Ovidii Metamorphoseon liber XV 622-870

(Carmen et error?)

Every reader of Ovid's poetry, and particularly of his erotic poems, must have been struck, time and again, by the ambiguous language of the poet. Maybe Ovid by nature had got a gift for it, maybe his rhetorical training laid the base for it, — anyway, the subject-matter of erotic poetry and the manner in which Ovid handled his themes turned him into a master of ambiguous language. He never got rid of this characteristic tendency. As for the *Metamorphoses*, George Lafaye rightly wrote : « Ses dieux sont des images des Césars, comme ceux des poètes alexandrins sont des images des Ptolémées... La mythologie, jusqu'au XVIII^e^ siècle, a souvent servi à faire entendre à mots couverts ce qu'on ne peut pas dire publiquement sous un monarque absolu » (1). Lafaye, however, was wrong when he stated : « dans ces deux derniers chants consacrés à la légende romaine les meilleurs morceaux, ceux où son talent s'est trouvé le plus à l'aise, ce sont ceux où il a mis en œuvre les idées et les fictions des Grecs » (2). The meaning of this paper is to point out that at least *Met.*, XV, 622 sqq. has nothing to do with Greek, but entirely and solely with Roman fictions. I mean : it has to do with the fictions of the Augustan propaganda (3).

I. — *The story of Aesculapius* (*Met., XV, 626-744*).

Nowadays it is understood that the story is meant as a foreshadowing of the rise of the « Saviours » Caesar and above all Augustus, and of their gracious work. This, indeed, is one side of the story. On closer investigation, however, Ovid gives some rather evident

(1) G. Lafaye, *Les Métamorphoses d'Ovide et leurs modèles grecs*, Paris, 1904, p. 112.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 236.

(3) « Augustan » to be taken comprehensive for Ovid's time. Cf. R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford, 1939, on « the organization of opinion », p. 471 f.

clues as to what he meant behind his obvious appraisal of the Roman Saviours. In his version of the story he conspicuously deviates from the « historical » facts as we still can read them in Livy and, more in detail, in Valerius Maximus (1). Mr. E. De Saint-Denis has lastly discussed four points of deviation (2) :

1. Ovid sends the Roman delegates to consult the oracle of Delphi instead of having them consult the Sibylline books. Mr. De Saint-Denis supposes here a mistake of the poet (« une confusion »). Mr. J. C. Arens thinks that Ovid in doing so made the story more impressive (3).

2. Ovid invents a disagreement in the Epidaurian government as to their lending the god to the Romans. In the opinion of De Saint-Denis this is : « plus dramatique : en outre, la situation nécessite l'intervention d'un songe — machine épique ».

3. Ovid establishes, at Antium, the snake in the temple of Apollo instead of in the temple of Aesculapius. Referring to Mr. Besnier, *L'île Tiberine dans l'antiquité*, De Saint-Denis explains : « si Esculape avait habité Antium, pourquoi l'aller chercher si loin, en Grèce, à Épidaure » ?

4. « Enfin, la réception solennelle d'Esculape, à l'embouchure du Tibre, est une addition d'Ovide. Addition pittoresque et charmante ».

Mr. De Saint-Denis, however, did not notice a rather striking fifth difference : though the « historical » journey went off prosperously (4), Ovid invents a rough sea just before Antium (720). Strangely enough he makes the oracle say twice that the Roman delegates had to look for their Saviour : *propiore loco* (637-38). In common Latin these words mean : « nearer to Rome », and the vocative *Romane* (637) makes this meaning definitely clear. So the Roman reader must now have been well prepared to grasp the meaning of the three verses : *Quod petis hinc, propiore loco, Romane, petisses : / et*

(1) Livy, X, 47 ; Valerius Maximus, I, 8, 2.

(2) E. De Saint-Denis, *Le génie d'Ovide d'après le livre XV des « Métamorphoses »*, in *R.É.L.*, 18, 1940, 111-40, p. 131-40.

(3) J. C. Arens, *De goden-childering in Ovidius' Metamorphosen*, Nijmegen, 1946, p. 159.

(4) Valerius Maximus, I, 8, 2 : *prosperam emensi navigationem.*

pete nunc propiore loco ! nec Apolline uobis, | qui minuat luctus, opus est, sed Apolline nato. The next clue lies in the words *iuuenis Phoebeius* (642), who in 656 turns out to be the bearded god of the *insula Tiberina* (1). Every reader is supposed to pick up these clues ultimately in 699-700 where Ovid intimates that the point of departure of the snake was divided from Italy only by the *aequor Ionium.* So the *Epidauria litora* (643) must be sought, not on the East-coast of Greece, but on the Werstern one. Actually on this coast there was a small town Epidaurus, not far from Apollonia (2). As for the Romans, to check all this, they only had to walk to the Porticus Vipsania in the Field of Mars near-by, to the new world-map Augustus had had put up, on initiative of his friend Agrippa. « It is this new and impressive map that we must think of as conditioning the world-picture in the mind of Ovid himself and his readers », as Mr. Wilkinson excellently pointed out (3). To the Romans of Ovid's time it must then be evident that the journey of the snake was the exact counterpart of the journey made by young Octavius in April-May of the year 44. Now the four differences of De Saint-Denis get their full significance, and coherence :

1. The snake had to come from Greece, notably from the *mediam tenentis orbis humum* (630-631), where Caesar had his operating-base for the planned wars against the Dacians and the Parthians. There he also had stationed his future successor Octavius for the finishing touch of his education and military training : Suetonius, *Aug.*, 8 ; Appianus, *B.C.*, III, 9 ; Velleius Paterculus, II, 59 ; Dio Cassius, 45, 3. This is where Delphi comes in (4). Cf. n. 2, p. 60.

2. The disagreement reflects the diversity of advices Octavius got after the murder of Caesar, and his uneasiness about his departure : Suetonius, *Aug.*, 8 ; Appianus, *B.C.* III, 10 ; Dio, 45, 3.

3. Perhaps Ovid corrected the historical tradition in this respect. At any rate he alludes to the special Augustan worship of Apollo. To this point I shall return presently.

4. The « state entry » in the neighbourhood of Rome is mentioned as referring to Octavius' arrival : Appianus, *B.C.* III, 12 ; Velleius Paterculus, II, 59, and see below.

The rough sea of Ovid, my fifth point of difference, corresponds to the historical traditions about Octavius' journey : Nicolaus Damascenus, *V. Caes.*, 18.

