a poetic flourish which, as I comment *ad loc.*[5], seems to be particularly Ovidian.

While it is difficult to detect any of Ovid's simple elegance in the *Consolatio*, my study of the text has led me to believe that C's engagement with the Ovidian corpus is deeper than rote imitation. As Thomas Jenkins has recently argued, the *Consolatio* does commit to a novel endeavor in its treatment of Livia, attempting to reconcile a description of her unprecedented political power and her traditional Roman femininity (2009: 1). As Jenkins asserts, the language applied to Livia in the poem is characteristically masculine elsewhere in the corpus of Roman literature, and accordingly its application to Livia in the *Consolatio* is novel and difficult to interpret (2009: 7-9). It seems that C is committed to imitating the form of Roman elegy in his consolation, and many extant expressions of feminine grief in the Roman elegiac corpus—especially in the works of Ovid—are located within the mournful speeches of bereaved lovers. Perhaps, then, the apparent eroticism which C applies to Livia's speeches constitutes an attempt to import poetic language from its native context into a novel one, an attempt similar to that which Jenkins

[5] Throughout this thesis, I utilize the abbreviation *ad loc*. to cite comments at specific line numbers.

notes regarding Livia's strangely masculine description in the poem. Even if the poet's appropriation of this language appears clumsy and awkward, its strangeness and its innovative nature seem worthy of scholarly attention.

The Consolatory Tradition

Extant manuscripts attribute various titles to the poem at hand,[6] but most modern scholars refer to the text as either the *Consolatio ad Liviam* or *Epicedion Drusi*.[7] Both of these titles—and, indeed, the contents of the text itself—locate the *Cons*. within an ancient and dynamic tradition of consolatory literature. A basic understanding of this tradition is, in my view, essential for interpreting the text, and thus I have produced a summary of this tradition and the *Cons.'* position within it below.

Consoling the bereaved is a basic human instinct; naturally, then, a popular, oral tradition preceded the production of literary consolations and the distillation of specific generic boundaries for consolatory writing. The traditional, oral forms of Greek lament—the *threnos*, *goos*, and *kommos*—find primordial poetic manifestations as early as Homer, and Pindar and Simonides both supply examples of such threnodies within the corpus of Greek Lyric poetry. The rise of rhetoric and the literary impetus of Athenian society were quick to embrace and subsume these earlier forms of lament. Two literary expressions of grief—the *epitaphios logos* and the *epicedion*, speeches and poems composed

[6] See Schoonhoven 1992: 65-9 for a thorough account an analysis of the various titles attributed to the poem.

[7] For convenience, I will refer to the *Consolatio ad Liviam* below as "*Cons*."

specifically for recitation at funerals—came to replace earlier oral laments (Alexiou 2002: 107).[8]

The poetics of Greek lamentation inevitably found firm manifestation and further development in the Latin tongue. Horace, who explicitly expressed his knowledge of Greek poetic lamentation,[9] produced profound expressions of lament and consolation,[10] and the works of Catullus,[11] Propertius,[12] Ovid,[13] and Statius[14] all contain striking examples of poetic lament and consolation for the bereaved. Additionally, Roman *carmina epigraphica* and other epitaphs frequently express sentiments and formulae consonant with the broader consolatory condition, some of which seem to be emulated in the *Cons.*[15]

Latin prose offers numerous examples of consolatory writing as well. The seminal point of transmission for prose *consolationes* into the Latin tongue appears to be Cicero's

---

[8] See Alexiou 2002: 102-108 for a detailed account of oral lamentation and its generic development in the Greek tongue.

[9] Concerning Greek elegiac lamentation, Horace notes: *versibus impariter iunctis querimonia primum / post etiam inclusa est voti sententia compos* (*Ars Poet.* 75-6).

[10] See especially *C.* 1.24, a consolatory lament written to Virgil on the death of a mutual friend and 1.33, a consolation to Horace's friend Albius on the loss of love.

[11] See Cat. 96, a consolation written to the poet's friend Calvus after the death of his wife.

[12] See Prop. 3.7, an elegiac lament written concerning the death of Paetus.

[13] See especially Ovid *Pont.* 4.11, a consolation to the Gallius on the death of his wife.

[14] See Silv. 5.1, a consolation to Abscantius on the death of his wife.

[15] For a thorough treatment of consolatory themes in Greek and Roman epitaphs, see Lattimore 1962: 215-64.

self-addressed consolation regarding the death of his daughter Tullia,[16] ostensibly a direct interpretation of *Peri Penthous,* the lost consolatory treatise of Crantor of Soli.[17] The true *loci classici* of Latin prose consolations—and, it seems, the prose works which exhibit the most relatedness the *Cons*.[18]—are those of Seneca the Younger. These letters, most notably *Ad Marciam* and *Ad Polybium* (*dial*. 6 and 7), are characterized by their philosophical, universalizing approach to consolation; multiple passages in these works have close parallels in the *Cons*., and in some cases nearly identical diction and phraseology.[19]

The Textual and Critical Tradition

This thesis does not contain a novel critical text or *apparatus criticus*, nor does it levy many opinions regarding disputed readings in the text.[20] Accordingly, I will treat the textual and critical tradition of the text here only briefly.

The most recent and fullest account of the *Cons*.' transmission is that of Schoonhoven (1992: 40-71); additionally, Richmond offers a very concise treatment of the subject with an extensive bibliography (1981: 2768-9). Relatively few manuscripts of the text are extant, and each is the product of the 15th century, an age notorious for its

---

[17] Crantor of Soli's *peri penthous* is believed to consist of a philosophical consolation to a certain Hippocles on the occasion of his death. For a discussion of Crantor's work and it's transmission to Cicero, see Scourfield 1993: 18-20.

[18] In *ad Marciam*, Seneca provides a full account of Livia's pious grief during Drusus' funeral, holding up the empress as an *exemplum* of maternal grief (3.1-2).

[19] For detailed accounts of these similarities, see Richmond 1981: 2776-7 and Jenkins 2009: 3-4.

[20] A notable exception to this statement can be found in my comment ad *v.* 34.

production of corrupt manuscripts.[21] Sixteen manuscripts of the text exist, eleven of which are bundled with other Ovidian works. The most significant recent development regarding the textual tradition of the *Cons.* is undoubtedly the discovery of a new manuscript, Z,by M.D. Reeve.[22]

Multiple editions of the *Cons*. are extant, the earliest of which (1471) originated in Rome. Notably, manuscripts F (1483), U (1474), and V (1493) were composed *after* the earliest extant edition of the text, and thus it has been conjectured that the Roman (1471) and Venetian (1474) editions are crucial for the poem's tradition (Richmond 1981: 2768). The most recent modern edition of the text is that of Henk Schoonhoven, which reflects the results of Reeve's thorough stemmatic inquires and his discovery of manuscript Z.[23] For the basis of my commentary, however, I have chosen to use J.H. Mozley's Loeb edition; while Schoonhoven's edition is attractive and updated, my study of the *Cons.* has convinced me that his tendency to resist the text's inherent eroticism is misguided.[24]

Date and Authorship

[21] Richmond notes that fifteenth-century manuscripts harbor "inevitable contamination."

[22] See Reeve 1983 for an account of this discovery; see Schoonhoven 1992: 43-44 for discussion of this discovery's implications for the textual tradition of the *Cons*.

[23] See Schoonhoven 1992 : 40 for the critic's own account of Reeve's contributions and their implications for a critical edition.

[24] The primary manifestation of this tendency can be found in Schoonhoven's reading of v. 34.

See my comment *ad loc*.

The date and authorship of any text are inextricably connected, and thus it seems appropriate to treat these two aspects of the *Cons.* here in a single section. The poem's date and the identity of its author still remain unknown, and these two questions have remained the primary *loci* of scholarly debate concerning the work. After reviewing the arc of existing scholarship pertaining to these topics, I will posit my own observations.

Scholars have recently proffered a variety dates for the poem, but the majority locate the poem's composition at some point within the late Augustan or Tiberian periods. Richmond brackets the text's composition within the years 12 C.E. and 37 C.E. (1981); Schrijvers reads the poem as a response to the death of Germanicus (Drusus' son), and accordingly assigns a Tiberian *terminus post quem* of 19 C.E. for the poem's composition (1988). Fraschetti argues for an authentic date (that of Drusus' death in 9 B.C.E) (1996), while Schoonhoven departs from the general consensus, assigning the date 54 C.E., directly following the death of Claudius and preceding the ascension of Nero (1992). Cogitore, after a detailed analysis of the poem's imprecision regarding the details of Drusus' funeral and its subsequent events, concludes that the poem is the product of an "*exercice purement rhetorique"* of an unknown date (1994).

My own study has not left me with any reason to doubt a late Augustan or early Tiberian date for the poem's composition. However, the text's apparent inundation with late Ovidian material (which I treat more thoroughly below) does firmly convince me, following Richmond, to reject an authentic date for the poem (9 BC).[25] The section of the text covered by my commentary places a particular emphasis on the person of Livia, and

[25] See the excerpt below from Richmond 1981:2776.

the most controversial component of this poetic discourse—the encomium of the empress (vv. 41-50)—does seem to provide some reinforcement for the *opinio communis* of the poem's date. As I discuss more thoroughly below, this section of the text attributes a strange mixture of traditional female and male virtues to the empress, a phenomenon which has recently sparked scholarly inquiry into the text's general treatment of Livia's gender and unique authoritarian role.[26] Recent studies in Roman epigraphy seem to affirm that such a juxtaposition of masculine and feminine virtues in female encomium are not alien to general period established for the poem's date. The *Laudatio Turiae*, an extended funerary inscription of of the late 1st century B.C.E., attributes a similar combination of male and female virtues to the deceased wife of an aristocrat.[27] The existence of such an inscription reveals that female *encomium* such as Livia's in the *Cons*. did exist even before Drusus' death in 9 B.C.E., and thus further commends the possibility of an Augustan or Tiberian date for the poem.

Any discussion of the *Cons.*' authorship must, it seems, account for its consistent and distinct Ovidian nature. Indeed, the sheer density of Ovidian expressions in the *Cons*. is a phenomenon frequently noted and systematically enumerated.[28] Yet the mere

---

[26] See Jenkins 2009: 7-9 for a thorough treatment of this section. Purcell takes Livia's depiction in the *Cons.* as the starting point for an extended discussion of Livia's political status (1986).

[27] Some such masculine virtues attributed to the woman are *virtus*, *firmitas animi, constantia*, and *patientia*. See Hemelrijk 2004: 188-190 for a detailed analysis of these qualities.