It will be evident that Ovid's insertion of the dream of the Roman delegates is made on purpose (1). As I see it, Ovid reacted to the official concoction of Cicero's dream about the new ruler of Rome and his recognition of young Octavius as such (Suetonius, *Aug.*, 91 ; Dio, 45, 2 ; Plutarch, *Cic.*, 44) (2). The poet denounces the hypocrisy of Augustus and his propagandists, who after the assassination of the orator used his authority by fabricating a dream of his in reference to his constitutional theories (3). Of course, nothing of this dream is in the writings of Cicero. Moreover, by imitating the Virgilian diction throughout the whole passage Ovid gave his allusion a still sharper undertone (4). The vocative *Romane* — a

(1) Cf. E. De Saint-Denis, *op. cit.*, p. 135. *Iuuenis* reflects the senate's decision after the victory of Mutina to call Octavius that name for having much better connotations than the anti-propagandistic bywords *puer* and *adolescens* (Servius, *ad Ecl.*, I, 42), cf. Virgil, *Georg.*, I, 500 ; Horace, *Sat.*, II, 5, 62 and *Carm.*, I, 2, 41.

(2) Dio Cassius, 45, 3 : ἐν τῇ Ἀπολλωνίᾳ πρὸς τῷ Ἰονίῳ (ὢν) κόλπῳ.

(3) L. P. Wilkinson, *The World of the Metamorphoses*, in *Ovidiana*, Paris, 1958, p. 231-44, p. 243.

(4) The flat descriptions of Delphi and « Epidaurus » de Saint-Denis explains : « Le décor n'écrase jamais les acteurs » (*op. cit.*, p. 136). There can be little doubt about Ovid getting his inspiration for the story from *Aeneid*, VI, 96-97 : *via prima salutis, quod minime reris, Graia pandetur ab urbe* — whether Virgil had been thinking of Apollonia or not, cf. Syme, *R.R.*, p. 463.

(1) The nucleus of the dream is the clause *uisum ut cognoscere possis* (660), cf. *cognouit* in 675.

(2) Sometime, a replica of this dream was ascribed to Catulus, who was about 63 B.C. the leading man of the conservatives. Plutarch, *Cic.*, 44, mixes it all up in reference to Cicero. J. Carcopino, *Les secrets de la correspondance de Cicéron*, II, Paris, 1947, p. 139 sqq., ascribes the concoction to friends of Cicero.

(3) Notably Cicero, *Rep.*, II, 51. K. Büchner, *Der Tyrann und sein Gegenbild in Cicero's 'Staat'*, in *Hermes*, 80, 1952, 343-71, has made clear that the passage does not concern the title of that ruler but the character of the true statesman : « Der Betreffende ist ja durch nichts Äusseres kenntlich. Aber es ist geradezu Prüfstein einer intakten Gemeinschaft, dass sie für das Wesen solcher Männer Sinn hat und sie erkennt » (p. 359). Büchner points out that Cicero referred back to the first Brutus who as « a private citizen » saved the Republic (p. 356). It is quite possible that here we have the link with Augustus' obvious protestations of being a private citizen when he saved the Republic, cf. the most official document of the new « mythus », *Mon. Anc.*, I, the very first sentence.

(4) For the « Virgilian or Roman setting » of otherwise Greek stories, cf. Brooks Otis, *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, Cambridge, 1966, p. 327 f.

little striking in view of the delegates (plural) — fits the mighty figure of the last champion of Roman freedom extremely well. Ovid reacted also to another official lie of the imperial propaganda, viz. the story about Octavius' mother Atia being impregnated by a snake in the temple of Apollo in Rome. This product of propaganda we can find in Suetonius, *Aug.*, 94, 4 and Dio, 45, 1. Suetonius expressis verbis tells us that was why Augustus was considered *Apollinis filius*, cf. 639 : *Apolline nato*. Dio even imagines Atia as foolish as to have thought so herself. This may account for Ovid's correction in deviation nr. 3. In the big reception of the snake (729-730), Ovid reacts to the official wording that Augustus entered the city as « a private citizen » and almost alone : Dio, 45, 5 *καὶ ἰδιωτικῶς καὶ μετ' ὀλίγων, ἄνευ ὄγκου τινος, ἐς τὴν πόλιν ἐσηλθεν* (1). This is strikingly in contradiction with the historical facts as related by Velleius Paterculus, II, 59 : *Cui aduentanti Romam inmanis amicorum occurrit frequentia.* The truth is that Octavius, for fear of the tyrannicides, travelled in Italy by short stages — which is alluded to in the many, otherwise meaningless, halting-places in Ovid's story (700-728) (2) — gathering around him a crowd of veterans and clients of the murdered dictator. Appianus says : *σὺν ἀξιολόγῳ πλήθει, αὐξομένῳ μᾶλλον ἑκάστης ἡμέρας οἷα χειμάρρῳ* (III, 12). The propaganda, however, afterwards had to stress the private citizenship of Octavianus and the firm, almost reckless determination of the young god to avenge his father (3).

I, for my part, am fairly much convinced that the words *maior ero*, etc. (661-662) and *deus eminet alte* (697) refer to Augustus' small size (cf. Suetonius, *Aug.*, 73 and 79) ; that in 656 *caesariem longae dextra deducere barbae* — so strikingly in contradiction to the *iuuenis* of 642 — does not so much betray an « attitude patriarcale » (de Saint-Denis) as it is a hint at young Octavius' decision to grow his beard till he had avenged Caesar (4) ; that in 674 *oculos circumtulit igne micantes* means a hit at Augustus' pretension of having the divine stern gaze

(1) Cf. n. 3, p. 45.

(2) E. De Saint-Denis explains the passage as « un fragment de périple, ornement cher aux Alexandrins » (p. 137). This, again, is one side of the story.

(3) Dio, 45, 4 : *προπετῶς ... καὶ τολμηρῶς*

(4) Dio, 48, 34, states that Octavius shaved for the first time in order to improve his looks for young Livia.

(cf. Suetonius, *Aug.*, 79 and Tacitus, *Ann.*, I, 42). Probably there is more of this stuff in Ovid's story, but as Arens rightly stated : « It is more than likely that, in the pictures of the gods, many contemporary and modern notes should elude us » (1).

A consideration of all these points must lead us to believe that the *Phoebeius anguis* (742) is Augustus himself. This identification of Ovid holds an equivocal intimation of the proverbial lubricity of the snake, as we may gather from the myth of Faunus who in the form of a snake finally succeeds in seducing his own daughter — a theme akin to the story of Leda and the swan, and equally well-known, perhaps even by sight, to every Roman (2). That story too Ovid must have had in mind ; for in *Fast.*, II, 193-94, he mentions Faunus having his temple on the *insula Tiberina*, of all places ! So — the snake being turned inside out — *in serpente deus* (670) means as much as : « Beware of Augustus, you Romans, the *Diui filius* is a serpent at heart, unreliable and depraved » (3).

II. — *The apotheosis of Caesar* (*Met., XV, 745-851*).

Now the reader is adequately prepared to enjoy the apotheosis-story of *diuus Iulius*. What Ovid thought about deification he explicitly declared time and again. *Am.*, III, 8, 45-52, he represents this business as the latest invention of the iron age, i. e. the climax of crime against nature, as Mr. Br. Otis has made clear (4). Further-

(1) *Op. cit.*, p. 176 (trl. H.).

(2) The temple of Bona Dea had a statue of the goddess with the snake (cf. P.W., *R.E.*, III, 1890, col. 687 s.v.). It might be argued that Antony's offering of the crown to Caesar at the Lupercalia of 44 could have been understood — and, therefore, in order to test public opinion, have been staged — as a joke, turning Caesar into the popular King Faunus with the crown (cf. Roscher, *Lex. Myth.*, s.u., col. 1458-60). That being the case, Ovid would not have been wholly unprecedented in this respect.

(3) In this respect, I think, Ovid was following the lead of Plautus whose *Amphitruo* reflects the contra-propaganda against Scipio. Cf. L. Herrmann, *L'actualité dans l'Amphitryon de Plaute*, in *A.C.*, 17, 1948, 317-322. I may add that the real son of Jupiter is called, quite suggestively : *qui illos anguis uicerit* (1123), and infer that Plautus in the final act, as purposely as it is striking, manœuvred the birth of Hercules into the play precisely for the sake of the narrative about the real son of a god killing snakes (1107-1119), which was one of the major points he intended to score.

(4) Brooks Otis, *Ovid and the Augustans*, in *T.A.Ph.A.*, 1938, 188-229, p. 207. Perhaps Ovid remembered a word of Cato — Cicero : *Quid est enim aliud Gigantum modo bellare cum dis nisi naturae repugnare?* (*Sen.*, 5).

more, in *Fast.*, I, 295-308, he glorifies astronomy as contrasted with the foul business of the heavenstormers of myth, but every Roman reader understood what he meant (1). So we might as well ask ourselves whether Ovid, in stopping his *Gigantomachia* for fear of losing his blackmailing girlfriend (*Am.*, II, 1, 11-22), actually had to refrain from insulting the contemporary heaven-stormers, Caesar and Augustus. To this affair I shall return in due course.

In accordance with the tradition Ovid bases Julius' apotheosis on his descent and his great deeds. The comet is to play the decisive part. Preparatory to the glorious end, the *laus Augusti*, Caesar's utmost is his paternity over Augustus : *neque enim de Caesaris actis / ullum maius opus, quam quod pater exstitit huius* (750-751). The commentators do not fail to stress the unironical tone of *scilicet* in 752. But in 760-761 Ovid says : *Ne foret hic igitur mortali semine cretus, / ille deus faciendus erat.* And continuously, at the initiative of Venus, the gods get busy. Mr. Arens cleverly points out that, if the assistance of the gods is needed, this does not say much for Caesar's merits in this respect (2). Venus herself runs rather high, and it is only by her abusive language that she succeeds in making the gods organize a series of traditional omina. The behaviour of the goddess is so strikingly violent that Ovid must have had special reasons for his excessive humanizing of the celestial scene. I think, he is hinting at the senate's unwillingness to acknowledge Caesar's apotheosis (3). Not until the new master of Rome had extorted the consulship in the year 43, did they give in. As Arens already remarked, Ovid deviates from the « historical » facts as recorded by Virgil (*Georg.*, I, 466-88) and Pliny (*N.H.*, II, 98) : Ovid's omina take place before the murder, not afterwards ; besides, they are of a very conventional nature (4). Perhaps in doing so Ovid meant to

(1) Very remarkably Ovid starts the passage with the words : *Quis uetat...* i. e. « Nobody at least can stop me from occupying myself seriously with celestial phenomena » — *uetat* hinting at the interdiction of neopythagorean manticism. Cf. J. Carcopino, *L'exil d'Ovide, poète néopythagoricien*, in *Rencontres de l'histoire et de la littérature romaines*, Paris, 1963. We may gather that Ovid's lost *Phaenomena* also had to do with the most recent celestial phenomena.

(2) *Op. cit.*, p. 165.

(3) Cf. Cicero, *Phil.*, I, 13.

(4) *Op. cit.*, p. 162-63. Here as generally Arens only looks for artistic reasons why Ovid may have done so.

represent the murder as a *piaculum*, thus justifying rather than condemning it.

For the sake of orthodoxy Ovid could not ignore Julius' apotheosis, as was ratified and put safe in the *Tabularium*, but with this version he reacted to Augustus' personal belief that the comet of July 44 meant his own rebirth as a god, cf. Pliny *N.H.*, II, 93-94 (1) ; Dio, 45, 7 ; Servius, *ad Ecl.* 9, 46. He fiercely ridiculised this belief and the make-believe of Augustus' divine mission by his propagandists. For he saw directly through Octavianus' smartness to seize immediately the opportunity of the people's belief (Caesar's soul) in order to secure his own deification (760-61). Tacitus still knew about Augustus' lifelong hopes to be a god (*Ann.*, IV, 38 : *melius Augustum qui sperauerit*). So Caesar's apotheosis really is a hit once more at Augustus (2).

III. — *The laus Augusti* (*Met.*, *XV*, *852-870*).

By now the reader is bound to expect a climax of ridiculising of the divine emperor. In this expectation Ovid does not disappoint him. The satirical undertone, swelling out in his admitting that Augustus only wins by not wanting to outdo his divine father, gets a destroyingly sharp edge in the comparison with Agamemnon (855 : *sic magnus cedit titulis Agamemnonis Atreus*).