[28] Richmond notes that "imitation of earlier poets, especially of Ovid, passes the bounds of usual Roman practice" (Richmond 2772: 1981). Schoonhoven has produced an appendix which catalogues each Ovidian line and expression in the *Cons*. (see 1992: Appendix G). In sum, he notes 34 whole lines and 58 phrases which have identical or near-identical parallels in the Ovidian corpus.

frequency of the text's verbal and syntactical similarities to the Ovidian corpus has not convinced any modern scholar of the text's Ovidian authorship. Indeed, the current and longstanding *opinio communis*[29] regarding the interrelation of the texts maintains that the *Cons*.' Ovidian style and diction is the production of a poet directly—and, perhaps, clumsily—copying Ovid.[30] [31] Richmond succinctly defends the notion of C having drawn from the Ovidian text, rather than *vice versa*:

> That Ovid must be the source is overwhelmingly certain for two reasons: (1) an analysis of the individual passages shows that they often fit into their contexts more naturally in Ovid than in the 'Consolatio'; (2) passages written by Ovid before 9 B.C must have been imitated by the author of the 'Consolatio': it is very improbable that Ovid for the rest of his life imitated a poetaster who had earlier imitated him. (1981: 2776)

If this view is to be accepted, it seems very likely that C has extensively imitated—or plagiarized—Ovid.

While my own study of the text has not placed me at odds with the general consensus that the poem is pseudo-Ovidian, I have become convinced that the nature of C's utilization of Ovidian sources ought to be revisited. I suspect that the poet's imitation of Ovid may be more sophisticated than mere verbal and syntactical imitation; in my

---

[29] Haupt produced the seminal assertion regarding the text's copied nature; he attributed the *Cons*. to the hand of a Renaissance forger, a claim that has since been disproven. See Richmond 1981: 2770 for a discussion of Haupt's original work and its reception.

[30] Richmond notes "the impression is conveyed of an author who has learned in the rhetorical schools how to construct his poem, but lacks imagination and the power to put himself in the reader's shoes… ineptness is to be seen" (1981: 2771-2772).

[31] A rejection of the text's Ovidian nature is further commended by Platnauer's statistical analysis of the poem's prosody. He notes that the frequency of fourth-foot caesuras, elisions of long vowels and diphthongs, and non-caesural hexameters render the poem "clearly un-Ovidian" (1951: 118).

view, some significant interpretive element seems to be present. This conclusion is based on a series of peculiar connections which I have observed between the same *locus* of the text which I have treated above—the author's encomium of Livia in vv. 41-50—and Ovid's own extended description of Livia in his third epistle written *ex ponto*. It should be noted, of course, that the conventional date of this Ovidian epistle, 13 AD,[32] does place the work well after Drusus' death.

However novel and noteworthy the author of the *Cons*.' attribution of both feminine and masculine qualities to Livia may be, Ovid employs a nearly identical mixture of terms to describe the empress in his third epistle *Ex Ponto*. Over the course of fifty-two lines (vv. 114-166), Ovid composes both a detailed description of Livia's merciful demeanor and specific instructions regarding the manner in which his addressee (his wife) ought to elicit a pardon from the benign empress on Ovid's behalf. As Ovid begins his description of Livia, he praises her *virtus*, *pudicitia*, and *mores*, which he opposes to *saecula nostra*. Additionally, he emphasizes her chastity to a singular "bed" (*toro*) in a manner typical of traditional Roman epigraphic encomium:

> quae praestat virtute sua, ne prisca vetustas
> laude pudicitiae saecula nostra premat:
> Quae Veneris formam, mores Iunonis habendo
> Sola est caelesti digna reperta toro (115-118).

[32] For the date of *Pont.* 3, see Larosa 2013: 5-8.

While *pudicitia* certainly exists in the pantheon of the traditional Roman female *mores,*[33] *virtus* does not.[34] While this image may seem unconventional, the *Cons.* exhibits a strikingly similar image of Livia. After producing a short speech in the person of Livia (vv. 31-36), the author of the *Consolatio* begins an encomium which produces an image of the empress almost identical to Ovid's:

> Quid tibi nunc mores prosunt actumque pudice
> Omne aevom et tanto tam placuisse viro?
> Quidque pudicitia tantum cumulasse bonorum,
> Ultima sit laudes inter ut illa tuas?
> Quid tenuisse animum contra sua saecula rectum,
> Altius et vitiis exeruisse caput?
> Nec nocuisse ulli et fortunam habuisse nocendi,
> Nec quemquam nervos extimuisse tuos?
> Nec vires errasse tuas campove forove
> Quamque licet citra constituisse domum? (*Cons.* 41-50).

Here, as in Ovid's description, Livia is set apart from her contemporary age (*contra sua saecula rectum*) by her *mores*, which consist of her chastity (*pudice, pudictia*), with a special emphasis on her loyal, monogamous marriage to Augustus (*placuisse viro*), as well as two forms of "power" (*nervos*, *vires*). *Nervos* and *vires*, like *virtus* in Ovid's description of Livia (*Pont*. 3.115), are particularly masculine qualities.[35] Additionally, *Pont*. 3.1.125 , Ovid titles the empress "chief woman" (*femina...princeps*), a

[33] See comment *ad* v. 43.

[34] As Larosa comments *ad loc*., this is the only extant attribution of *virtus* to a Roman empress. See my comment *ad* v. 49, *vires,* for a discussion of this term's particularly masculine resonance.

[35] The author also references Livia's *vires* at line 117. See comments *ad* vv. 48 and 49, *nervos* and *vires*.

title which closely matches C's appellation of the empress in v. 303: *femina tu princeps*.[36] Both authors, then, present similarly novel images of the empress, images which seemingly attempt reconcile Livia's façade of traditional femininity with her burgeoning political power.[37]

As Ovid's plea continues, he suggests that his wife should approach Livia with a pitiful show of tears: *tum lacrimis demenda mora est, summissaque terra /*
ad non mortalis bracchia tende pedes (149-150). Ovid's concept of a "delay of tears" (*mora lacrimis*) closely matches the "delay of weeping" (*flendi mora*) which Livia fails to maintain in the *Cons*. After presenting various *exempla* of maternal lament (vv. 105-112), the author fashions an extended and graphic description of Livia's grief (vv. 113-118), which she finally fails to restrain: *In vires abiit flendi mora: plenior unda / defluit, exigua siqua retenta mora* (117-118). The sum of these similarities does not seem merely to constitute a mass of copied diction and borrowed phrases. Rather, the *Cons.* and *Pont*. 3 share a complex image of the empress, rich with unconventional—and almost identical—details.

Yet there is one aspect of Livia's description in the *Cons*. which radically diverges from Ovid's treatment of the empress. Like C, Ovid describes Livia to his wife with a series of mythological *exempla* (vv. 119-124). Unlike C, however, Ovid employs

---

[36] The author of the *Cons.* also suggests Livia's status as *princeps* in vv. 343-344: *femina digna… / principibus natis, principe digna viro*.

[37] See Jenkins 2009: 7-9 for a particularly instructive analysis of *Cons.* vv. 41-50. He concludes that "the author is grappling with the real difficulties of representing Livia's *auctoritas* in language appropriate to her gender: by stressing Livia's feminine restraint, he paradoxically emphasizes her newly exercised 'male' powers of influence and even intimidation."

his *exempla* to describe what the empress is *not*. At the forefront of Ovid's *exempla*-wicked women with which the poet contrasts Livia's own rectitude-readers find *impia Procne*, the wife of king Tereus who slew her own son to avenge the rape of her sister:[38] *quid trepidas et adire times? non impia Procne* / *filiave Aeëtae voce movenda tua est* (*Pont*. 3. 119-120).

In light of Ovid's treatment of Procne's story in the Metamorphoses-a particularly graphic and dramatic account of the myth-she seems to constitute a very apt *exemplum* of maternal wickedness. Notably, however, C employs the very same *exemplum* to the opposite effect. Readers find Procne (post filicide) at the fore of a set of *exempla* which ostensibly describe Livia's pious grief: *Talis in umbrosis, mitis nunc denique, silvis* / *deflet Threicium Daulias ales Ityn* (*Cons.* 105-106). Given the apparent relatedness of the *Cons*. to Ovid's *Pont*. 3, it seems impossible that C would have been unaware of Ovid's negative use of the *exemplum*. Of course, it is possible that C was simply *prompted* by Ovid to utilize Procne and simply flipped the sense of the *exemplum* to fit its context, but it seems that he would have had to account for his audience's potential familiarity with the Ovidian material. If a reader were to recognize the Ovidian resonance of the poem as whole, this inversion of Ovid's own *exemplum* could have struck a dissonant note.

One possible explanation for this phenomenon—although it may seem too radical to accept—is that C has intentionally transplanted Ovid's Procne (the filicide) into the poem, and thus C presents readers with a covert, nasty insult to the empress. This idea is bolstered, perhaps, by the fact that C pairs the *exemplum* of Procne with that of the sisters

[38] See comment ad vv. 105-106.

of Meleager, another victim of maternal filicide, and the sisters of Phaethon, a victim of his father's own fatal blunder (vv. 109-112).

If C has, in fact, intentionally inverted Ovid's *exemplum*, then he may partially escape the charge of simply being an Ovidian plagiarist. Such an inversion would constitute an *interpretation* of the Ovidian material, a witty, dangerous wrinkle of poetic subversion consonant with Ovid's own.[39] It should be noted that murderous tendencies are attributed to Livia elsewhere. Dio records that Livia was suspected of murdering her nephew, Marcellus,[40] and both Dio and Tacitus (56.30.1-2, Ann. 1.5) record that she was suspected of murdering Augustus himself. If C's reversal of Ovid's *exemplum* does constitute a jab at the empress, then, it does not stand alone.

Whatever the case, I have become convinced that the *Consolatio* deserves a much higher level of scrutiny than it has been traditionally given. If scholars meet the text with preconceived notions about its literary merits, they only do themselves a disservice. Roman elegy, whether that of Propertius, Tibullus, or Ovid, is set apart from other forms of poetry by its playful—and oftentimes undermining—interaction with poetic precedents. Although the *Cons*. is ostensibly serious and somber, the assumption that it completes its consolatory task in an entirely straightforward manner seems foolhardy. Even one small chip in the poem's facade might be enough to reveal that the whole structure is corrupt

[39] See Gaisser 1977: 381-391 and Heyworth 2009: 269 for discussions of Ovid's tendency to utilize myths and mythological exempla to sly and subversive ends.

[40] See comment *ad* v. 65.

CHAPTER TWO

Translation

Woman who seemed blessed for so long, woman called of late “mother of the Neros”,
now half this name has left you;
now you read, Livia, a mournful ode for Drusus,
now you only have one to call you “mother”;
5) your devotion does not stretch you with the love of two;
When your son’s name is mentioned, you do not ask “which?”;
who dares to set boundaries on your grief?
Who calms the tears on your face?
Alas, how easy it is (although this pain affects all)
10) to speak these brave words to another's grief:
“You were struck by a thin bolt of lighting,
that you can be stronger by your calamities.”
He is dead: a youth, a venerable example of morals,
he was the fiercest in war, the most dignified in peace.
15) He recently ripped the shadowy alps from the enemy,
and bore the title “ruler of war” with his brother king.
With rage he crushed the race of the Suevi and the indomitable Sicambri
and he put the savage bands into flight,
he earned an unknown triumph for you, Roman,

Visa diu felix, “mater” modo dicta “Neronum,”
iam tibi dimidium nominis huius abest;
iam legis in Drusum miserabile, Livia, carmen,
unum qui dicat iam tibi “mater” habes,
nec tua te pietas distendit amore duorum,
nec posito fili nomine dicis “uter?”
et quisquam leges audet tibi dicere flendi?
et quisquam lacrimas temperat ore tuas?
ei mihi, quam facile est, (quamvis hoc contigit omnes)
alterius luctu fortia verba loqui!
“Scilicet exiguo percussa es fulminis ictu,
fortior ut possis cladibus esse tuis.”
Occidit exemplum iuvenis venerabile morum:
maximus ille armis, maximus ille toga.
Ille modo eripuit latebrosas hostibus Alpes
et titulum belli dux duce fratre tulit:
ille genus Suevos acre indomitosque Sicambros
contudit inque fugam barbara terga dedit,
ignotumque tibi meruit, Romane, triumphum,

and he bore your authority into new lands.

Ignorant of your fate, mother, you were preparing to pay vows to Jove,

to pay vows to the arm-bearing goddess,

to sate father Gravidus with gifts,

and whatever gods whose worship is just and pious.

With the mind of a mother you were considering sacred triumphs,

perchance even the chariot was in your cares then.

The rites of death, not the rites of triumph, must be lead by you;

the pyre waits for Drusus, not Jupiter's hill.

You imagined him returned, in your mind you cherished delights

anticipated, and he, then, stood victorious before your eyes:

“soon he will come, and the throng will see me rejoicing;

soon my gifts must be brought forth to my Drusus.

I will march through the streets and I will be called blessed on account of my sons;

I will press my lips to his neck, his mouth, and his eyes.

Thus will it be, thus he will run to me, thus will he join my kisses;

thus will he speak, but I will speak first.

You cherish great delights; but put away, most miserable woman, your false hope;

cease to speak joyfully of your Drusus.

That need of Caesar, the second part of your prayer,

died: loose, Livia, your unbecoming hair.

Of what avail are your morals, your whole life lived chastely

or to have pleased so well such a husband?

protulit in terras imperiumque novas.
solvere vota Iovi fatorum ignara tuorum,
mater, et armiferae solvere vota deae
Gradivumque patrem donis implere parabas
et quoscumque coli est iusque piumque deos,
maternaque sacros agitabas mente triumphos,
forsitan et curae iam tibi currus erat.
funera pro sacris tibi sunt ducenda triumphis
et tumulus Drusum pro Iovis arce manet.
fingebas reducem praeceptaque mente fovebas
gaudia et ante oculos iam tibi victor erat:
“Iam veniet, iam me gratantem turba videbit,
iam mihi pro Druso dona ferenda meo.
obvia progrediar felixque per oppida dicar
collaque et osque oculos illius ore premam.
talis erit, sic occurret, sic oscula iunget;
hoc mihi narrabit, sic prior ipsa loquar.”
gaudia magna foves: spem pone, miserrima, falsam;
desine de Druso laeta referre tuo.
Caesaris illud opus, voti pars altera vestri,
occidit: indignas, Livia, solve comas.
Quid tibi nunc mores prosunt actumque pudice
omne aevum et tanto tam placuisse viro?

Of what avail, to have heaped up such a pile of good deeds with chastity

that chastity is the highest among your praises?

45) Of what avail, to have held your soul straight against your times,

to have stretched your head high, away from its vices? (note abl of separation)

Of what avail, not to have harmed another and to have had the opportunity to harm,

and that no one feared your powers?

Of what avail, that your powers never wandered towards the campus or the forum,

50) and that you established your home within the permitted boundaries?

Alas, the injustice of Fortune dominates even these morals,

even here she turns her uncertain wheel;

even here is she felt. Lest the voracious lady not devour something,

she rages, and everywhere she regards the just-in her estimation-unjust.

55) Certainly, if Livia alone had been a woman exempt from grief,

fortune's jurisdiction would have been diminished.

What if Livia had not carried herself thus in every manner,

so that the good things in her life were not enviable?

Think too of Caesar's house, which- exempt from death,

60) should have been higher than human evils.

That watchman, himself, holy, seated on the highest citadel,

the ruler of mankind, was worthy to look down from safety,

not worthy to be mourned by his own or to mourn for any of them,

not worthy to suffer what we, the rabble, suffer.

Quidque pudicitia tantum cumulasse bonorum,
ultima sit laudes inter ut illa tuas?
Quid, tenuisse animum contra sua saecula rectum,
altius et vitiis exeruisse caput?
Nec nocuisse ulli et fortunam habuisse nocendi,
nec quemquam nervos extimuisse tuos?
Nec vires errasse tuas campove forove
quamque licet citra constituisse domum?
Nempe per hos etiam Fortunae iniuria mores
regnat et incerta est hic quoque nixa rota;
Hic quoque sentitur: ne quid non improba carpat,
saevit et iniustum ius sibi ubique facit.
Scilicet immunis si luctus una fuisset
Livia, Fortunae regna minora forent.
Quid si non habitu sic se gessisset in omni,
ut sua non essent invidiosa bona?
Caesaris adde domum, quae certe, funeris expers,
debuit humanis altior esse malis.
Ille vigil, summa sacer ipse locatus in arce,
res hominum ex tuto cerner edignus erat,
nec fleri ipse suis nec quemquam flere suorum
nec, quae nos patimur vulgus, et ipse pati;

65) We saw him mourning his sister's child, snatched away:

just as for Drusus, that was a public grief.

He entombed Agrippa in your tomb, Marcellus,

and that place now held his two sons-in-law.

With the tomb's door was hardly shut fast for Agrippa,

70) behold! His sister began the rites of death.

Behold! With great Caesar's tears given thrice, Drusus, the newest loss,

Is the fourth to draw his grief.

Now close the the tombs, Fates, unlocked too often,

that tomb already lies open more than is just.

75) You depart, Drusus, and for the last time is your name lifted in vain;

let this be the last complaint of your fate.

That sorrow can fill whole ages,

and it can fill the station of a great grief.

Much was lost in you, nor were you, such a crowd of virtues,

80) the the only one whom every virtue touched,

nor was another parent more fruitful than your mother,

who brought forth so many blessings through two births.

Alas, where is that pair equal in just as many virtues,

where is their harmonious piety and love undoubted?

85) We saw Nero, shocked at the death of his brother,

weep through his pale face, with hair let down,

vidimus erepta maerentem stirpe sororis:
luctus, ut in Druso, publicus ille fuit;
Condidit Agrippam quo te, Marcelle, sepulcro,
et cepit generos iam locus ille duos;
vix posito Agrippa tumuli bene ianua clausa est,
percipit officium funeris ecce soror.
Ecce ter ante datis iactura novissima Drusus
a magno lacrimas Caesare quartus habet.
Claudite iam, Parcae, nimium reserata sepulcra,
claudite: plus iusto iam domus ista patet.
Cedis, et incassum tua nomina, Druse, levantur
ultima: sit fati summa querela tui.
Iste potest implere dolor vel saecula tota
et magni luctus obtinuisse locum.
Multi in te amissi, nec tu, tot turba bonorum,
omnis cui virtus contigit, unus eras,
nec genetrice tua fecundior ulla parentum,
tot bona per partus quae dedit una duos.
Heu, par illud ubi est totidem virtutibus aequum
et concors pietas nec dubitatus amor?
Vidimus attonitum fraterna morte Neronem
pallida promissa flere per ora coma,

unlike himself with countenance proclaiming grief.

Alas, how grief held his whole face!

Yet you saw your brother in the final hour, soon to die,

And he saw your tears,

And dying, he felt your breasts bound to his,

And he held his gaze fixed on your countenance

A gaze already death-blue, already swimming with death,

A gaze soon to slip beneath his brother's hands.

But the pitiable mother did not take his last kisses,

Nor warm his frigid limbs with her trembling breast;

She did not receive his fleeing spirit with mouth drawn near,

Nor scattered her shorn hairs over his limbs.

You were snatched away from an absent woman, while fierce wars detained you,

More useful to your fatherland, Drusus, than to yourself.

She melts, as when the thin snows struck by Zephyrs and sunbeams

Melt in the warming spring;

She complains of you, of evil plights and mocked vows,

And she accuses her age as one too old.

So in the shady woods, gentle, now, at last,

The Daulian bird weeps for Thracian Itys;

Such complaints of the Halcyons over the windy waters

Are sung with thin voice to deaf waves;

So, beating feathery breasts with new wings,

dissimilemque sui, vultu profitente dolorem:

ei mihi, quam toto luctus in ore fuit!

Tu tamen extremo moriturum tempore fratrem

vidisti, lacrimas vidit et ille tuas,

affigique suis moriens tua pectora sensit

et tenuit vultu lumina fixa tuo,

lumina caerulea iam iamque natantia morte,

lumina fraternas iam subitura manus.

At miseranda parens suprema neque oscula legit,

frigida nec fovit membra tremente sinu;

non animam apposito fugientem excepit hiatu

nec sparsit caesas per tua membra comas.

Raptus es absenti, dum te fera bella morantur,

utilior patriae quam tibi, Druse, tuae.

Liquitur, ut quondam zephyris et solibus ictae

solvuntur tenerae vere tepente nives;

te queritur casusque malos irrisaque vota

accusatque annos ut diuturna suos.

Talis in umbrosis, mitis nunc denique, silvis

deflet Threicium Daulias ales Ityn;

Alcyonum tales ventosa per aequora questus

ad surdas tenui voce sonantur aquas;

sic plumosa novis plangentes pectora pinnis

(110) Did you chant the son of Oeneus, you transformed birds;
thus wept Clymene, and thus her daughters, when from on high
the boy fell, smitten away from his father's horses.
Sometimes she congeals her tears, hardens and holds them,
and, stronger than her eyes, drives them, suspended, within:
115) but they gush again and bathe her lap and breast,
poured out from heavy and overflowing eyes.
A delay of weeping leads to strength; the stream flows fuller
even if retained by brief delay.
At last, when it was permitted through her tears, she began thus, dolefully,
120) with a gasp hampering her mid-cry;
"Child, brief fruit, the second lot of a double birth,
the glory of a mother now consumed, where are you?
Alas, of late so mighty, where are you? You are borne to tomb and fire.
Should these gifts be prepared for your return?
125) Were you worthy to meet your mother's eyes thus?
Did I deserve to see you returning so?