Comparisons of Roman rulers with members of the house of Atreus were common property of literature and society. As Plutarch tells us (*Pomp.*, 67 and *Caes.*, 41), Pompey, in the years 49-48, was called by his political friends « Agamemnon » and « King of Kings ». Dio also mentions the nickname Agamemnon, but in reference to Pompey's first successes by land and sea (42, 5). At any rate, Pompey must have known this surname at the latest during his great expedition in Asia, because it is then that he called Caesar — who in Rome had entered upon relations with his wife — « Aegisthus »

(1) Pliny begins his record with the statement : *Cometes in uno totius orbis loco colitur in templo Romae* (§ 93). After the excursus on religion (§ 14-27) it goes without saying that Pliny thought this to be the climax of « human imbecility ».

(2) Cf. J. Van Gelder, *Commentaar op P. Ovidius Naso-Bloemlezing*, The Hague-Brussels, 1967, p. 133. As far as I know, Van G. is the first to observe *ad Met.*, XV, 821-828 : « With bewildering candour Ovid in this passage throughout revives memories of events such as undoubtedly 'the emperor Augustus' would have preferred to be relegated to limbo » (trl. H.).

(Suetonius, *Caes.*, 50). The choice of this name, only too natural in the case, was ever so much the happier as Pompey liked to pass off for the untiring warrior as contrasted to Caesar, who preferred activity behind the scenes. Instructive as to the deterioriation in the sounding of the name is the inquisitorian treatment of Agamemnon in Horace's *satire* II, 3, 187-207. During the Principate comparisons of this kind were understood as malicious hits at the rulers. Tiberius compelled a knight to commit suicide for having written a tragedy entitled « Atreus » (Dio, 58, 24) or « Agamemnon » (Suetonius, *Tib.*, 61). Agrippina, the widow of Germanicus, one day excused the prosecutor of a member of the family for being tool of Tiberius with a variant on a Homeric verse, saying « not you are guilty but Agamemnon » (Dio, 59, 19). In this connection we might as well remember the dramata of Seneca. Even the praetexta « Octavia » is built on the understanding of the comparison between the dynasts and the house of Atreus — « consciously » as Mr. Balsdon says (1). At that time, however, the allusions had become much less direct, as may be read in Tacitus' *Dialogus*. When *Aper* asks *Maternus : Cui bono est, si apud te Agamemnon aut Iason diserte loquitur ?* (c. 9), the answer is that, is spite of his innocent language, *Maternus* had exerted influence with his drama's (c. 11). The Augustan censorship may have obliterated this namegiving, yet in Ovid's poems, thanks to the ambiguous language and the subtle and cunning handling of themes, we still can pick up the witticism of Ovid's *Agamemnon*. The hypocrisy of the emperor not only annoyed him, he also amused himself and his readers with it. They must not have had much trouble in recognizing the *dux* in the *dux ducum Agamemnon* (2). In the *Ars*, *Agamemnon* is represented as a sultan and as a warning against the double standard of morals (II, 399-408). In the *Remedia Amoris* the same *Agamemnon* is put on the stage, this time as a supreme model for the readers of chasing love away, with a new one (467-486), — the text contorting the image of Agamemnon in allusion

(1) J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Roman Women*, London, 1962, p. 128.

(2) The addressing as *dux* cannot have been pleasant to Augustus, who wanted to pass for *princeps*, i. e. prince of peace. Cf. Propertius, II, 7. For the antithesis *dux-princeps* cf. Cicero, *Off.*, II, 16. It is scarcely conceivable that *dux* should allude to the religious implications of the Greek translation ἡγεμών which was in use in the Eastern parts of the Empire. Anyway, Ovid had no use for the word *princeps* then.

to Augustus' well-known sexual appetite. It is very likely that in this text about a sensual tyrant Ovid reacts to the propagandists (« friends », as Suetonius, *Aug.*, 69 calls them) telling that Augustus in his affairs with the wives of noblemen persued an imperial policy — a tale which Rome, at the time, must have been far from being apt to swallow. If ever Augustus was shocked by Ovid's erotic teachings, it must have been by this crafty play on the adage *Qualis rex talis grex*.

The comparisons of the next lines serve only to wrap up Ovid's intentions, unless the mention of Jupiter (858) means already the hit at Augustus as it does throughout the *Tristia* (1). I am inclined to think so, for the mentioning of the Tarpeian rock (866) cannot but conjure up the victims of the Augustan regime.

A nasty hit is measured out by the poet in wishing Augustus a long life in the name of *Caesarea* Vesta (864-865), without any doubt mentioned twice, i. e. emphatically, in reference to Augustus' impiety of stealing personally the testament of Antony out of the temple of Vesta (2). The sarcasm of calling this wish *pium* (867) is quite obvious. In full harmony with this sarcasm Ovid ends his wish with the prayer that the official deification of Augustus may come off, but not before his own death (868-870). But, probably, it was not only sarcasm, for here Ovid clearly reacted to Virgil's hope of living to see the Golden Age (*Ecl.*, IV, 53) and, equally, to Horace's enthusiasm for a long reign of Octavianus (*carmen* I, 2, 45).

IV. — *The Prooemium* (*Met., XV, 622-625*). (*From the Apocalyps of Ovidius*) (3).

Up to now, commentators have been puzzled by Ovid's invocation of the Muses at the start of the last act of his poem. Of course, he

(1) Cf. W. Maro, *Zur Behandlung des Augustus in den « Tristien »*, in *Atti del Conv. Int. Ovid.*, II, Rome, 1959, p. 345-54 ; G. Luck, *Notes on the Language and Text of Ovid's Tristia*, in *H.S.C.Ph.*, 65, 1961, 243-61.

(2) Cf. *Fast.*, III, 419-28 : here, in reference to pious Aeneas, Augustus is introduced as the new *pontifex maximus* ; Ovid then exclaims : *Cognatum, Vesta, tuere caput ! — cognatum*, I think, referring to the annexation of Vesta and her house by Julius Caesar in 63 B.C. The ambiguity, viz. as to the question whose head Vesta had to protect, is as malicious and witty as can be.

(3) Cf. the very first word *Pandite* (622). R. Crahay and J. Hubaux, *Sous le masque de Pythagore*, in *Ovidiana*, p. 283-300, compare *Met.*, XV, 60 sqq. with apocalyptic lite-

wanted it to be made clear that this part of the poem does not belong to the *carmen perpetuum*. So a new prooemium was needed. It is quite possible that Horace's studied connection of his Muses with Augustus in *carmen* III, 4 — which at least partly was meant as a warning (1) — contributed to Ovid's need of invoking the Muses at the start of his warning. If Mr. Otis was correct in identifying the *di* of *Met.*, I, 2 with the *melior natura* of the stoic view of life (2), a fortiori the Muses are the personification of Ovid's very own views. During his exile he blamed his Muses time and again, and, at least once, as the first cause of his relegation : *uos estis nostrae maxima causa fugae*, *Tr.*, V, 12, 46. In *Tr.*, I, 7 he tells us how he burnt the manuscript of the *Metamorphoses* immediately after receiving the imperial edict. Several copies, however, were circulating already among his friends. Nevertheless he burnt his manuscript : *uel quod eram Musas, ut crimina nostra, perosus, / uel quod adhuc crescens et rude carmen erat* (21-22). In all probability Mr. Thibault was right in suggesting that « Ovid may never have known the real cause of his exile » (3). We might as well take it that Augustus for obvious reasons wanted nobody to know the back-grounds of this relegation. So the words *carmen* and *error* might be the termini of the edict. Anyway Ovid could expect the emperor to have been informed about the closing passage of the *Metamorphoses* (4). Furthermore, it is only too natural that the first reason Ovid himself gives for the burning of the manuscript is the real one. So I feel tempted to identify the Muses of *Tr.*, I, 7, 21 with those of *Met.*, XV, 622.

In my interpretation, therefore, the poet in this prooemium is asking himself about the mysterious origin of the Roman Coronides. That is why he deliberately used the word *unde* (624). The answer is then given by the story : the snake came from Apollonia.

Ovid, I think, in *Met.*, XV is apocalyptically warning the Romans that they were making an enormous mistake in believing Augustus

rature, especially the Book of Baruch. I may remind the reader that the dragon Tiamat of Babylonian mythology is basical for the imagery of later apocalyptic literature. Also *uerba uidendi* are characteristic and essential for this kind of revelations, the author telling us what he « saw ».

(1) Cf. the introductory comments of Orelli-Baiter, *ed. min.*, *ad loc.*

(2) *Ovid and the Augustans*, p. 228 note.

(3) J. C. Thibault, *The Mystery of Ovid's Exile*, Berkeley, 1964, p. 114.

(4) Maybe by the *comites* referred to *Tr.*, IV, 10, 101, and *P.*, II, 7, 62.

to be the long-expected Saviour of Virgil's fourth Eclogue, whom Horace already implored and welcomed in the *Caesar* of his *carmen* I, 2. Horace did so to avert the deluge which he expects to come as a punishment for the foul deeds of his contemporaries (1-24), and he wishes the « Expiatory Avenger » (29/44) a long reign (45 sqq.). Ovid, on the contrary, expects mere disaster after the official deification of Augustus, as it had been prepared by the monster himself. That must be why he invented a second creation of man, out of the blood of the wicked Giants, in *Met.*, I, 151 sqq., suggesting that heaven-stormers cannot but produce a wicked race of men. For, artistically, the story of the Roman heaven-stormers points back to the tale of the heaven-stormers of the myth. Thus, the narrative has come full circle, making the apocalyptic warning as clear as possible (1).

V. — *Conclusion.*

In the most recent study about the *Metamorphoses*, *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, Professor Brooks Otis states that « in the way he felt and thought about the world, Ovid was fundamentally anti-Augustan » (2). Thus he explains « the curiously unsatisfactory quality of precisely those passages that are most obviously meant to carry the Augustan message » (3). Mr. Otis is right in calling the work « the only epic of love », and he hits the very truth when he draws attention to « the incompatibility of *maiestas* and *amor* » as the main theme of Ovid's *Divine Comedy* (*Met.*, I-II), in which connection he observes : « Why be the stern moralist who rejects his own age ? (*Ars* III, 121-2). This sentiment of the *Ars Amatoria* (repeated also in the *Fasti*) expressed the view of a man who was reacting against what he thought to be hypocrisy. The *Divine Comedy* says much the same thing » (4). In my opinion, however, this sentiment, this revolt against hypocrisy not only underlies the *Divine Comedy*, but pervades the whole work

(1) For the preconceived correspondences between I and XV, cf. W. Ludwig, *Struktur und Einheit der Metamorphosen Ovids*, Berlin, 1965, p. 82.

(2) *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, p. 339.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 308.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 127. For « Ichspaltung » (Fränkel's « cleavage of identity ») cf. E. Doblhofer, *Ovidius urbanus, Eine Studie zum Humor in Ovids Metamorphosen*, in *Philologus*, 104, 1960, p. 63-91 ; p. 223-35.

If the Jupiter of the first book was to make the impression of a split personality, a fortiori the worldly Jove of the last one — the comparison is already prepared in *Met.*, I, 168 sqq. — had to be a hypocrite. It is Ovid's ambiguous, cryptic and more or less apocalyptic way of expressing this view which may explain « the curiously unsatisfactory quality » of *Metamorphoseon* l. XV.

Whereas in the *Divine Comedy* gods behave like men of Rome, in the Roman scenes men try hard to pass off for gods. It is like a world turned upside down, a world by passions almost inexplicably and often monstrously metamorphosed. This must have been the great bewilderment of the poet who wrote the *Ars Amatoria*, that amazing mixture of utter cynicism and utter tenderness in matters of love, of « a poet between two worlds » (1).

Appendix : Carmen et error.

In his poems of exile throughout Ovid time and again blames or defends his *Ars* as the *carmen*. But equivocal Ovid may have had good reasons for doing so. *Tr.* II evidently is a circumstantial exposition of the hypocrisy and the unfairness of the man who, after having himself played around in light poetry and being himself a notorious player of dice (*ad nostros non leue crimen auos* : 472) (2), had condemned the *Musa iocosa* of Ovid. Furthermore the poet hits at Augustus' well-known sensuality which was so outrageously connived at by Livia (Suetonius, *Aug.*, 71). In the light of this the reader is supposed to get the double-meaning of his remarkable blessing of the imperial family in 161-166 : *Liuia sic tecum sociales compleat annos, | quae nisi te nullo coniuge digna fuit, | quae si non esset, caelebs te uita deceret, | nullaque cui posses esse maritus erat ; | sospite sit tecum natus quoque sospes, et olim | imperium regat hoc cum seniore senex* (3). A master-piece of ambiguity and innuendo. Yet in the lines 63-88 Ovid refers to his homages to Augustus in the *Metamorphoses*. But he is so sensible as not to exaggerate his merits in this respect : in comparison to other poets he styles

(1) Though I feel much indebted to H. FRÄNKEL, *Ovid : a Poet between Two Worlds*, Berkeley, 1945, I fail to see the importance of his comments on the journey of the snake (« the transfer of a culture », p. 108).

(2) Cf. R. MARACHE, *La révolte d'Ovide exilé contre Auguste*, in *Ovidiana*, p. 412-19.

(3) The « senility » of Tiberius, who for years had lived on Rhodes as a grasswidower and who even after Julia's downfall was to remain without spouse, is as obvious as the inference is nasty.

his veneration only *minimo turis honore* (76). Poetry, he explains, cannot add substantiously to Augustus' glory (67-68) but, unfortunately, an enemy had poisoned Augustus' mind against his *carmina uenerantia* by reading out from his *deliciae* (77-80) (1). This is a very significant statement. It implies that these *carmina* were not unequivocally and sincerely *uenerantia*. Walther Kraus, for his part, was quite right when, in view of « einer schwebenden Ironie », he remarked : « Das gilt vor allem für Ovids Huldigungen, die wohl eben deshalb für Augustus so ärgerlich waren » (2). It implies secondly that Ovid's erotic poems harboured incriminating passages. Rightly modern philology fosters doubts about the *Ars* being more than a mere pretext of Augustus in banishing Ovid, and this not only on account of the lapse of time since its appearance. Neither the subject-matter nor, even, the poet's impertinent admissions of adherence to the sophisticated tendencies of his time seem to create sufficient reason. But, if Ovid's erotic poetry harboured virulences against the emperor personally, that would make all the difference and then the implications of *Tr.*, II, 77-80 fit together. By *carmina uenerantia* Ovid in the context meant his *laus*, or *laudes, Augusti* in the *Metamorphoses*. He could not be certain that Augustus knew about the final book, but, I think, the emperor deliberately chose the moment of relegation so as to prevent the publication of the *Metamorphoses*, and, of necessity, selected the indefinite indication of *carmen*, which by the people only could be understood as indicating the *Ars*. This solution would not make speculation about culpable relations of Ovid with any, male or female, member of the imperial family wholly superfluous. But it would account for our and Ovid's own uncertainties concerning the *carmen* that evoked the anger of Augustus and, as a consequence, of all people (87-88) (3). Now, in the *Tristia*, Ovid could without considerable danger refer to his homages to Augustus in an unpublished and not to be published work, whereas his presenting the *Ars* as the *carmen* not only seemed correct but also opened the opportunity of making Augustus the one to

(1) The best and the majority of the mss. read : *carmina ne nostris quae te uenerantia libris* 79.

(2) *Forschungsbericht*, in *Anzeiger f. d. Alt.*, 16, 1963, Sp. 11.

(3) *Tr.*, IV, 4, 36, Ovid presents only the *ultima* of his life at Rome as culpable, which seems to exclude the *Ars*. Also *Tr.*, IV, 10 and *P.*, II, 9 raise doubts as to his opinion about the *carmen*, cf. n. 2, p. 60.

blame. As Mr. Marache and others already have shown, Ovid did use this opportunity, in his own ambiguous way.

Of course, we never shall know for certain, what was the *carmen* nor what was the *error*. I think to have made it acceptable that Ovid's *error* was closely connected with his contesting the imperial divinity and Augustus' divine mission. That explains why, on every occasion, he explicitly mentions the wounded, injured, offended, deity or deities, which is to say that he had assaulted an almost established belief. It is really tempting to consider his lost *Gigantomachia* as the first charge (1). The *amica* who forced him to stop the work can without difficulty be identified with the *Caesarea puella* to whom Ovid was all too submissive, as Sidonius Apollinaris has put it (2). The inference of the word *Caesarea* then is that she acted by order of the emperor. This seems to be corroborated in *Am.*, II, 1, 19 : *Iupiter, ignoscas !* — Ovid also apologizing to the worldly Jove for having started the poem. Such was already the suggestion of H. de la Ville de Mirmont, in 1905 : « ce n'est pas un caprice de femme, mais un ordre de l'Empereur, qui a fait interrompre la *Gigantomachie* » (3). This would account for Ovid's rather traumatic preoccupation with the Giants of myth : *Met.*, I, 151 sqq. (with that remarkable second creation of man in contradiction to the traditional presentation in 76-88) (4) ; *Met.*, V, 318, sqq. (« une parodie de la guerre des Olympiens et des Géants », to quote de la Ville de Mirmont) (5) ; *Met.*,

(1) In all probability H. de la Ville de Mirmont, *La Jeunesse d'Ovide*, Paris, 1905, was right in suggesting that Ovid was motivated to write a *Gigantomachia* by the unwillingness of other poets to treat the theme in honour of Augustus (p. 242 et suiv.). I think Ovid decided to do so after the publication of Horace's *Carm.* I-III in 23 B.C., especially *c.* III, 4, which must have been in his eyes a start into the wrong way of treating the theme.

(2) Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carm.* XXIII : *quondam Caesareae nimis puellae | ficto nomine subditum Corinnae.* She may have been one of the mistresses of Augustus (Thibault) or, rather, a young lady like those that par icipated in the stripping shows organized for the pleasure of the new god (Suetonius, *Aug.*, 69-70). To Ovid she might have presented her attendance at the palace as a form of worship of the new Apollo. Anyway this would make sense to explain Ovid's lifelong contest with « His Divinity ». Cf. *Am.*, I, 1,1 sqq.

(3) *Op. cit.*, p. 248.

(4) B. Buchheit, *Mythos und Geschichte in Ovids Metamorphosen I*, in Hermes, 94, 1966, observes the discrepancy — « einen gewissen Widerspruch » — between the two creations of man without offering any explanation. He also in this connection mentions some allusions to Augustus « versteckt zwar, doch kenntlich genug », leaving, again, the explanation to the reader (p. 103).

(5) *Op. cit.*, p. 258.

X, 150-51 ; *Fast.*, I, 307-08 ; III, 439 sqq. ; V, 35 sqq. ; *Tr.*, II, 69 sqq. ; 329 sqq. ; *P.*, II, 2, 9 sqq. — to mention only the loci of some extent.

If the *carmen* was not, after all, the *Ars* but the *Metamorphoses*, then « the riddle of the relationship between the poem and the mistake » (Thibault) would be solved. At any rate, there is no need to assume that this relationship should reflect any bearings of the *Ars* on any offence of Ovid in the sexual sphere. Thibault, however, was rather rash in treating the *Metamorphoses* in some twenty-five lines, concluding : « he (Ovid) does not once mention the *Metamorphoses* in this connection » (1). *Tr.*, I, 7 (21) already meant the *Metamorphoses*. So does, I think, *Tr.*, V, 12 :

1. As I suggested before, v. 46 must refer to the Muses of *Met.*, XV, 622. In favour of this view is the comparison with Perillus of the next lines. The story of Perillus as told *Tr.*, III, 11, 40-54, would have no point and the comparison between the poet and the inventor being caught in his own trap would have been inept, if it should regard the *Ars*, for the simple fact that Ovid did not fall into the *artes* (III, 11, 42 and V, 12, 48) that he had taught. On closer investigation, however, the point of comparison appears to be the very voice of the bull *s o u n d i n g* like a true one and *b e i n g* something quite different. For, by ordering a proof of that ambiguous voice, the tyrant caused the destruction of the inventor. So the word *artes* of V, 12, 48 sounds like signifying the books of the *Ars*, but it really means Ovid's manners of playing with words and motifs, exactly as in III, 11, 42 it concerns the artful voice-construction of Perillus. Outsiders easily could miss the point, but this comparison, more than anything else, betrays Ovid's style of communicating his intentions, viz. by ambiguity (III, 11, 54 : *geminos sonos !*). *A.A.*, I, 651-654, the same story is told in view of lying and perjury. In the context 641-656 the words *ludite* (641) and *fallite fallentes* (643) are very significant, for they imply what Ovid did to Augustus.

2. The lines 53-54, *non liber hic ullus, non, qui mihi commodet aurem | uerbaque significent quid mea norit, adest*, are all the more intellegible, if Ovid actually was banished in order that his voice — that so equivocally challenged the imperial divinity — should not be heard

(1) *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

anymore. It may even be argued that Augustus, under the disguise of *error*, merely banished that voice that misrepresented his behaviour as was inspired by reasons of imperial policy. Anyhow Ovid himself understood this to be the secret aim behind his relegation, a burial among the living. This idea, yet, cannot be applied very well to the voice of the Ovidian *artes* such as, in spite of his banishment, cheerfully went on being practised inside as well as outside Rome. But Ovid could without danger present the *Ars* (68) as the *carmen*. In the eyes of those who would believe this to be the case, the very author of the edict must have been the one to blame and have become the laughing stock himself.

3. In the context of the poem the tragic fate of Priam and Niobe losing their children (7-8) is much more in harmony with the fate of the *Metamorphoses* than with the condemnation of the *Ars*. Furthermore the rather strange lines about Socrates and Anytus (11-16) may be explained as referring not only to Socrates' imperturbability, but, underneath, to his unmasking of some orthodox beliefs of the time and to his removal for being a constant nuisance to the rulers. This explanation is highly favoured by the words *ira dei* (14) meaning the wrath of Augustus as opposed to human intelligence (*sapientia*, 13).

4. The mentioning of the burning of poems (61-66) must be a reminder of the burning of the *Metamorphoses* (1).

Ovid could only hint at the *Metamorphoses* as connected with his relegation, and he did so. In this way the puzzling relationship between *carmen* and *error* may be considered as cleared up. We may presume that Ovid purposely presented *carmen* as being distinct from *error* (cf. n. 2, p. 60).

(1) A. Grisart, *La publication des Métamorphoses*, in *Atti del Conv. Int. Ovid.*, II, p. 125-56, studies Ovid's own words about his *Met.* as related to the traditions about the *Aeneid*, arguing on this line : in spite of Augustus « qui en exilant Ovide avait été cause de leur destruction », Ovid aimed at having the *Met.* published, because an edition would intimate that « un dieu supérieur à Auguste sans doute avait voulu les garder pour la postérité », and, as a consequence, Ovid would have felt superior to Virgil. So far — in view of Ovid's objections to Virgil (cf. Otis, in *T.A.Ph.A.*, 1938, p. 209) — I can agree. But when Grisart states that Ovid hoped to be recalled « grâce à l'éloge d'Auguste, qu'il a fait dans ses *Métamorphoses* », he destroys the argument, I am afraid, by the very discrepancy of his inferences.

Thibault makes a great fuss about the poet « seeing a crime » — preferring to take crime as an external object. The classical locus is *Tr.*, II, 103-110, where Ovid illuminates and veils his *error* with the myth of Actaeon, evidently in reference to his own recording of that *Fortunae crimen, non scelus* (*Met.*, III, 141-142), and to the offended deity of Diana seen in the nude (1). Now, did not Ovid see the « deity » Augustus naked when he saw through the deification-business of the years 44-42 ? Moreover, did not he see a crime, at least in his own view (2) ? It may be clear that the comparison of Actaeon regards Ovid's offence of « seeing the deity in the nude » (3), whereas the comparison of Perillus concerns his double voice « in service of the tyrant », cf. *Tr.*, III, 3, 74, *ingenio perii meo*.

Mr. Léon Herrmann has definitely pointed out that Ovid at the moment of his relegation had already written the whole of his *Fasti* in first version (4). Now it must be clear why Ovid simply could not think of elaborating the books VII and VIII, being July and August, and so on, in view of editing. At the moment he must have been, if not panic-struck, at least entirely at a loss as to the emperor's knowing about his *Metamorphoseon* l. XV. Mr. Thibault, who approves of Herrmann but who had overlooked the link with the *Metamorphoses*, could not but jump at the conclusion that either Ovid or his literary executors « saw fit » to destroy *Fast.*, VII-XII (5). I hope also to have outlined the answer to the question why he or they did so.

To sum up, the ambiguity and double interpretation of the crowning act of his *Metamorphoses* may lead to a re-unravelling of the web of riddles that Ovid's works and relegation have offered to us for a long time. All the same, my admiration of this « most original of the Latin poets » (Lee) — for his brilliancy in handling poetical language and themes, for his daring denouncing and subtle ridiculising of the incensed Principate and the hypocrisy of « His Divinity » (6) — has only increased.

(1) Arens draws attention to the ridiculous uneasiness of Diana being seen in the nude by a mortal (*op. cit.*, p. 69-70 ; 181).

(2) For Ovid's expressions of « seeing » in this context, cf. n. 3, p. 51.

(3) Most remarkably, *Tr.*, III, 11, 17-18, *nuda(m) Caesaris ira(m)* is mentioned twice, re-echoing I think Caesar's « deity in the nude ».

(4) For discussion of this important question see Thibault, *op. cit.*, p. 107-09.

(5) *Op. cit.*, p. 108.

(6) In his review of Fränkel's book W. Marg thinks that the Romans must have heard in the Cipus-story « eine scharfe Kritik am Prinzipat » (in *Gnomon*, 21, 1949, p. 56).

I should like to end this paper with a word of Fränkel on the *Metamorphoses* : « But if we are patient and curious enough to search on with a mind responsive to anything, unexpected as it may be, then we shall be rewarded by startling finds » (1) — and its variant by V. Buchheit : « Die eigenen Wege Ovids, die man ihm zutrauen sollte, sind zahlreicher als bisher angenommen wird » (2).

A. W. J. HOLLEMAN.

(1) H. FRÄNKEL, *Ovid*, p. 73.

(2) *Op. cit.*, p. 108, n. 4. Further investigation may show how Ovid's motifs often are interwoven to the point of becoming inextricable. Thus, as for the story of the snake, it would be very interesting to know whether Ovid was aware of the role of Delphi in the making of the Scipiones so far as they were the forerunners of the Principate. He knew, of course, the stories about Africanus maior which were partly so conspicuously identical with the concoctions of the Augustan propaganda (cf. LIVY, 26, 19). E. DE SAINT-DENIS, after all, in assuming « une confusion » of the stories of Aesculapius and Magna Mater (cf. LIVY, 29, 10-14), may have been not that far from the truth, but that the blending was deliberate and no mistake at all. In loco, however, the selection of Delphi alludes to Caesar making Apollonia the dividing point between East and West, and perhaps to his intention to balance Eastwards. At the same time the snake alludes to the *genius* of the *pater familias* of the Empire, whom Augustus wanted so much to pass off for.

To give another instance : in the Letter to King Cotys, *P.*, II, 9, 75-76, Ovid refuses to speak of his fault, *ut lateat sola culpa sub Arte mea*. In loco Ovid could imagine a Thracian to consider the *Ars* as immoral. At the same time to the Romans *lateat sub* intimates that Ovid knew the *Ars* to be a mere pretext, while *sola* may be understood as suggesting that *error* and *carmen* (another one than the *Ars*) really were the same thing. This seems to be corroborated by some startling lines of his Autobiography, *Tr.*, IV, 10 : in 89-90 Ovid states that only and nothing more than an *error* caused his exile and he repeats the statement in 99-100 : *causa meae cunctis nimium quoque nota ruinae | indicio non est testificanda meo.* This may hold the solution to Fränkel's puzzle of this elegy : « I do not understand why he fails to refer to the *Metamorphoses* » (*Ovid*, p. 235).

Finally, in *P.*, I, 1, the words *culpa perennis erit* (64) would have been a very strange statement to the general reader if they should not regard the immortality that Ovid in the *Epilogue* of the *Met.* had predicted to this poem. Therefore, I think, the attention of the addressee is focussed on some stories of the *Met.* (27-47). This *Epilogue* obviously alludes to HORACE, *Carm.*, III, 30. Being prevented from having his *Gigantomachia* compared to Horace's *carmen* III, 4, Ovid must have felt even superior to Horace, when he had reached the end of the *Met.* That may account for the rather overwrought expression *super alta perennis astra ferar* (875-76). At the same time these words clearly hold a depreciation of Caesar and Augustus, who could not reach as far as that. Ovid ultimately aimed at depreciating the legalized immortality of dynasts as contrasted with the true *gloria immortalis* of free poetry (cf. A. D. LEEMAN, *Gloria*, Rotterdam, 1949, p. 134-36 ; 174-75).

L. Aelius Seianus and his Political Significance

Lucius Aelius Seianus was born at Volsinii in Etruria, the son of L. Seius Strabo (1), prefect of Egypt in 15 and praetorian prefect before this date. Sejanus was probably a coeval, or very nearly, of the young Caesar, Gaius, who was born in 20 B.C. According to Tacitus (2), Sejanus attached himself to Gaius *prima iuventa* presumably prior to the latter's Istrian command (3) and his eastern mission (1 B.C.). There is no unambiguous evidence that Sejanus accompanied Gaius, but it is likely. After a formal education commensurate with his family status he would spend the time between his assumption of the *toga virilis* and the age of 17 in some form of *tirocinium* (military training, parades), and thereafter would probably see service abroad, in all likelihood on the staff of the young Caesar. Thus the indications are that Sejanus was born in 20 or 19 B.C.

Sejanus' father, L. Seius Strabo, held in succession the two highest equestrian offices and was *princeps equestris ordinis* (4). Moreover his mother was extremely well-connected (5), and her brother, Q. Junius Blaesus (6), had reached the consulship in 10. Presumably,

(1) TAC., *Ann.*, IV, 1, 2 ; VI, 8 ; DIO, 57, 19, 5 ; JUVENAL, X, 4 ; *R.E.*, 1, s.v. *Aelius*, no. 133 ; *P.I.R.*², 1, A, 255. All dates are A.D. unless otherwise designated.

(2) *Ann.*, IV, 1, 2. For the date of Gaius' birth vid. DIO, 54, 8, 5.

(3) DIO, 55, 10, 17. Cf. R. SYME, *Roman Revolution*, Oxford, 1952, p. 428, (henceforth cited as *R.R.*). Syme takes Tacitus' statement *Gaium Caesarem - - - - sectatus* to mean that Sejanus 'accompanied' Gaius. It could equally well mean that he merely 'courted' Gaius. Velleius, who served as Tribune under Gaius in the East, is silent with regard to Sejanus' participation, (VELL., II, 101). Cf. T. W. AFRICA, *Rome of the Caesars*, New York, 1965, p. 31 ff.

(4) TAC., *Ann.*, I, 24, 2 ; VI, 8 ; DIO, 57, 19, 5 ; VELL., II, 127, 3 ; *R.E.*, 1, s.v. *Seius*, no. 15.

(5) VELL., *loc. cit.*

(6) *Ann.*, III, 35 ; 72, 4. Cf. VELLEIUS, *loc. cit.*, who mentions only *one* consular uncle and is hardly likely to be incorrect in his efforts to enhance Sejanus, especially as he was a contemporary of the latter.