Oeniden subitae concinuistis aves;
sic flevit Clymene, sic et Clymeneides, alte
cum iuvenis patriis excidit ictus equis.
Congelat interdum lacrimas duratque tenetque
suspensasque, oculis fortior, intus agit:
erumpunt iterumque lavant gremiumque sinusque,
effusae gravidis uberibusque genis.
In vires abiit flendi mora: plenior unda
defluit, exigua siqua retenta mora.
Tandem ubi per lacrimas licuit, sic flebilis orsa est
singultu medios impediente sonos:
“Nate, brevis fructus, duplicis sors altera partus,
gloria confectae, nate, parentis, ubi es?
Sed neque iam ‘duplicis’ nec iam ‘sors altera partus,’
gloria confectae nunc quoque matris, ubi es?
Heu, modo tantus, ubi es? tumulo portaris et igni.
Haec sunt in reditus dona paranda tuos?
Sicine dignus eras oculis occurrere matris?

CHAPTER THREE

Commentary

1 felix: The appropriate sense of this term is uncertain. Witlox suggests the sense of *felix* as "fertile", while Schoonhoven argues for the the exclusive sense "happy, fortunate", citing internal evidence (1932, 1992 *ad loc*.). For an example of a similar construction in extant writing, see Domitius Martius' epigram regarding the death of Atia (the mother of Augustus): *Ante omnes alias felix tamen hoc ego dicor, / sive hominem peperi femina sive deum* (*epigr. Bobiensia* 39.1). As Cazzaniga suggests regarding this epigram, *felix* can simultaneously describe two qualities: both 'materiale' (*felix* by virtue of physical progeny) and 'morale' (*felix* by virtue of this progeny's august identity) (in Alfonsi 1964: 387). Perhaps the sense of *felix* is not mutually exclusive in the *Cons.*, either. The adjective *felix* appears in the *Cons.* twice more, in both instances describing Livia (*Cons.* 33,145).

'Neronum': This appellation, which refers simultaneously to Drusus' *praenomen* and Tiberius' *cognomen*, appears to be uniquely Horatian (cf. *Carm.* 4.4.28, 37 and 4.14.14), though it is sparsely employed by later historians (cf. Suet. *Tib.* 4.3.8 and Tac. *Ann.* 1.28.19). As Witlox suggests *ad loc.*, the construction resembles Juvenal's description of Cornelia: *Cornelia, mater Gracchorum* (Juv. 6. 167, 168).

2 dimidium: If the appellation *Neronum* in the previous line does indeed recall Horace, this word confirms the echo. Compare the grammatical usage and sense with Horace's

heartfelt plea to the ship conveying Virgil, *et serves animae dimidium meae* (*Carm.* 1.3.8). In both cases: 1) a partitive genitive depends on the noun; 2) the noun's immediate context is emotionally charged; 3) the noun refers to a bereaved and departed subject.

2 nominis… abest: See Ov. *Trist.* 5.2. 56 for a syntactical parallel found in another emphatic statement of bereavement: *nec mihi ius civis nec mihi nomen abest.*

3 Iam: The poet forms an anaphora with *iam* in the previous line (*Cons.* 2). This is the first of an unusual triad of anaphoras in the poem's introductory lines: see *nec… / nec* (*Cons.* 5-6) and *et quisquam… / et quisquam* (*Cons.* 7-8).

Legis…Livia, carmen: The poet implicitly informs readers of the poem's epistolary form before immediately announcing the addressee of the epistle, Livia. For the sense of this phrase, see *Pont.* 4.2.34: *sive quod in tenebris numerosos ponere gestus / quodque legas nulli scribere carmen idem est*; Ovid also announces the epistolary nature of his poem to his addressee from its outset: *Quod legis… /... Severe* (*Pont*. 4.2.1-2).

miserabile… carmen: This phrase may constitute a programmatic statement concerning the poem's genre. As Sch. notes *ad loc*, other extant identical phrase—Verg. *G.* 4.511 (*miserabile carmen*), Man. 5.558 (*miserando carmine*), and Priap. 68.15 (*miserabile carmen*)—seem to exclusively signal *lamentatio*. However, given the consolatory nature of this poem, I think Horace's *lugubris cantus* (*C.* 1.24.2-3) may constitute a better parallel for the phrase. For the programmatic nature of the phrase, see Ovid's use of

flebile carmen (*Her. 15.7, Trist.* 5.1.5); in both cases, the form of the poem is defined in the poem's first few lines.

7 Et… flendi?: The author denounces the notion that Livia should show restraint in her grief. For a similar sentiment and context, see the question initiating Horace's consolation to Vergil on the death of Quintilius: *Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus / tam cari capitis* (*C.* 1.24.1-2). In both cases, an initial interrogative pronoun seem to lend emphatic energy to the question.

leges…dicere: For a similar expression, see Statius *Silv.* 5.5.60-61: *qui dicere legem / fletibus aut fines audet censere dolendi!* Elsewhere, this expression often carries a legal sense; see *Virg*. Aen. 12.111-12, *regique iubet responsa Latino / certa referre viros et pacis dicere leges*.

8 Et...tuas? : Witlox suggests *ad loc* that *ore = verbis consolatoriis,* giving the whole line the sense: *verbis consolatoriis dolorem imminuere conatur.* This reading is attractive, because, as Sch. notes *ad loc.,* the anaphora of lines 7 and 8 begs a parallel sense for both lines in the distich. However, the reading *ore = in ore* should not be dismissed outright, in light of the striking and extended description of Livia's tears *in ore* in lines 113-120. Note the parallel structure at line 90 applied to Drusus' brother, Tiberius: *vidisti, lacrimas vidit et ille tuas*.

11-12 Scilicet… tuis: As Mozely notes *ad loc*., these lines seem to constitute an illustration of the previous distich (vv. 9-10).

13 Occidit: An abrupt perfect severs the poetic narrative from the proem's circumlocution in lines 1-12. Propertius uses an identical term to initiate a line referring to the death of Marcellus: [*Marcellus*] *occidit, et misero steterat vicesimus annus* (Prop. 3.18.15).

exemplum iuvenis: Describing the deceased as an *exemplum* is commonplace of consolatory writing. Statius employs a similar sentiment in the preface to his poetic *consolatio* addressed to Abscantius regarding the death of his wife, Priscilla: *Omnibus adfectibus prosequenda sunt bona exempla, / cum publice prosint* (*Silv.* 5.1.1-2).

14 Maximus… maximus: Strikingly similar pentameters are found twice in the Propertian corpus: *maxima praeda tibi, maxima cura mihi* (2.16.2), *Cynthia forma potens, Cynthia verba levis* (2.5.28). C seems particularly fond of such repetition within pentameters: see *Ausoniae matres Ausoniaeque nurus* (204)*, Illa rapit iuvenes, sustinet illa senes* (272)*,* and *Oceani coniux Oceanusque pater* (438).

armis...toga: The poet emphasizes Drusus' dual proficiency in the realm of war and politics, and thus increases the universal applicability of his life as an *exemplum iuvenis* (see note *ad* v.3, *exemplum iuvenis*). The poet's particular emphasis on Drusus' toga may color Drusus with a sense of Augustan traditionalism. According to Suetonius, Augustus strongly desired to revive traditional Roman dress:

> Etiam habitum vestitumque pristinum reducere studuit, ac visa quondam pro contione pullatorum turba indignabundus et clamitans: "en Romanos, rerum dominos gentemque togatam!" negotium aedilibus dedit, ne quem posthac paterentur in Foro circave nisi positis lacernis togatum consistere. (*Aug*. 40.5.1-5)

25-28 Maternaque… manet: The poet describes the inversion of Livia's expectations after her son's death: a funeral, not a triumph, is to be led for Drusus. This pair of couplets corresponds closely to Seneca's description of Drusus' funeral parade as *funus simillium triumpho* (*Marc.* 3.1). As Versnel notes, the ceremonial dress for triumphs and funerals saw significant overlap during the imperial period (1970:118-119). Following this observation, Jenkins asserts that these couplets provide some evidence for the poem's date: " the *Consolatio*… belongs to this inchoate period of merger between the triumphs awarded the princes of the imperial family and their equally elaborate funeral." (2009: n. 19). Furthermore, Drusus' funeral seems to have marked a specific point of transition for the public conception of the *Domus Augusta*. Regarding the popularity of the triumph-like funeral, Severy notes that "few indicators could communicate so clearly that [Drusus] was conceptually a part of Augustus' house, even though he was never adopted by Augustus, and that a role in this family was considered a role in society as well" (2003: 162).

25 agitabas: the imperfect here (also in v. 23, *parabas,* and v. 29, *fingebas*..*fovebas*) suggests an anticipation on the part of Livia that is consistent with the historical record. According to Manning, Livia and others were planning a triumph for Drusus before he even set out for Rome from Germany (Manning 1981: 41).

27 pro: the appropriate sense of *pro* here seems to be "instead of". I translate "The rights of death, not the rights of triumph, must be led by you."

28 tumulus: I join Sch. in reading *tumulus* as *Mausoleum Augusti* (1992: *ad loc.*). Drusus would have been the third to be buried in the Mausoleum, after Marcellus in 23 BCE and Marcus Agrippa in 12 B.C.E. (Claridge 2010: 206).

pro Iovis arce manet: the grammatical ambiguity of this preposition, as in line 27, allows for two potential readings: 1) If *pro* with ablative *arce* is to be taken as "instead of," then I follow Witlox in reading *pro arce Iovis* as *pro capitolio vel pro honore* (1932: *ad loc*.). This reading is metaphorical; "death (symbolized by the *Mausoleum Augusti*) awaits Drusus instead of royal honor (symbolized by the *arx Iovis* or the Capitoline Hill)." See the note below on the ambiguity of the term *arce Iovis*. 2) If *pro* is to be read as "in front of", the poet produces a topographical image which is consistent with the physical reality of Rome. The original entrance to the *Mausoleum Augusti* faced south, towards the open field of the *Campus Martius*, but also towards the Capitoline hill (Claridge 2010: 204). The first, metaphorical, reading would render the pentameter structurally and conceptually consistent with the preceding hexameter (see note *ad* v. 27, *pro*). However, I do not think the second, topographical reading of the line can be dismissed, especially in light of the poet's other usage of *arce* to describe the Palatine hill in v. 61 (see note *ad loc*). There is no reason, however, to assume that metaphorical and literal readings for this line are mutually exclusive.

arce Iovis: see Wright 1917: 24-28 for a detailed study of the term *arx Iovis/Tonantis* in Roman elegy. These terms—employed at Ov. *Fast.* 349-350, *Tr*. 4. 2.55-56, and Tib. 2.5.25—are somewhat ambiguous. According to Wright, the term's semantic range

includes Jupiter's Olympian abode, the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus *on* the Capitoline hill, and the Capitoline hill itself (24-28). In light of the geographical setting of the poetic narrative surrounding line 28, one of the latter two readings seems appropriate here.

29 Fingebas: Propertius uses the same verb in his lament over the death of Marcellus: *nunc, tolle animos et tecum finge triumphos* (Prop. 3.18.17). In both the *Cons.* and Prop. 3.18, the reader imagines (or is compelled to imagine) a triumphal image of the deceased.

30 Gaudia: In light of the *Cons.'* elegiac form and demonstrable relatedness to the canon of Roman elegy (Cite intro on Ovidian nature), the erotic (and implicity incestual) connotations of this term cannot be ignored. The strong erotic sense of *gaudia* is conveyed in Hor. *C.* 3.6.25-8:

> Mox iuniores quaerit adulteros
> inter mariti vina, neque eligit
> cui donet impermissa raptim
> gaudia luminibus remotis.

See Nisbet and Hubbard *ad* v. 26-8 for a further discussion of the erotic nature of *gaudia*. See also Ov. *Met*. 9. 482-4: *pro Venus et tenera volucer cum matre Cupido / gaudia quanta tuli! quam me manifesta libido /contigit!* Here, Byblis, enflamed with incestual *libido,* enjoys the *gaudia,* euphemistic orgasms, which her twin brother Caunus provides in her dreams.

31-32 Iam… iam… Iam: Compare to the nearly identical anaphora in the proem (vv. 2-3).

31 turba: Livia imagines a large crowd gathered for Drusus' imaginary triumph. Throughout the poem, C seems to sustain an emphasis on the plurality of Drusus' mourners. In addition to characterizing himself as part of the *volgus* in v. 64 (see comment *ad loc.*), C matches the ostensibly happy crowd here with a mournful one: *Obvia turba ruit lacrimisque rigantibus ora* / *consulis erepti publica damna refert* (v. 199-200),

34 Colla… premam: Livia imagines herself meeting Drusus with with various forms of physical affection, kissing his neck, mouth, and eyes. Notably, Vollmer attempts to evade the notion of Livia kissing Drusus' neck by reading the line with an implied zeugma: [*brachiis*] *collaque et osque oculosque illius ore premam* (1923). Furthermore, Schoonhoven emends *osque* to *usque*, thus further attempting to evade an erotic reading of the line (1992).

Intense physical expressions of affection, as the following passages illustrate, do seem relatively normative—and not necessarily sexual—in a Roman context. Quintus Cicero states his intention to meet his friend Tiro with kisses: *uidebo tuosque oculos, etiam si te ueniens in medio foro uidero, dissauiabor* (*Ad Fam*. 351.2). So too does Catullus anticipate reuniting with his friend Veranus by grasping his neck and kissing his eyes and neck: *applicansque collum* / *iucundum os oculosque saviabor* (9.8-9); Kroll does not detect any eroticism *ad loc* (1990).

In light of the Ovidian nature of the *Consolatio*, however, it seems that similar expressions of physical affection elsewhere in the Ovidian corpus ought to take precedence as interpretive comparisons. Ovid's description of Byblis' erotic affection for her brother closely mirrors the language in C's distich; in the passage below, Byblis kisses her brother and embraces his neck: *illa quidem primo nullos intellegit ignes, / nec peccare putat, quod saepius oscula iungat, / quod sua fraterno circumdet bracchia collo* (*Met* 9. 457-459). While this Ovidian passage does not imply that these forms of physical affection are *necessarily* erotic, Ovid implies that they have the *potential* to be erotic; indeed, they are certainly erotic for Byblis. Elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses*, embracing the neck seems more clearly erotic. After demanding a sexual embrace "*coeamus!"* (3.387), Ovid describes Echo's erotic desire for Narcissus thus: *et verbis favet ipsa suis egressaque silva* / *ibat, ut iniceret sperato bracchia collo* (3.388-389). So too does Ovid's Salmacis desire both to kiss and embrace the neck of Hermaphroditus: *poscenti nymphae sine fine sororia saltem / oscula iamque manus ad eburnea colla ferenti* (4.334-335). In the *Heroides,* Ovid's Hero fantasizes about Leander's embrace. Here, grasping of the neck constitutes something like sexual foreplay:

> nunc dare, quae soleo, madidis velamina membris,
> pectora nunc nostro iuncta fovere sinu
> multaque praeterea linguae reticenda modestae,
> quae fecisse iuvat, facta referre pudet. (19.59-64)

Furthermore, Ovid characterizes grasping of the neck as a touch both adulterous and erotic as the narrator of the *Amores*: *Iniecit collo, cum volet, ille manum?* (*Am.* 1.4.6).

In light of these Ovidian examples, it seems difficult to ignore the potential erotic connotations of this line. Perhaps C, heavily influenced by Ovidian material, is

attempting to apply language more appropriate to a elegiac lover to Livia; whatever the case, it seems difficult to escape reading a certain awkward eroticism into this line.

35 sic oscula iunget: This expression is particularly Ovidian. Ovid employs the same verb and with the same direct object at *Am*. 2.5.23, *Met.* 2.357. 2.430, 4.74-75, 9.458, 9.560, 10.362, *Her.* 2.94, 18.101, 18.102. The term's Ovidian useage is not exclusively erotic. At *Met.* 2.357-8, Clymene, recently bereaved of her son Phaethon, rushes to embrace and kiss her daughters as they are transformed into trees: *quid faciat mater, nisi, quo trahat inpetus illam* / *huc eat atque illuc et, dum licet, oscula iungat*? Notably, C does employ the grief of Clymene and her daughters later in the poem as an *exemplum* to describe Livia's grief (vv. 111-112, see comment *ad loc.*), and thus this example may have a greater bearing on the *Cons.* than the others. Every other Ovidian example of the expression listed above is situated in an erotic context, however, and thus it is difficult to dismiss its potential erotic import.

37 Gaudia magna foves: See note *ad* v. 30 for the erotic implications of the term *Gaudia*. Ovid uses this term to describe maternal grief; as Clymene as she weeps over the tomb of Phaethon, she "fondles" the boy's inscribed name with her chest: *incubuitque loco nomenque in marmore lectum / perfudit lacrimis et aperto pectore fovit* (*Met.* 2. 339-40). Elsewhere in the Ovidian corpus, however, the term often has an erotic meaning. Ovid's Phaedra describes the arousing effect of *Amor* with *fovere*: *adsit et, ut nostras avido fovet igne medullas* / *figat sic animos in mea vota tuos!* (*Her.* 4.15-6), and Ovid's Hero

fantasizes about Leander, imagining that he *pectora nunc nostro iuncta fovere sinu* (*Her*. 19.62).

41 quid… prosunt: Here, C initiates a series of rhetorical questions which constitute an encomium of Livia. Statius uses a similar expression in his *consolatio* to Abascantius regarding the death of Priscilla; like Livia's, Priscilla's chastity was of no avail: *quid probitas aut casta fides, quid numina prosunt / culta deum?* (*Silv*. 5.1.155-6).

mores: A similar usage of this term can be adduced in Statius' encomiastic praise of Priscilla: *laudantur proavis et pulchrae munere formae / quae morum carvere bonis falsaeque potentes* (Stat. *Silv.* 5.1. 51-53).

pudice: C announces Livia's chastity, a theme which he elaborates with four lines (v. 41-4). Elsewhere, Martial uses the vocative form of *pudicus* to describe Domitian: *Tibi, summe Rheni domitor et parens orbis, / pudice princeps, gratias agunt urbes* (*Epig.* 9.6.1-2). Ovid frequently uses the adjective to describe his heroines in the *heroides*: of Dido (*animumque pudicum*, 1.5) of Deianiha (*votis operata pudicis* 9.35), and of Penelope's prayers (*ille tamen pietate mea precibusque pudicis / frangitur et vires temperat ipse suas* 1. 85-86).

42 Placuisse… viro: The poet emphasizes Livia's chastity by describing her chaste marriage to Octavian. Horace also emphasizes Livia's monogamy (*unico gaudens mulier marito*, *C.* 3.14.5), and Ovid uses a grammatically similar expression regarding Livia's

marriage in *Pont*. 3 (*sola est caelesti digna reperta toro*, 1.118). Similar sentiments expressed with similar grammatical constructions are extant in Roman epitaphs (Lattimore 195), such as *CE* 959 (*Casta pudens, volgei nescia, feida viro*) and *CE* 958 (*Coniuge namque uno vixit contenta probato*).

Sexual fidelity, a key tenet of Augustus' moral program, was an important aspect of Livia's public facade (Wood 1999: 77). By announcing that Livia's chastity is of no avail in the face of Drusus' death, (*quid… prosunt / placuisse viro?*), C may strike a particularly poignant note.

43 Pudicitia: Ovid also ascribes *pudicitia* to Livia in *Pont*. 3.1.116 (see note below *ad*. v. 45, *rectum*). As Suetonius records, *pudicitia* was a key object of Octavian's legal reforms: *Leges retractauit et quasdam ex integro sanxit, ut sumptuariam et de adulteriis et de pudicitia, de ambitu, de maritandis ordinibus* (Suet. *Aug.* 34.1.1-3). The personified *Pudicitia* was a Roman goddess associated with traditional female *mores*—domestic *mores* which Livia publicly represented as the emperor's spouse (Purcell 2016, Wood 1999: 77). Notably, Palmer has argued that Livia may have been directly involved in the restoration of a shrine to *Pudicitia Plebeia* on the Vicus Longus, an assertion that has since been challenged by Barret (1974:125-40, 2004: 202-3). As Wood notes, numismatic evidence from the reign of Tiberius *does* provide an example of Livia's official association with "deified abstractions", such as *Salus* (Wood 199: 210); perhaps C uses *Pudicitia* in its personified sense here, directly associating Livia with the goddess.

45 Quid… rectum: In *Pont*. 3, Ovid employs a similar phrase to the opposite effect, claiming the superiority of the current age against the past on account of Livia's *pudicitia*: *quae praestat virtute sua, ne prisca vetustas / laude pudicitiae saecula nostra premat* (1.115-6).

This line presents an interesting paradox. While the following couplets of the author's encomium attribute particularly *masculine* virtues to Livia (see notes *ad* vv. 47-50), here C implicitly associates Livia with a bygone age ("against her own age", *contra sua saecula*), and thus more strongly, it would seem, with the traditionally female virtues listed so far: "chastity" (*pudice*, *Pudicitia* vv. 41, 43), and monogamy (*placuisse viro*, v. 42).

Vollmer (with Sch. following) suggests that this line contains a nautical metaphor, citing a similar construction in Ennius: *dum clavum rectum teneam navemque gubernem* (*Ann*. 508). If this assertion is valid, then the metaphor may intensify the author's following censure of *Fortuna* (vv. 56). *Fortuna Gubernans,* pictured holding a detailed rudder, was established as the standard depiction of *Fortuna* in imperial Roman coinage (Arya 2002:79). Perhaps the poet implies that Livia is a more apt helmsman than *Fortuna* herself.

47-48 Nec...tuos: C colors Livia with a sense of masculine political potency, and implies her potential to wield this power in a harmful manner. As Hemelrijk notes, self-control, the primary virtue conveyed by this distich, was a traditionally masculine Roman virtue (2004: 188). A similar sentiment regarding Livia is attested in the *Senatus consultum de Cn. Prisone Patre*:

> Et Iuliae Augustae, optume de re publica meritae non partu tantrum modo principis nostri, sed etiam multis magnisque erga cuiusque ordines homines beneficis, quae cum iure meritoque plurumum posse in so, quod a senatu petere, deberet, parcissime uteretur eo, et principis nostri summa erga matrem suam pietati suffragandum indulgendumque es*se… (Potter and Damon* 1999: 32).

The unprecedented nature of Livia's power is confirmed in Cassius Dio's account, but the historian characterizes her attitude regarding this power in a much different light than in the *Cons.*or the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*. Here, she is "conceited" (ὤγκωτο):

> πάνυ γὰρ μέγα καὶ ὑπὲρ πάσας τὰς πρόσθεν γυναῖκας ὤγκωτο, ὥστεκαὶ τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοὺς ἐθέλοντας οἴκαδε ἀσπασομένους ἀεί ποτε ἐσδέχεσθαι, καὶ τοῦτο καὶ ἐς τὰ δημόσια ὑπομνήματα ἐσγράφεσθαι. (57.12.2)

The form of this distich seems to follow an established encomiastic pattern; as Sch. aptly points out, the particular virtue expressed in this couplet—namely, the appropriate restraint and moderation of power, wealth, and possessions—conforms to the quality which Cicero praises as an appropriate and ideal subject of panegyric (1992 *ad loc.*):

> *...sed tamen quod ipsa virtus in earum rerum usu ac moderatione maxime cernitur, tractanda in laudationibus etiam haec sunt naturae et fortunae bona, in quibus est summa laus non extulisse se in potestate….non se praetulisse aliis propter abundantia fortunae* (*De Orat.* 2.342).

48 nervos: This term has a wide variety of connotations, none of which are particularly feminine. With reference to this term's Ovidian manifestation in the *Amores* (*Cum bene surrexit versu nova pagina primo/ Attenuat nervos proximus ille meos,* 1.1.17-18),

Hejduk notes its wide range of possible meanings: “sinew”, “muscle”, “nerve”, “bowstring”, “lyre string”, “penis”, “power”, and “literary abilities” (2001: 199). Cicero’s use of the term to describe political power may express the sense most appropriate here: *experietur consentientis senatus nervos atque vires* (*Phil.*5.32). Like Cicero, C pairs the term with *vires* (v. 49).

Notably, early commentators and editors seem to have sensed the oddity of the term and vigorously attempted to evade the it. *Ad loc*. Baehrens conjectures *servos,* and Haupt notes *”nam neque nervos dictos esse puto aptissime!”.*

49 vires: This term also carries a particularly masculine resonance (see note above *ad*. V. 48, *nervos*) Note Cicero’s insistence on the inherent masculinity of a phonetically similar term, *virtus*: *Appellata est enim ex viro virtus...a virus virtus nomen est mutata* (*Tusc.* 2.43). Perhaps *vires* carried a similar masculine resonance. Ovid also ascribes *virtus* to Livia: *quae praestat virtute sua* (*Pont* 3.1.115)

51 Nempe: Ovid frequently uses this term to answer rhetorical questions, oftentimes with a pathetic sense. For example, see *Trist.* 3.23, of the fates of Daedalus and Icarus:

> quid fuit, ut tutas agitarit Daedalus alas,
> Icarus inmensas nomine signet aquas?
> nempe quod hic alte, demissius ille volabat;
> nam pennas ambo non habuere suas.

For other identical usages of *nempe,* see *Her*.9.59-62 and *Ars.* 1.171-175.

Fortunae Iniuria: Ovid uses a similar expression of Fortune in reference to the death of Cadmus; *Fortunae crimen in illo (Met*. 3.141). Seneca the younger also produces an extended censure of *Fortuna* in his consolation to Polybius (*Dial*. 11.15.1-2), drawing an emphatic and universalizing conclusion: *nemo enim tam expers erit sensus ac sanitatis, ut fortunam ulli queratur luctum intulisse, quam sciet etiam Caesarum lacrimas concupisse* (2). Statius, in his *consolatio* to Abscantius, similarly inveighs against *Fortuna*, linking the goddess with *Invidia*: *Quisnam impacata consanguinitate ligavit / Fortunam Invidiamque deus? Quis iussit iniquas / Aeternum bellare deus?* (*Silv*. 5.1.137-139).

Livia renovated the temple of the goddess *Fortuna Muliebris*, a cult whose underlying mythology was widely known among the Romans of the period (Wood 1999: 78). Thus, depending on the actual date of the *Cons.*, the author's specific censure of *Fortuna* in reference to Livia's grief may have struck a particularly biting note.

52 Regnat [Fortunae iniuria]: Ovid's Phaedra uses a similar expression to describe *Amor* at *Her*. 4.11-12: *Quidquid Amor iussit, non est contemnere tutum; / Regnat et in dominos ius habet ille deos.*

incerta est… nixa rota: For similar extant poetic expressions, see Tib. 1.5.69-70 (*Versatur celeri Fors levis orbe rotae*), Ov. *Ex Ponto* 4.3.31-32 (*haec dea non stabili, quam sit Levi's, orbe fatetur,/ quem summum dubio sub pedestrian sampler habet*), and Ov. *Tr.* 5.8.7 (*nec metuis dubio Fortunae stantis in orbe / numen…*). Cicero also employs similar terminology in *Pis.* 22.8: *Fortunae rotam pertimescebat*.

.

53 improba: Two other examples of this term as a descriptor of *Fortuna* are extant: *Virg. Aen.* 2. 79-80 (*nec si miserum Fortuna Simonem / finxit, vacuum etiam mendacemque improba finget)* and Sil. *Punica* 5.92-5.93 (*... Improba quantum / hoc possit Fortuna loco?*).

54 Saevit: For similar poetic expressions, see Ov. *Pont*. 2.3.51 (*quo Fortuna magis saevit*), Enn. *trag*. 166 (*saeviter Fortuna*), and Hor. *S.* 2.2.126 (*saeviat atque novos moveat Fortuna tumultus*). Seneca also applies this verb to Fortune in his *consolatio* to Polybius: *Quid Pompeios? quibus ne hoc quidem saeviens reliquit fortuna, ut una eademque concideren*t *ruina.(Dial.* 11.3.4.2).

Extant epigraphical examples also express blame for Fortune's ferocity, such as the following: *Atrox o Fortuna*, *truci quae funere gaudes,* / *Quid mihi tam subito Maximus eripitur* (*CE* 1065.1-2).

iniustum ius: Such such oxymorons, formed by noun/adjective pairs in direct opposition, are particularly Ovidian. See *Met.* 1.433 (*Concordia discors*), *Met.* 2.627 (*iniusta iusta*), *Met.* 8.477 (*inpietata pia*), and *Trist.* 5.10.439 (*inpietata pia*).

57-58 Quid...bona: I translate: "What if Livia had not carried herself thus in every manner, so that the good things in her life were not enviable?" While the subject of *gessisset* is ambiguous, *Livia* seems likely; she is the 3rd person singular subject of *fuisset* in the previous verse (56), and it thus seems reasonable that a reader might assume that she is the subject of the following distich.

invidiosa bona: A few similar expressions are extant in the epigraphic tradition. Some associate *invidia*, with deadly *fatum*, such as the following: *Invidia fati rapitur Vincentia florens* / *et nunc ante patrem conditur Helionem* (*CE* 1311.3-4). One example juxtaposes a description of the deceased's chastity with the "envious law of fate": *kara fui casto bene iuncta pudica marito* / *invida sed fati lex reddidit inrita vota*… (*CE* 386.3-4). If *habitu omni* in line 57 includes the qualities listed in vv. 41-50 (see comments *ad loc.*), then the sense of this epitaph may be very similar to that of vv. 57-58.

59 Caesaris adde domum: The poet's invective against *Fortuna* progresses into an extended description of the emperor, his family, and the other recent deaths they have endured (vv. 59-74). In his consolation to Polybius, Seneca also places the emperor in close apposition with his invective against *Fortuna*, explicitly commending the memory of the emperor to his addressee as a consolation *contra Fortunam*: *Hic tibi, quem tu diebus intueris ac noctibus, a quo numquam deicis animum, cogitandus est, hic contra Fortunam advocandus* (*Dial*. 4.1-3).

61-64 Ille… pati: The poet mourns Augustus' disturbance, and in so doing describes the emperor's ideal state as something resembling Epicurean ἀταραξία. Epicurus' basic formulation of this concept explicitly regards the ataraxic individual as "blessed" (μακάριον) , which may help to explain the sense of *sacer* in the line at hand. As Epicurus states: τὸ μακάριον καὶ ἄφθαρτον οὔτε αὐτὸ πράγματα ἔχει οὔτε ἄλλῳ παρέχει· ὥστε οὔτε ὀργαῖς οὔτε χάρισι συνέχεται· ἐν ἀσθενεῖ γὰρ πᾶν τὸ τοιοῦτον (*RS* 1).

Sch. rightly draws attention to the similar sentiment expressed in the preface of book two of *De Rerum Natura* (1992: *ad loc.*):

> Suave, mari magno, turbantibus aequora ventis
> e terra magnum alterius spectare laborem,
> non quia vexari quemquamst iucunda voluptas
> sed quibus ipse malis careas quia cernere est; (Lucr. 2.1-4)

vigil… sacer: Ovid too ascribes vigilance and holiness to Augustus. For Augustan vigilance, see *Pont*. 1.7.43 (*qui pervidet omnia ,Caesar*) and *Trist*. 2.3 (*luminibus tuis, totus quibus utitur urbis*); for Augustan holiness, see *Trist* 2.53-4 *(iuro/ per te [Caesarem] praesentem conspicuumque deum*).

62 Res hominum: In addition to the explicit statement of holiness in the previous line (*sacer,* v. 61), this expression distances Augustus from other mortals and further suggests his divinity. The poet's specific choice of language to describe the emperor's divinity is consonant with other expressions of divinity—namely, that of Jupiter—elsewhere in the corpus of Augustan poetry. Virgil's Venus uses identical construction to address Jupiter, drawing a contrast between his "eternal commands" (*aeternis… imperiis*) and the "affairs of men"(*res hominum*): *adloquitur Venus: "o qui res hominumque deumque* / *aeternis regis imperiis et fulmine terres* (*Aen*. 1.229-30). Horace also employs an identical phrase in his poetic encomium of the emperor: *[Augustus], qui res hominum ac deorum / qui mare ac terras variisque mundum / Temperat horis?* (*C.* 12.14-16).

63 Nec fleri...suorum: The two epexegetical infinitives in this line express a sentiment commonly applied to Augustus and the *Domus Augusta*: the imperial family ought not to

mourn or be mourned. For extant poetic expressions of this idea, see Ov. *Trist.* (*optavi, peteres caelestia sidera tarde*) and Hor. *C.* 1.2.45 (*[Caesare] serus in caelum redeas, diuque / Laetus intersis populo Quirini…*). Seneca also expresses a desire for the emperor never to mourn his kin: *Quam diu inter mortales erit, nihil ex domo sua mortale esse sentiat [Caesar]!* (*Dial*.11.12.5).

64 nos…volgus: This is the first of C's two self-identifications (at v. 202 C identifies himself as an *eques.*). By employing the term *volgus*—a term which suggests a plurality—C seems to imply that in some manner the consolatory song has a populous audience, an image which C initiates in v. 31 (see comment *ad loc.*, *turba*) and further develops in v. 199-200: *obvia turba ruit lacrimisque rigantibus ora / consulis erepti publica damna refert*. White asserts that the C's implicit apposition of the terms *volgus* here and *eques* in v. 202 constitutes a flattering comparison of the whole class of *equites* with the imperial family, a factor which contributes to his assertion that the *Cons*. is "the most court-oriented poem of this [late Augustan] period" (1993: 203-4).

In some instances, Augustan poets take pains to distinguish themselves from the lower classes; for example, see Hor. *C*. 3.1.1 (*Odi profanum volgus et arceo*) and Prop. 2.23.1-2 (*Cui fugienda fuit indocti semita vulgi / ipsa petita lacu nunc mihi dulcis aquast*). However, self-deprecation of the kind implicit in C's self-identification as one of the *volgus* is not completely alien to imperial poetics. See Ovid's direct address to the emporer in *Trist*. 2 Imploring Augustus to avoid an early death, Ovid identifies himself as part of a *turba*:

optavi, peteres caelestia sidera tarde,
parsque fui turbae parva precantis idem,
et pia tura dedi pro te, cumque omnibus unus
ipse quoque adiuvi publica vota meis (57-60).

65 erepta… stirpe sororis: The poet refers to the death of Marcus Claudius Marcellus—Octavian's nephew and the son of the emperor's older sister, Octavia minor—in 23 BC. Dio's commentary on Marcellus' relationship with Livia makes the prominent position of this reference intriguing. Dio notes that Livia held—in some capacity—blame for Marcellus' death on account of dynastic jealousy: αἰτίαν μὲν οὖν ἡ Λιουία τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Μαρκέλλου ἔσχεν, ὅτι τῶν υἱέων αὐτῆς προετετίμητο (53.33.4)

66 Luctus… publicus: A relatively rare expression. The term appears at Liv. *Urb*. 5.39.5.1, and, most notably, in Suetonius, referring to the grief elicited my Germanicus' death in AD 19: *Et ut demum fato functum palam factum est, non solaciis ullis, non edictis inhiberi luctus publicus potuit duravitque etiam per festos Decembris mensis dies* (*Cal*. 6.2). Suetonius clearly delineates the term as separate from official *solacium* and *edictum*, and the author of the *Cons.* places the term in close proximity to his self-identification as a member of the *volgus* (see note *ad* v. 64); these usages seem to suggest that *luctus publicus* refers to general, unsanctioned public grief, as opposed an official funerary program.

ut in Druso: The poet implies that Drusus, like Marcellus, was met with a *luctus publicus* (see note on *luctus publicus* above). The fact that Drusus' death was met with great mourning on the part of ordinary Roman citizens is also supported by Seneca's account

of Drusus funeral. The historian notes that mourners had arrived from a multitude of locations to observe the funerary procession:

> Accedebat ad hanc mortem, quam ille pro re publica obierat, ingens civium provinciarumque et totius Italiae desiderium, per quam effusis in officium lugubre minicipiis coloniisque… (*Dial.* 6.3.1-2).

In this respect, then, C's account seems to match the historical record.

69 ianua clausa est: While here the poet uses these terms to describe the death and burial of Agrippa, elsewhere in the canon of Augustan elegy *ianua clausa* is almost exclusively used in relation to a locked-out lover, the mournful subject of a paraclausithyron. *Ianua clausa* is used in this manner at Prop. 1.16.17-18, 2.23.12, 4 23.12, Ov. *Am.* 3.8.7, and *Rem.* 506, 587. The only elegiac appearance of this term without some erotic connotations is found at Ov. *Pont.* 2.7.38: *sed quia res timida est omnis miser et quia longo est / tempore laetitiae ianua clausa meae*.

72 A magno lacrimas Caesare: This phrase is the first of four direct references to the emperor's tears in the poem: v. 209 (*et voce et lacrimis laudasti, Caesar, alumnum*), v. 442 (*et flevit populo Caesar utrumque palam*), and vv.465-6 (*Denique laudari sacrato Caesaris ore / emerui, lacrimas elicuique deo*). Such explicit references to the emperor's grief seem relatively rare, but a few close parallels exist. Suetonius records Octavian's tears upon receiving the title of *Pater patriae* (*lacrimans respondit Augustus,* Suet. *Aug*. 58.2.6) and, most notably, Propertius' Cornelia describes Caesar's tearful grief upon her death, directly addressing Scribonia (Octavian's second wife, whom he divorced to marry

Livia) (Freisenbruch 2010: 15): *defensa et gemitu Caesaris ossa mea. / ille sua nata dignam vixisse sororem / increpat, et lacrimas vidimus ire deo* (4.11.58-60).

76 querela: Many other elegiac instances of this term describe erotic complaint (for example, see Ov. *Her.* 1.70, 2.8, 13.110, 17.12 and Prop. 1.16.39, 2.20.5). Notably, however, Propertius does in two instances use this term in an elegiac context to describe funerary complaints. He condemns a *querela* in the context of his future funeral procession (*nec mea tunc longa spatietur imagine pompa, / nec tuba sit fati vana querela mei*, 2.13.19-20), and Cynthia uses the term to describe the popular response to her death (*maternis laudor lacrimis urbisque querelis,* 4.11.57). Notably, Statius uses this term in his consolation to Abscantius: *Et iniustos rabidis pulsare querelis / caelicolas solamen erat* (Stat. Silv. 5.1.22-23).

79 Tot turba bonorum: This encomiastic phrase closely matches that ascribed to Livia earlier in the poem ([*quid prosunt*]... *tantum cumulasse bonorum,* v. 43). In light of the term's earlier usage in the *Cons*, it seems appropriate to read *bonorum* here as a substantive adjective, perhaps describing *mores* (such as Livia's in v. 41). As Witlox points out, this usage of *turba* with a partitive genitive seems to be particularly Ovidian: see *Rem*. 461 (*quid moror exemplis, quorum me turba fatigat*) and *Trist*. 5.6.41 (t*am me circumstat densorum turba malorum*).

83-85: Heu, par… Vidimus: As C. laments the disintegration of the *Nerones* as a pair, he issues a pair of mournful interjections by means of a gamma acrostic:

Heu, par illud ubi est totidem virtutibus aequom
Et concors pietas nec dubitatus amor?
Vidimus attonitum fraterna morte neronum

This acrostic has quite a pedigree in the corpus of Augustan poetry. Virgil employs a similar acrostic to frame the bereaved Andromache as she attends the tomb of Hector in the *Aeneid*:

...Manisque vocabat
Hectoreum ad tumulum, viridi quem caespite inanem
Et geminas, causam lacrimis, sacraverat aras.
Ut me conspexit venientem et Troïa circum (3.304-6)

Ovid seems to be particularly fond of this acrostic, which he employs four times in the *Metamorphoses*. In each case he uses the acrostic to frame a situation worthy of a mournful interjection: (1) Arethusa's' account to Ceres of Persephone's imprisonment in Hades:

Hic caput attollo desuetaque sidera cerno.
Ergo dum Stygio sub terris gurgite labor,
Visa tua est oculis illic Proserpina nostris: (5.504-6)

(2) The stabbing of Pelias at the hands of his own daughters (which spells out EHEU):

...Senectam
Exigite, et saniem coniecto emittite ferro!"
His, ut quaeque pia est, hortatibus inpia prima est
Et, ne sit scelerata, facit scelus: haud tamen ictus
Ulla suos spectare potest, oculosque reflectunt,
caecaque dant saevis aversae vulnera dextris. (7.339-41).

(3) Ajax's condemnation of Ulysses' desertion of Nestor in battle:

> Qui licet eloquio fidum quoque Nestora vincat,
> Haud tamen efficiet, desertum ut Nestora crimen
> Esse rear nullum; qui cum inploraret Ulixem
> Vulnere tardus equi fessusque senilibus annis
> proditus a socio est; (13.63-7)

(4) Pythagoras' dissertation on the cruel appropriation of pigs and goats for slaughter:

> Hostia sus meruisse mori, quia semina pando
> Eruerit rostro spemque interceperit anni;
> Vite caper morsa Bacchi mactandus ad aras (15.112-4).

In light of the distinctly Ovidian nature of the *Cons*. and the remarkable frequency of the "HEU" acrostic in the Ovidian corpus, it seems probable that C was influenced by Ovid's work to employ it her in vv. 83-5. If this is, in fact, the case, then it would seem that C's engagement with Ovidian material is more sophisticated than a shallow borrowing of diction and phraseology.

89- 94 Tu.. manus: C provides an extended description of Tiberius' presence with the dying Drusus. Dio's account affirms this fact; according to the historian, Augustus sent Tiberius, who reached Drusus soon before his death:

> προπυθόμενος δ᾽ ὁ Αὔγουστος ὅτι νοσεῖ ˙οὐ γὰρ ἦν πόρρω, τὸν Τιβέριον κατὰ τάχος ἔπεμψε: καὶ ὃς ἔμπνουν τε αὐτὸν κατέλαβε καὶ ἀποθανόντα ἐς τὴν Ῥώμην ἐκόμισε, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα μέχρι τοῦ χειμαδίου τοῦ στρατοῦ διά τε τῶν ἑκατοντάρχων καὶ διὰ τῶν χιλιάρχων, ἐκεῖθεν δὲ διὰ τῶν καθ᾽ ἑκάστην πόλιν πρώτων βαστάσας. (55.2.1-2)

95-96 neque oscula… nec fovit… sinu: C.'s description of Livia's unrealized final embraces of Drusus closely matches the language he uses earlier in the poem to describe Livia's unrealized—and triumphant—reunion with her son. As I indicate *ad loc.* (vv. 34, 115), the vocabulary C employs here has erotic associations elsewhere in the corpus of Roman elegy.

101-102 Liquitur… nives: Livia, figured as "snows" (*nives*) is "struck" (*ictae)* by two heat sources, the "zephyrs" (*zephyris*) and "sun-rays" (*solibus)*. Compare this simile—which initiates an extended description of Livia's weeping—to Ovid's description of the grief initiated by his exile: *non igitur mirum, si mens mea tabida facta / de nive manantis more liquescit aquae* (*Pont.* 1. 67-68). Both mourners melt.

105-112 Talis.. Equis: C elaborates his description of Livia's grief with four mythological *exempla*. As my comments below indicate, at least three of these *exempla* seem awkward or inappropriate in their context. Because of the Ovidian nature of the *Cons*. (see especially my note *ad* vv. 83-5 and 113-18), I've chosen to explicate some of these *exempla* with reference to their more full accounts in the *Metamorphoses*. For discussions of the use of mythological *exempla* elsewhere in the corpus of Augustan poetry, see Gaisser 1977 and Heyworth 2009.

105-106 Talis… Ityn: C compares the grief of the "Daulian birds" (*Daulias ales*—the transformed sisters Procne and Philomela—to Livia. The source of these sister's grief is the death of Procne's son, Itys, whom Procne murders and feeds to her husband, Tereus, in revenge for his brutal rape of Philomene. Ovid provides an exceptionally graphic

description of this murder, and thus C's use of this *exemplum* here—especially in light of his apparent familiarity with the Ovidian corpus—seems quite problematic. According to Ovid, Procne drags her son off "without delay… like a tigress" (*Nec mora… tigris, Met.* 2. 636-637), stab him while he is "calling, 'Mother! Mother!'" (*'mater, mater' clamentem, Met*. 2. 6.40), "shred his limbs apart" (*membra / dilaniant Met.* 2. 644- 645), and stews him (*Met* 2. 645-646).

The inappropriateness of this *exemplum* in the *Cons*. is even further evidenced by Ovid's description of Livia in *Ex Ponto* 3.1. Here, Ovid employs the very same *exemplum* to describe to his wife what Livia is *not*, associating *Impia Procne* with Medea: *quid trepidas et adire times? Non impia Procne / filiave Aeëtae voce movenda tua est* (119-20).

107-108: Alconum… aquas: C compares Livia's grief to that of the lovers Ceyx and Alcyone. According to Ovid, after Ceyx's death at sea, the pair is transformed by Juno into birds (*Met.* 11. 650-709). The erotic nature of the relationship described by this *exempla* makes its appropriateness as a descriptor of maternal lament seem questionable.

109-110 Sic...aves: Ovid compares Livia's grief to that of Meleager's sisters. Like the Itys in the first *exemplum*, the deceased here, too, is the victim of maternal filicide. As Ovid recounts the myth in the *Metamorphoses,* Caledonian king Oeneus sends his son Meleager to slay a great swine; after slaying the great hog and dividing the spoils, the provoked meleager proceeds to slay, amongst others, his own brother and his maternal uncle. His mother, Althaea, upon learning of the slaughter, becomes enraged and throws

an enchanted branch (to which Meleager's life is inextricably attached) into a fire (*Met.* 8.277-625).

111-112 Sic...Equis: The author completes his set of mythological *exempla* with Phaethon, the son of Clymene and Helios, who, as Ovid recounts the myth, perishes by Jupiter's thunderbolt after driving the chariot of the sun on a catastrophic course across the heavens (Ov. *Met*. 2. 1-360). His sisters, weeping, are transformed into trees (Ov. *Met.*2. 379-404).

113- 118: Congelat… Mora: C produces an extended image of Livia's variously viscous tears, tears not only retained but *thickened* by the grieving mother. While this image of Livia's tears is difficult to visualize, it seems more palatable after a close look at the lines in the *Metamorphoses* directly following Ovid's account of the Clymeneides' arboreal transformation, the myth which C references in his final *exemplum in vv.* 111-12. Their sappy tears *also* harden and are borne away in a stream: *inde fluunt lacrimae, stillataque sole rigescunt / de ramis electra novis, quae lucidus amnis / excipit et nuribus mittit gestanda Latinis* (2.364-366).

In light of this example from the metamorphoses, Livia's tears too seem like sap. C and Ovid's shared apposition of similar imagery and identical mythological content gives me reason to suspect that the author of the *Consolatio* may have directly transplanted the Ovid's tearful image into his own text; whatever the case the image certainly seems more natural in its context within the *Metamorphoses*. If this assertion is true, it would strongly commend the notion that C was directly interacting Ovid's text in

the composition of this passage, including the *exempla*, which, as noted above, find particularly dramatic and violent manifestations in the *Metamorphoses* (see notes *ad* vv. 105-112).

115-116 Erumpunt… genis: The author draws attention to Livia's anatomy as she approaches her monologue. Such detailed anatomical description also precedes Cynthia's monologue (*capillos… oculos… digito… ora… pollicibus… manus,* Prop. 4.7.7-11).

115 gremiumque sinusque: These terms have a wide variety of connotations, and thus their contribution to the author's overall image of Livia is unclear. Both terms are elsewhere used can refer to bodies of water, and thus they may constitute an extension of the the aquatic metaphor initiated in lines 101-102 (see Virg. *Aen*. 8.712-13: *pandentemque sinus et veste tota vocantem / caeruleum in gremium latebrosaque flumina victos*). In the corpus of Roman elegy, the terms generally carry an erotic meaning; for example, Ovid's Oenone uses these words as she describes her weeping grief at the departure of her former lover, Paris: *haerebat gremio turpis amica tuo! / tunc vero rupique sinus et pectora planxi* (*Her*. 5.70-71).

116 gravidis: Statius uses the same adjective to describe the bereaved Abscantius' tears: *dum canimus, gravibusque oculis uxorius instat / imber* (*Silv*. 5. 30-31).

121-125: The opening lines of Livia's apostrophic monologue are similar to the proem (vv. 1-12) in both sense and structure; the lines constitute an emphatic hypophora

composed of an extended epimone answered by a succinct, biting reply. As in the proem, Livia's speech first draws attention to Drusus and Tiberius as a pair.

122 confectae… parentis: I translate "glory of a mother now consumed." For the sense of the terms, see Cat. 68B.119 (*confecto aetate parenti*) and Verg. Aen. 4.599 (*quem subiisse umeris confectum aetate parentem*).

121 duplicis sors altera partus: *Sors* is used with reference to birth at Ov. Met. 9. 676-677 **...***onerosior altera sors est, / et vires fortuna negat*. Additionally, Lucretius employs similar terminology to describe his theory of fertilization: *semper enim partus duplici de semine constat* (4.1229).

126 haec sunt… dona paranda: The gerundive here is almost identical to that in Livia's initial monologue (v. 32, *dona ferenda,)* in terms of grammar, sense, and metrical position. As Wiltox suggests, *haec* probably refers to material aspects of the funeral, "*rogus, ignis, sepulchrum*" (1932: *ad loc*.). Thus, the line may constitute an indignant response to the similar hexameter at line 32: the gifts of a funeral—not a triumph—are to be prepared for Drusus. See my comment *ad* v. 32 for the expression's possible erotic connotations.

127 oculus occurrere matris: Ovid uses a similar expression in the speech of Phyllis to Demophoon: *ad tua me fluctus proiectam litora portent / occurramque oculis intumulata tuis!* (*Her.* 2. 135-136).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alfonsi, L. 1964 “Domizio Marso.” *Maia* 16: 377-388.

Arya, A.D. 2002. “The Goddess Fortuna in Imperial Rome: Cult, Art, Text.” Ph.D. diss., University of Texas.

Baehrens, Emil. 1879. *Poetae latini minores*. Leipzig.

Barrett, Anthony. 2004. *Livia: First Lady of Imperial Rome*. Yale University Press.
Catullus. 1958. *Carmina*. Edited by Roger Mynors. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Claridge, Amanda. 2010. *Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cogitore, Isabelle. 1994. “Praecursoria consolatoria : hypothèses de travail sur la *Consolatio ad Liviam de morte Drusi*.” *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome* 106 (2): 1095-1117.

Fraschetti, Augusto. 1996. "Indice analitico della Consolatio ad Liviam de morte Drusi Neronis filii eius qui in Germania de morbo periit." *Melanges de I'ecole frangaise de Rome* 108: 191-239.

Freisenbruch, Annelise. 2010. *Caesars’ Wives: Sex, Power, and Politics in the Roman Empire*. New York: Free Press.

Gaisser, Julia Haig. 1977 "Mythological Exempla in Propertius 1.2 and 1.15." *The American Journal of Philology* 98 (4): 381-91.

Hejduk, Julia Dyson. 2014. *Clodia: A Sourcebook*. University of Oklahoma Press.

Hemelrijk, E. A. 2004. “Masculinity and Femininity in the Laudatio Turiae.” *Classical Quarterly* 54 (1): 185–197.

Heyworth, S. J. 2009. “Propertius and Ovid.” In *A Companion to Ovid*, edited by Peter E. Knox, 265–78. Wiley-Blackwell.

Hornblower, Simon, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow. 2012. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*.Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, Thomas E. 2009. “Livia the Princeps: Gender and Ideology in the Consolatio Ad Liviam.” *Helios* 36 (1): 1–25.

Lattimore, Richmond. 1942. *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Levick, Barbara. 1990. *Claudius*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Manning, C. E. 1981. *On Seneca's "Ad Marciam."* Brill.

Nocchi, Francesca Romana. 2016. *Commento agli "Epigrammata Bobiensia."* Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Potter, D. S., and Cynthia Damon. 1999. "The "Senatus Consultum De Cn. Pisone Patre"" *The American Journal of Philology* 120 (1): 13-42.

Purcell, Nicholas. 1986. "Livia and the Womanhood of Rome." *PCPhS* 212: 78-105.

Richmond, J. A. 1981. "Doubtful Works Ascribed to Ovid." ANRW II, 3 (4): 2773-82.

Schrijvers, P. H. 1988. "A propos de la datation de la Consolatio ad Liviam." *Mnemosyne* 41:381-5.

Schoonhoven, Henk. 1992. *The Pseudo-Ovidian Ad Liviam de Morte Drusi (Consolatio Ad Liviam, Epicedium Drusi): A Critical Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Groningen: E. Forsten.

Scourfield, J. H. D. 1993. *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Severy, Beth. 2004. *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*. Routledge.

Statius. 1990. *Silvae*. Edited by E. Courtney. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

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

Vollmer, Friedrich, ed. 1923 *Ovidii Nux, Consolatio ad Liviam, Priapea*. Teubner: Leipzig.

White, Peter. 1993. *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge, MA.

Witlox, Arnold. 1932. *Consolatio ad Liviam, Prolegomenis, Commentario Exegetico, Indice Instructa.* Groningen: Van Aelst.

Wood, Susan Elliott. 1999. *Imperial Women: A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C.-A.D. 68*. Brill.

Wright. H. W. 1917. “The Sacra Idulia in Ovid’s *Fasti*.” Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania.