

SEX, SATIETY, AND SLAUGHTER IN FEMALE *IRA*: THE USE OF *SATIARE* IN
OVID'S *METAMORPHOSES*

INDIA MOORE WATKINS

A thesis submitted to the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of
Classics in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Chapel Hill
2018

Approved by:

Sharon L. James

James O'Hara

Patricia Rosenmeyer

© 2018
India Moore Watkins
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

India Moore Watkins: Sex, Satiety, and Slaughter in Female *Ira*: The Use of *Satiare* in Ovid's
Metamorphoses
(Under the direction of Sharon L. James)

Throughout the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid employs the verb *satiare* programmatically, linking sex, eating, and bloodshed in a web of associations surrounding the goddesses Juno and Diana as they punish mortals. Ovid twists *satiare*'s poetic etymology from Vergil's *Aeneid*, which portrays Juno as insatiable for revenge, employing it instead with reference to Diana to show how the virgin goddess can be satiated with extreme bloodshed. He also foregrounds these goddesses' sexual motivations to highlight the ironies implicit in Juno's role as the goddess of marriage and childbirth and in the virginal Diana's satisfaction in gory revenge. The other appearances of *satiare*, in reference to Cephalus and Erychsithon, connect these men with the unpredictable female *ira* that *satiare* describes in the rest of the poem. The web of unsettling and violent associations between these goddesses and *satiare* evokes the inherent Greekness of the mythology that Ovid is drawing on.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
SECTION I: JUNO AND LATONA.....	4
SECTION II: DIANA.....	13
SECTION III: <i>SATIARE</i> APPLIED TO MEN.....	19
CONCLUSION.....	25
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	30

INTRODUCTION

Wrathful goddesses litter the pages of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Minerva beats Arachne with a shuttle before turning her into a spider, Juno tricks her husband into annihilating her rival with a thunderbolt, and Diana makes Actaeon into a deer and sets his own dogs upon him. In many ways, Juno's unrelenting pursuit of Jove's rape victims is not surprising: Ovid inherits Vergil's Juno, the goddess whose unquenchable *ira* drove most of the epic's plot. Throughout the *Aeneid*, Vergil assigns *ira* as Juno's primary characteristic and repeatedly capitalizes on the poetic etymology between Juno Saturnia and the verb *satiare* to suggest that Juno is, in fact, insatiable in her quest for revenge until the very end of the poem (O'Hara 164). Ovid, inheriting the well-known connection of Juno to insatiability, gives this ironic etymology another twist and repeatedly links *satiare* not with Juno, but with Diana, in order to show that unlike Juno, this virgin goddess's anger can be satisfied with extreme bloodshed.

The wrath of both goddesses stems ultimately, I will argue, from their relationships to sex. Juno, the goddess of marriage and childbirth, is perpetually frustrated by Jupiter's refusal to have children with her, and the constant stream of women he has raped, particularly those who have children, serve as reminders of her own sexual frustration.¹ Furthermore, in ancient thought,

¹For example, only when Callisto gives birth to her son Arcas does Juno punish her. Juno says to her, *scilicet hoc etiam restabat, adultera... / ut fecunda fores, fieretque iniuria partu / nota, Iovisque mei testatum dedecus esset* (4.171–73).

women were as a rule oversexed, from Pandora on.² Just as Juno's frustration in her role in her marriage has no foreseeable end, her punishments of Jupiter's rape victims and their families throughout both the *Aeneid* and the *Metamorphoses* extend across generations, seeming relentless in scope. But in the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid peels Juno away from her political function in the *Aeneid* and highlights her sexual motivations by portraying her primarily as the perpetually frustrated wife of Jove.

Diana's celibacy, on the other hand, is self-imposed, as Ovid stresses, for example, at 1.487. Micaela Janan sees Diana as the poem's primary "object of desire," a goddess whose militaristic maintenance of virginity both casts her as an unattainable object of male desire and is the root of her insatiable need for revenge (80). But, as we shall see, verbal echoes of satiety, not insatiability, surround Diana as she carries out some of her most horrifying punishments. With the word *satiare*, then, Ovid blurs the lines between sex, eating, and violence to foreground the sexual preoccupations of these two goddesses. Furthermore, by reserving *satiare*—a word loaded with Vergilian implications—for Diana rather than Juno, Ovid both plays with his reader's expectations about the vocabulary used to describe these goddesses and highlights the ironies implicit in Juno's role as the goddess of marriage and childbirth and in the virginal Diana's satisfaction in gory revenge.

Although most of the occurrences of the verb *satiare* in the *Metamorphoses* are connected with female *ira*, there exists a larger context for them, throughout the poem, in which sex, violence, and eating are conflated. Consider the way the poem dwells on Philomela's stump of a

²From the moment of her creation, Pandora inspired irresistible lust in men because of the longing with which Aphrodite endowed her: καὶ κάριν ἀμφιχέαι κεφαλῇ χρυσέην Ἀφροδίτην / καὶ πόθον ἀγλαέον καὶ γυνοῖβόρους μελεδῶνας (Hes. *Op.* 65–66). To give just one example from Ovid's own works, the *praeceptor Amoris* of his *Ars Amatoris* lectures, *parcior in nobis nec tam furiosa libido: / legitimum finem flamma virilis habet* (*Ars.* 1.281–82).

tongue right after Tereus slices it out: *radix micat ultima linguae* (6.557). Amy Richlin points out that Ovid's description of Tereus' mutilation of Philomela's body stands in for the rape itself, in a kind of pornography of violence, and that "the flickering stump of the tongue, like a clitoris, makes Philomela's ruined mouth a simulacrum of her ruined genitals" (141). Furthermore, Tereus continues to rape Philomela, despite her mutilated mouth.³ Here, Ovid conflates sex and violence and locates the source of this conflation in Philomela's mouth. Later, when Tereus unwittingly consumes his own son, Itys, and then asks about his whereabouts, Procne gleefully shouts, *intus habes, quem poscis* (6.655). Tereus too focuses on Itys' location inside himself, referring to his body as *bustum miserabile nati* (6.665). When Tereus eats his son, committing violence and eating become one and the same. Both mother and father figure this transgressive act in a strangely sexual way.⁴ Even though Ovid does not use a word with a *sat-* root in this episode, sexual lust, bloodlust, and eating become so mixed up that it becomes difficult to tell where one ends and the other begins: the conflation of sex, eating, and violence is a larger theme that recurs more often throughout the *Metamorphoses* than derivations of *sator* appear.

³In fact, the poet asserts that Tereus is aroused by Philomela's mutilated body. As a stand-in for the rape itself, the entire episode is sexualized. For example, the description of Tereus drawing his sword resonates strongly with phallic imagery: *quo fuit accinctus, vagina liberat ensem* (6.551). Furthermore, the poet heightens the sense of gross fascination with Philomela's mutilated mouth throughout the passage by playing up the implausibility of his subsequent actions: *hoc quoque post facinus (vix ausim credere) fertur / saepe sua lacerum repetisse libidine corpus* (6.561–62).

⁴The way both Tereus and Procne refer to the fact that Tereus has just eaten his son for dinner looks forward to the description of Myrrha as she leaves her father's bedroom: *plena patris thalamis excedit et inopia diro / semina fert utero conceptaque crimina portat* (10.469–70). Ovid figures Myrrha's transgressive sexual act in terms of satiety with *plena* and highlights her breach of social norms with *inopia* and *crimina*.

SECTION I: JUNO AND LATONA

The intertwining of sex, violence, and satiety appears throughout the *Metamorphoses*, but the word *satiare* itself appears almost exclusively in reference to divine female *ira*⁵ and centers on Diana and Juno: by applying the word laden with Vergilian implications most often to Diana and Juno, the poet plays with the original Vergilian poetic etymology. Ultimately, the etymological connection refers not to Juno, but to her father, Saturnus. Cicero states that Saturnus is named such because he is filled, *saturaretur*, with years (*ND* 2.64), though Varro also draws a connection between Saturnus and the verb *sero* (*LL* 5.64) (O'Hara 270). Vergil ironically twists this etymological connection in reference to Juno Saturnia, branding Saturn's daughter insatiable (O'Hara 164). The link between Saturnia and *satiare* emerges most clearly in Vergil's first use of the connection in his *Aeneid*:

Irim de caelo misit *Saturnia* Iuno
Iliacam ad classem ventosque aspirat eunti,
multa movens necdum antiquum *saturata* dolorem. (*Aen.* 5.606–08).

The placement of Saturnia and *saturata* between *antiquum... dolorem* highlights Juno's refusal to be satisfied. Later in Book 5, Aeneas describes Juno's anger against him as implacable:

Iunonis gravis ira neque exsaturabile pectus / cogunt me, Neptune, preces descendere in omnis

⁵As we shall see, Ovid also describes Cephalus' right hand as *satiata* (7.809), and Erysichthon is doomed to perpetual insatiability (8.836). The concept of satiety and the network of associations it invokes do not, however, appear in reference to male deities. For example, when Apollo flays Marsyas, Ovid spends less than four lines (6.382–85) explaining Marsyas' transgression and Apollo's reaction, but fifteen (6.385–400) describing the punishment itself. Even though this punishment is one of the most gruesome in the poem, Apollo is not described as satisfied (or unsatisfied) with its gore, perhaps because Apollo is a male deity, or because Marsyas overstepped artistic, not sexual or reproductive, bounds.

(5.781–82). When Juno later sees that Aeneas' fleet has been rescued, she ironically exclaims, *at, credo, mea numina tandem / fessa iacent, odiis aut exsaturata quievi* (7.297–98). Throughout the *Aeneid*, then, the narrator, Aeneas, and Juno herself use derivatives of *satiare*, poetically etymologized with Saturnia, to cast her grudge against Aeneas as insatiable.

In the *Metamorphoses* as well, Juno plays the role of the relentless avenger, particularly in her crusade against the newly founded house of Cadmus in Books 3–4. Janan, in her exploration of Thebes' role in the *Metamorphoses*, argues that in Ovid's mini-"Thebaid," Juno exemplifies the concept of the Lacanian lack as a character who continuously desires but is never fulfilled (96). Ovid, then, fashions a Juno with the same essential character as the Juno in the *Aeneid*, but while Vergil combined political and sexual motivations for Juno's anger (*Aen.* 1.126–28), Ovid draws attention solely to her sexual reasons for revenge. Juno's vengeful presence haunts the first three-fourths of the *Metamorphoses* as she punishes her husband's rape victims with particular ruthlessness: she sets Io, in cow form, under the watchful eyes of Argos and drives her over the ends of the earth (Book 1), she turns Callisto into a bear and denies her, even as a constellation, the purifying bath of the ocean (Book 2), and she tricks her husband into incinerating Semele (Book 3). When Ovid turns to reworking the *Aeneid* in Book 14, however, he pointedly leaves Juno out of the narrative, removing her familiar political function as the foil of Rome. By foregrounding Juno's revenge on Jove's rape victims rather than on the Trojans, Ovid signals his departure from Vergil's work and his return to the inherent Greekness of these myths. Furthermore, as we shall see, he repeatedly refuses to adopt the vocabulary that Vergil had used to draw attention to this portrayal of Juno as the implacable avenger, and the conspicuous absence of Juno's Vergilian epithet becomes as telling as its presence.

Ovid most emphatically signals his departure from Vergil in his treatment of Juno in Book 3. Attempting to bolster her confidence in her divine status, Juno says to herself: *si sum regina Iovisque / et soror et coniunx—certe soror* (3.265–66). Lucia Prauscello (566) correctly reads this remark as “Ovid’s witty correction” of Juno’s self-representation in the *Aeneid*: *ast ego, quae divum incedo regina Iovisque / et soror et coniunx* (1.46–47). Prauscello argues that Juno, just at the moment when she is acting as a wife, must deny her status as such, and that therefore she “defines and limits her status to that of Jupiter’s sister and it is as such, that is, as Saturnus’ raging and vengeful daughter, that she comes to reveal and assert her truer self” (567). In fact, just a few lines later, Juno calls herself “Saturnia,” solidifying her identification as Jove’s sister rather than wife (3.271). Although Ovid does pointedly rework Juno’s lines to draw out her identity as Saturn’s vicious daughter, her own self-correction also highlights her sexual disappointment: Ovid simultaneously denies Juno the status of Jove’s true wife and draws attention to her role as the wife of Jupiter.⁶

Juno’s awareness that she does not fully embody the role of Jove’s wife stems not only from the fact that Jove is having an affair with Semele, but also more painfully from the fact that Semele has conceived a child by Jove, something Juno, his wife, has done with what she describes as limited success.⁷ Her language shows that she considers this pregnancy a

⁶Even though one could argue that goddesses seldom play the role of the true wives of their husbands in any tradition, Ovid’s poem gives several examples of real marriages, full of mutual respect, love, and family values—for example, Pyrrha and Deucalion in Book 1 and Baucis and Philemon in Book 8.

⁷Juno reveals that Semele’s pregnancy is the basis of her jealousy when she concludes, *...et mater, quod vix mihi contigit, uno / de Iove vult fieri: tanta est fiducia formae* (3.269–70). Anderson points out that Juno has had very few children by Jupiter—most notable of whom is the lame Vulcan—and therefore becomes enraged with Semele because of her own pregnancy (301). Likewise, Hill argues that “her bitterness arises primarily from the much greater fecundity of other goddesses and women” (244). Rosati argues that the *vix* in line 269 is somewhat exaggerated, given Vulcan’s importance as a deity, but that her characteristic hatred of Jove’s

particularly transgressive act on Semele's part: *manifestaque crimina pleno / fert utero et mater* (3.268–9). Here, the adjective *manifesta* shows that Juno is incensed by the public nature of Semele's pregnancy; for Juno, Semele's pregnancy loudly announces her affair with Jupiter. The charged term *crimen* reveals Juno's attitude, but the adjective *plenus* also looks forward to Myrrha's state, *plena patris* (10.469), after an even more transgressive sexual act, namely incest. Directly after Juno remembers this affront, she resolves that she cannot be herself if she does not punish Semele: *nec sum Saturnia* (3.571). She acknowledges that Jupiter can take away her status as wife but cannot erase her identity as Saturnia's daughter, her most basic, truest self. Here, Juno herself connects Semele's greatest offense against her, pregnancy, with a need to mete out punishment as the vengeful daughter of Saturnus.⁸

Right after the description of Semele's gruesome death, Ovid describes Juno's anger at Jupiter for a different kind of offense, namely for arguing that women enjoy sex more than men. After Tiresias sides with Jupiter, Juno curses him with blindness. Ovid says that Juno takes this

illegitimate children could arise partially from her role as goddess of marriage and childbirth. Rosati also draws attention to the irony of Juno's epithet here, as *Saturnia*, derived from *Saturnus*, stems in folk etymology from *sero*, to sow (166). Bömer similarly points out that Juno dwells much more on her bitterness towards Jove's illegitimate children than on her own children by him (520). Juno's sense of violation about this pregnancy in particular could also be exacerbated by the fact that Semele and Juno were engaging in a long-term, consensual affair: although Juno shows no mercy to Jupiter's hit-and-run rape victims (e.g., Callisto), perhaps she sees Semele's affair with Jupiter as more of a threat.

⁸After Juno's particularly harsh treatment of Callisto, as well, she earns the patronymic Saturnia. Juno turns the pregnant Callisto into a bear, and she wanders the wilderness as a beast for many years before her grown son almost spears her. In the last minute, Jupiter takes pity on the pair and whirls them up to heaven as a constellation, but Juno makes the other gods promise that Callisto, even in her constellational bear form, will never dip into the sea. Shawn O'Bryhim has elucidated this puzzling detail by pointing out that by turning Callisto into a bear, Juno has denied the new mother a purifying bath, and by prohibiting the constellation from dipping into the ocean, Juno has made this injunction eternal (79–80). Right after Juno obtains her wish, she is again called Saturnia (2.531), as Ovid once more connects Juno's thwarted role as the rightful wife of Jove and mother of his children with her identification of Saturnus's vengeful daughter.

judgement entirely out of proportion, grieving more excessively than is right: *gravius Saturnia iusto / nec pro materia fertur doluisse* (3.333–34). Once again, Juno's identification with her natal family via her patronymic appears in close conjunction with a matter dealing with sex. Just as she was called Saturnia when dealing with her husband's pregnant rape victims, so she is again connected with her father when she and her husband disagree on another matter of sex. Ovid repeatedly employs Juno's patronymic to activate her identification as Saturnus' cruel and vengeful daughter and to highlight the fact that her anger almost exclusively centers on matters having to do with sex. In contrast, in the *Aeneid*, Jupiter identifies Juno with their father in connection to her tireless rage against the Trojan race as a whole: *es germana Iovis Saturnique altera proles: / irarum tantos volvis sub pectore fluctus* (12.830–31). Unlike Vergil's Juno, Ovid's Juno identifies herself repeatedly with her natal family, rather than as Jove's true wife, and narrows her anger down to Jupiter's sexual transgressions rather than expanding it to encompass the entire Trojan race and, by extension, the Romans.

In fact, the only time that Ovid does employ the verb *satiare* in association with Juno, he purposefully misplaces it. In Ovid's Hercules cycle, he recounts the hero's marriage to Deianira and her rescue from the lecherous centaur Nessus. Before Nessus dies, he gives the gullible Deianira a cloak steeped in poison, promising her that it can restore lost love. When Deianira mistakenly believes that Hercules has started an affair, she sends her husband the toxic garment. Burning alive, Hercules begins his long tirade by mistakenly attributing the source of his pain to his usual tormentor, Juno:

... caecaque medullis
 tabe liquefactis tollens ad sidera palmas,
 'cladibus' exclamat '*Saturnia*, pascere nostris!
 pascere et hanc pestem specta, crudelis, ab alto
 corque ferum *satia*! (9.174–78).

Here, Hercules draws on Vergil's use of this poetic etymology, first introducing Juno by her patronymic then employing the associated verb two lines later.⁹ James O'Hara includes this passage in his list of poetic etymologizing of Saturnia and *satiare* (164), and Andreas Michalopoulos argues that this association "emphasises Juno's fierce nature" (155). In fact, Hercules, not the most intellectually gifted hero, bumbles the Vergilian allusion: Juno is not responsible for Hercules' suffering, and if Hercules knew his Vergil, he would realize that bidding the goddess to be satiated is fruitless.¹⁰ Here, Ovid acknowledges the well-known poetic etymology of Saturnia and, in having Hercules misidentify the source of his pain, he signifies his departure from Vergil's use of the poetic etymology of *satiare*.

Although Ovid declines to use Vergil's vocabulary in his description of Juno's unrelenting anger, in his structuring of Hercules' life story, he nevertheless reinforces the image of her implacability. In the end, Juno grudgingly allows Hercules to be deified, but Ovid undercuts her acquiescence by reversing the chronological order of Hercules' life and flashing back to his birth immediately after he describes his apotheosis. Here, Alcmena herself relates how Juno, in her form as Lucina, goddess of childbirth, tortured her by preventing her from giving birth. Even though Juno ultimately gives up her anger against Hercules, Ovid ends his narrative with a story that showcases the goddess' grudge against him: he structures his account of Hercules' life to create the effect that Juno's persecution of him will never end.

In fact, although Hercules' address to Juno draws on Vergil's depiction of Saturnia, it more closely quotes Niobe from *Met.* 6. Niobe brags that in her abundance of riches and twelve

⁹Just a few lines after that, Hercules repeats the word *pascere* as he narrates his slow destruction: *ignis edax imis perque omnes pascitur artus* (9.202). By repeating this verb, Hercules strengthens the connection between the image of eating and the violence being done to his body.

¹⁰Aeneas ineptly does likewise: '*et pater omnipotens et tu Saturnia coniunx / (iam melior, iam, diva, precor)....*' (*Aen.* 12.178–79).

children, she is more worthy of worship than the goddess Latona, who has borne only two children, and in exile to boot. Latona, in response, enlists her two children Diana and Apollo to deprive Niobe of the bounty of which she is so proud. After the archer deities have slain her six sons, Niobe begs Latona to be satisfied:

... ad caelum liventia bracchia tollens
'pascere, crudelis, nostro, Latona, dolore
[pascere, ait, satiaque meo tua pectora luctu]
corque ferum *satia!*' dixit; 'per funera septem
efferor. exulta victrixque inimica triumpho! (6.279–83)

Niobe's speech very closely resembles Hercules': both characters address the goddesses as *crudelis*, bid them to feed, *pascere*, on their grief, and use the phrase *corque ferum satia*.¹¹ Read alongside Hercules' address to Saturnia, the insertion of Latona's name into Niobe's prayer seems almost jarring; here there is no connection between the verb *satiare* and Juno Saturnia, even though Ovid repeats the phrase *corque ferum satia* word for word.¹² Unlike the misguided Hercules, Niobe has correctly identified the authoress of her grief and therefore has a chance of successfully appealing to the goddess: a request that would prove impossible in the case of the insatiable Saturnia could well be realized in a prayer to Latona. By styling the beginnings of these two speeches so similarly and repeating the verb *satiare*, Ovid encourages the reader to draw parallels between them: whereas Hercules correctly uses Vergil's poetic etymology of

¹¹Because both lines 281 and 282 contain verbs of speaking, most editors remove one of them to make sense of the passage. Anderson brackets lines 281 because he considers the prepositional phrase in line 282 essential to understanding the verb *efferor* in line 283 (190). Tarrant, however, brackets both lines 281 and 282. Removing line 281 and preserving 280 and 282 makes the parallels with Hercules' speech even more apparent.

¹²Ironically, Latona shows the same vindictiveness in punishing Niobe that Juno once inflicted upon her as a rival for Jove's affection. Here, the word *satia* activates associations with Juno and brings the irony of the situation to the forefront.

Saturnia in a speech to the wrong addressee, Niobe uses the word *satiare* loaded with Vergilian associations in her prayer to a different goddess, this time the correct one.

But as soon as Niobe admits defeat, the word *victrix* in line 283 rekindles her former arrogance, and she gloats, '*cur autem victrix? miserae mihi plura supersunt, / quam tibi felici: post tot quoque funera vinco*' (6.284–85). Immediately following the abrupt switch in her train of thought, the slaughter resumes: *dixerat, et sonuit contento nervus ab arco* (6.286). Latona takes Niobe's prayer at face value: she does take her fill of Niobe's pain, but not as Niobe had hoped. Ovid frontloads the reassumption of his narration with verbs, *dixerat et sonuit*, to emphasize the immediacy of Latona's response to Niobe's words: as soon as Niobe resumes her bragging, Latona strikes. The jarring change in tone of Niobe's speech and Ovid's emphasis on the immediacy of the next blow lend the impression that Latona is responding directly to Niobe's arrogance: Latona herself is not excessively bloodthirsty, but Niobe sabotages her own prayer.

Although Niobe directly addresses Latona as the one responsible for her children's deaths, Diana and Apollo do the dirty work. Janan uses this episode to contrast male and female divinities' approaches to taking revenge: whereas Juno hunts down every last member of the house of Cadmus, Janan argues, Apollo kills Niobe's children and washes his hands of the whole affair (99). By focusing on Apollo as the main figure in this episode, Janan writes off the goddesses' roles in the action. In fact, after the slaughter has begun, the narrative focuses on the mortal experience of the events, as the divine arrows seem to materialize out of thin air. Furthermore, Niobe identifies Latona, not Apollo, as the driving force of her tragedy. Here, Ovid explores Latona's, not Apollo's, *ira* and casts her as a vengeful goddess, to be sure, but one who responds to explicit affronts to her divinity; her reaction is contrasted with Juno's vindictiveness in hunting down innocent women only because her husband has raped them. She takes revenge

when Niobe styles herself as a goddess more divine than herself, pauses when Niobe pleads, and resumes as Niobe continues to brag. Latona, unlike Juno, responds to immediate stimuli and, in the end, is satisfied.¹³

Immediately following the description of Niobe's transformation, Ovid again flashes back, this time to describe how Latona bore Apollo and Diana. Juno, angered that Latona has conceived twins by her philandering husband, closes off the whole earth to Latona in the very hour of her childbirth. Here again, Juno uses her role as goddess of childbirth to torture a woman in labor. By ending both episodes with tales of Juno's revenge on women in labor with children sired by Jupiter, Ovid draws attention to the root of Juno's anger—her husband's cheating and her own sexual frustration and dissatisfaction with her existing children¹⁴—and underscores the irony of her situation: the goddess of marriage and childbirth is reduced to taking revenge on her husband's rape victims rather than on her husband. Furthermore, by interrupting the chronological flow of both of these stories, the poet brings Juno to the forefront and creates the effect that her rage is never-ending and all-encompassing. As she is constantly thwarted in her role as wife, Juno's anger is insatiable in its scope, but Ovid pointedly declines to use the poetic etymology that highlights this characteristic.

¹³As the mother of two powerful Olympian gods, in whom she takes great pride, Latona perhaps does not feel such affronts to her status as deeply as Juno does.

¹⁴The most famous of Juno's children is the lame Vulcan (see footnote 7).

SECTION II: DIANA

Apart from these two occurrences of the verb *satiare* in the imperative form, almost every other instance of the verb in the perfect passive participle¹⁵ appears in reference to Diana. As noted above, Diana takes an active role in the slaughter of Niobe's children, and even though she is acting under orders from her mother, we can reasonably associate the use of this verb with Diana as well. Like mother, like daughter. As we shall see, the verbal echoes that surround the episodes of Diana's vengeance express satiety, not insatiability, as Ovid capitalizes on Vergil's poetic etymology to portray this vengeful goddess stuffed with slaughter.

The two appearances of the participle *satiatus* bookend the Actaeon episode, first introducing Actaeon's dogs and then clinching the story by modifying Diana. In the prologue-like introduction to Actaeon's metamorphosis, Ovid pre-emptively describes the hero's dogs as gluttoned with the blood of their master:

prima nepos inter tot res tibi, Cadme, secundas
causa fuit luctus alienaque cornua fronti
addita vosque, canes *satiatae* sanguine erili;
at bene si quaeras, fortunae crimen in illo,
non scelus invenies; quod enim scelus error habebat? (3. 138–42)

By introducing one of Diana's most brutal acts of revenge with the participle *satiatus*, loaded with Vergilian implication, Ovid looks forward to the end of the episode and implies from the very beginning that Diana, too, will be satiated with slaughter. Furthermore, the direct address and the emphatic repetition of *crimen* and *scelus* (twice) in these first few lines challenge the

¹⁵As we have seen, the verb appears twice as an imperative, in reference to Latona (6.282) and Juno (9.178), and once as a finite verb, in reference to Erysichthon (8.836).

reader to find any trace of wrongdoing on Actaeon's part. Because Ovid initially establishes Actaeon's transgression as a mere mistake, Diana's punishment as the episode unfolds seems excessively brutal.

Ovid further connects the appearance of *satiatus* here with Diana by making it, and the dogs it modifies, feminine. Franz Bömer chalks this distinction up to the fact that hunting dogs were often female (488), even though Ovid's subsequent catalogue describes, at length, both male and female dogs. Alessandro Barchiesi argues that the feminine adjective connects the bloodthirsty dogs to the Bacchantes who tear apart Pentheus, Actaeon's father, later in the book (149). But the parallel to the *satiatae canes* comes much sooner, in its application to Diana at the end of the episode. Furthermore, while Bömer is correct that hunting dogs were often (but not exclusively) female, the practice of referring to a group of male and female dogs as exclusively female does not reflect Ovid's desire to show off his knowledge of hunting practices, but rather is symptomatic of a larger "feminization of the animal dog" (Franco 145). According to Cristiana Franco, authors like Xenophon and Isocrates often refer to dogs as feminine "to exploit the symbolic opportunities that the cultural opposition of male-female creates" (145). Here, Ovid does the same thing, assigning female dogs the thirst for bloody vengeance that is associated with female divinities throughout the rest of the poem.

By foregrounding the dogs in this way, Ovid also invokes the other, more naturalistic version of Actaeon's story, in which the dogs suffer a sudden attack of *lyssa*, a "disease" that causes them to go mad and revert to their primal, wolf-like instincts (Franco 30). According to Franco, this version of the myth plays out latent anxiety that dogs could simply go wild at any moment and thus reveals the assumption that dogs were particularly vulnerable to mental imbalance (30). C.M.C. Green sees the ancient conception of hunting overall as "a paradigm for the

process by which particular opposites (female and male, wild and tame, wildness and civilization, ignorance and knowledge) were brought into a relationship proper to each” and considers hunting disasters like Actaeon’s death as an inversion of this proper relationship (226). In his telling of the Actaeon myth, Ovid renders the dogs female to foreground the anxieties about hunting dogs: the *satiatae canes* at the beginning of the episode show the instability of the canine as well as the feminine mind, one that can be beset by bloodthirst at any time.¹⁶

At the end of the episode, the repetition of *satiatus* shows that Ovid means the reader to associate the dogs not merely with females in general, but with one female in particular: *nec nisi finita per plurima vulnera vita / ira pharetratae fertur satiata Dianae* (3. 251–52). He ends this story with a bang, positioning *satiata Dianae* together as the last two words of the episode to connect them with the unstable, bloodthirsty beasts he featured at the beginning. The repetition of the use of *satiatus* casts Diana as the aggressor in this scenario, one who does not pause as Latona did, but is satisfied only when Actaeon has died a sufficiently bloody death.

Furthermore, the narrator distances himself from the goddess’ revenge throughout the episode, seemingly not wishing to condone such drastic measures. As noted above, by emphasizing his *error*, Ovid casts Actaeon from the very beginning as an unwitting victim rather than an aggressor. Furthermore, in this last line, he separates himself from the conclusion of the

¹⁶The poet’s portrayal of the female mind in the Actaeon episode as inherently unstable and violent looks forward to the cast of unpredictable females later in the poem: Procne and Philomela slaughter Tereus’ son (6.620–46), Medea suddenly murders her own children to punish her husband (7.297–99), and Pentheus’ mother, just at the end of Book 3, tears him apart alongside a horde of Bacchantes (3.710–31). Ovid’s treatment of Medea in particular emphasizes her unpredictability: in three lines, she murders her children, leaves her husband, and flees Thessaly. This portrayal of women as inherently unstable creatures is rooted in Greek thought; Ovid has import- ed these notorious women from Greek mythology into his epic. See Franco (2014) for a deeper discussion of the connections between dogs, violent unpredictability, and women. Hesiod’s Pandora, in particular, exemplifies this association with her dog-like mind: ἐν δὲ θέμεν κύνεόν τε νόον καὶ ἐπὶ κλοπὴν ἥθος Ἑρμείην ἦνωγε, διάκτορον Ἀργεῖφόντην (Hes. *Op.* 67–68).

story with the verb *fertur*: here the narrator introduces another layer of storytelling to remove himself as the authority for this ending.

Ovid also immediately follows this ending by describing the gods' judgment of Diana's actions:

rumor in ambiguo est: aliis violentior aequo
visa dea est, alii laudant dignamque severa
virginitate vocant; pars invenit utraque causas.
sola Iovis coniunx non tam, culpetne probatne,
eloquitur, quam clade domus ab Agenore ductae
gaudet et a Tyria conlectum paelice transfert
in generis socios odium... (3.253–59)

By showing that Diana's punishment sparked a debate amongst the gods, Ovid suggests that her extreme vengeance was something to be talked about even among her fellow deities. Furthermore, Ovid singles out Juno, even though she belongs to neither camp of this dispute: Juno is simply happy that a member of the house of Cadmus has met a grisly end. D.C. Feeney argues that the *satiata* four lines earlier refers rather to Juno than to Diana and reintroduces a familiar Vergilian theme, as Juno's anger against the house of Thebes is reactivated (1991: 201). Because of the participle's emphatic position framing the description of Diana's punishment and of its other recurrences (discussed below), this participle should be understood in reference to Diana, not Juno: Ovid does not cast Juno as satiated but rather ushers her in immediately following this episode to contrast the two goddesses' styles of vengeance. While Diana's *ira* derives satisfaction in her extreme bloodthirst, Juno's anger is instead rekindled as she continues her crusade against Cadmus' descendants. Ovid refers to Juno as the wife of Jove to draw further attention to the virgin goddess' satiety and the wife's insatiability, thereby deepening the juxtaposition of the two goddesses. In situating the episode that details one of Diana's cruelest punishments in the

middle of Juno's crusade against Thebes, Ovid highlights both his refusal to associate Juno with her Vergilian modifier and his reassignment of *satiare* to cast Diana as gluttoned with blood.

Diana appears again as stuffed with gore at the end of the Meleager episode. When the people of Calydon leave her out of their sacrifices, she becomes enraged:

Oenea namque *ferunt* pleni successibus anni
primitias frugum Cereri, sua vina Lyaeo,
palladios flavae latices libasse Minervae;
coeptus ad agricolis superos pervenit ad omnes
ambitiosus honor: solas sine ture relictas
praeteritae cessasse *ferunt* Latoidos aras.
tangit et ira deos. (8.273–79)

Here, the narrator distances himself from the narrative by introducing the verb *fero* not once, but twice; he emphatically takes himself out of the running as the authority for the reason behind the goddess' anger. Furthermore, the gnomic statement that emphatically ends halfway through a line recalls the *ira* that Diana satisfies at the end of the Actaeon episode. By introducing uncertainty into the reasons behind Diana's anger, the poet makes her divine wrath seem more unpredictable and connects her both to the female dogs that kill Actaeon and the other women in the poem, such as Medea and Procne, who commit sudden violence.

To avenge her slighted divinity, Diana sets a fire-breathing boar upon the people, prompting the heroic hunt in which Meleager dedicates the spoils to Atalanta. Meleager's uncles attempt to appropriate the prize, and Meleager murders them in a fit of anger. Althaea, his mother, chooses her allegiance to her natal family, and she throws into the fire the magic branch that has so far preserved her son's life. When she kills herself, Meleager's sisters are left to mourn the destruction of their family. Throughout this string of murders and suicide, the reader loses sight of Diana's instigation of the affair until immediately after the description of the sisters' grief: *quas Parthaoniae tandem Latonia clade / exsatiata domus...* (8.542–43). Ovid emphatically con-

cludes the Meleager episode with an image of Diana gluttoned on the family's misfortune. Furthermore, he connects this episode both with the Actaeon episode and with Niobe's story: the participle *satiata* reappears to clinch the story as it did with the Actaeon episode, this time underscored by the intensifier *ex-*, and the matronymic Latonia connects Diana with her mother. Only when the Calydonian boar has wreaked all possible destruction and most of the ruling family's members have died is Diana satisfied. At that point, she turns Meleager's sisters into birds. Here, Ovid continues his pattern of emphatic association of *satiare* with the vengeful Diana.

SECTION III: *SATIARE* APPLIED TO MEN

Lest this pattern be too neat, however, Ovid also assigns the participle of *satiare* in reference to two men, Cephalus and Erysichthon. These episodes seem at first unrelated to Diana, but echo many of the themes that surround other occurrences of *satiare* throughout the *Metamorphoses*. When Cephalus is asked, in Book 7, about his remarkable spear, one that never misses its mark, he is at first loath to tell its story. Prompted, he recounts how his new marriage was almost destroyed when the goddess Aurora forced him, though he was reluctant, into a love affair. Upon his return to his wife, Procris, he disguised himself and tested her fidelity with increasingly extravagant gifts, and when she finally considered his proposal, he revealed himself. She fled to join Diana's ranks, but when they made up, she gave him a preternaturally swift hunting dog and the magic spear (7.661–803). Cephalus then switches to a seemingly idyllic description of his hunting practices:

venatum in silva iuvenaliter ire solebam,
nec mecum famuli nec equi nec naribus acres
ire canes nec lina sequi nodosa solebant:
tutus eram iaculo; sed cum *satiata* ferinae
dextera caedis erat, repetebam frigus et umbras... (7.805–10)

Cephalus' depiction of his hunting both echoes and pointedly departs from the beginning of the Actaeon episode in Book 3: after the mini-prologue in which the *satiatae canes* appear, the narrator relates that the mountain was "stained with the slaughter of various animals" (3.143), and Actaeon himself says that his "hunting nets, weapons, and companions were dripping with the blood of animals" (3.148). Both Cephalus and Actaeon are hunters embarking on an idyllic

landscape at noon, but they are strongly marked as hunters engaging in excessive slaughter: Actaeon's surroundings and hunting equipment are soaked with blood, while Cephalus' right hand is satiated with slaughter.

Barchiesi, citing Bömer's commentary, notes that the size of the prey concerned ancient hunters the most (301). Here Ovid focuses not on the size of the spoils, as he did in his telling of the Calydonian boar, but on the amount of blood shed and the way it subsequently marks these hunters, their equipment, and their environment. C. Green notes that "*ferinum* is the condition out of which hunting drew humans; but—when hunting is conducted in the wild, and particularly when sex is involved—the danger is that wildness will reclaim the young hunters" (240). Here, the images of excessive bloodshed that haunt Actaeon's and Cephalus' hunting scenes reflect this anxiety that hunting toes the border between civilization and wilderness, and they foreshadow the transgression of this boundary.

Actaeon, whose surroundings and tools are stained with gore, slips back into the wilderness by literally becoming the wild prey. Even though he hunts to an extreme, the participle *satiata* modifies the dogs and the goddess who kill him, not himself, and therefore casts these feminine forces as his aggressors that glut themselves on his blood. Thus, the foreboding tone created by the description of his excessive hunting foreshadows his own demise, and the appearance of the participle *satiata*, in reference to the female forces that destroy him, cast him as the victim of the scenario.

Cephalus, on the other hand, pointedly contrasts his style of hunting with that of Actaeon: he uses no dogs or nets but hunts with his spear alone (7.806–807). Furthermore, the participle *satiata* refers not to any aggressor, but to his own right hand, which is satiated with the slaughter of wild beasts (7.809). *Dextera*, like Diana and Actaeon's dogs, is feminine: Ovid uses

synecdoche to cast a feminine part of Cephalus' body as Cephalus himself, linking him both to Diana and to Actaeon's (female) dogs. Here, Ovid feminizes Cephalus in the same way he feminizes Actaeon's dogs, making a feminine part stand in for the whole in order to exploit the associations that come along with it.¹⁷ Furthermore, as Anderson notes, Ovid seems to have invented this use of the participle from *satiare* with an explanatory genitive, in the sense that he is full of slaughter (326). By constructing his participle with such a unique use of the genitive, Ovid figures Cephalus as a receptacle of the blood, much in the same way that Myrrha functions as a repository for her father's seed, *plena patris* (10.469).¹⁸ Both Myrrha and Cephalus are filled with the fluids of their transgressive acts, incestuous sex and excessive hunting, respectively.

Furthermore, Cephalus' and Actaeon's setting situate them in feminized spaces.¹⁹ Both of these hunters, tired from the day's slaughter, wander through *loci amoeni* alone at noontime, much as the virgin huntresses from the first three books of the *Metamorphoses* did before they found themselves victims of divine rapes. Anderson calls Actaeon's environment "a frequent setting for disaster" (352) and argues that the description of Cephalus' setting leads the reader to expect violence (326). According to Anderson, these settings create doubt as to who the aggressor is and who the victim, but, as we shall see, Ovid plants verbal cues to remind the

¹⁷The noun *manus*' feminine gender alone does not suffice to feminize Cephalus: rather, the pointed use of *satiata*—a word that connected Diana to Actaeon's dogs in their bloodlust and now is joined to Cephalus' hand that has engaged in excessive slaughter—is strongly reminiscent of the goddess and the female dogs. See Corbeill (2015) for a more detailed discussion of the relationship between grammatical gender and biological sex.

¹⁸Ovid's version of this story in Book 3 of the *Ars Amatoria* lacks this excess of bloodshed and any mention of satiety (3.687–746); the unusual use of the participle *satiata* has been reserved for its context in the *Metamorphoses*, perhaps to make the connection between Cephalus and Actaeon explicit.

¹⁹These spaces are feminized in that they are repeatedly, throughout the *Metamorphoses*, locations for (sexual) violence against women.

reader of the outcomes of these well-known tales. As Actaeon's story unfolds, he clearly becomes the victim of Diana's divine wrath. In retrospect, then, the appearance of the participle *satiata* at the beginning of the episode signals Actaeon's innocence. In contrast, even at the end of Cephalus' story, when he accidentally spears his wife, it remains unclear who the aggressor is, or even if there is an aggressor in this story. The participle *satiata* at the opening of the episode, however, both feminizes Cephalus and connects him with the female aggressors in Actaeon's story. As Cephalus is telling his own tale, the participle *satiata*, with its implications of violent unpredictability, casts doubt over his reliability as a narrator and the trustworthiness of his account.

By casting Cephalus in a female role with this participle, Ovid also alludes to another, seedier version of this myth. In Hyginus' version of the story, Procris does not graciously return to her husband bearing gifts: she dresses up as a boy and tempts him with the magic hunting dog and spear. She refuses to sell them for any price, but asks him to submit to intracural sex: *si utique... perstas id possidere, da mihi id quod pueri solent dare* (Fab. 189.7). Consumed by greed, Cephalus agrees, and Procris reveals herself to punish and then forgive her husband. By using a participle that exclusively refers to females throughout the *Metamorphoses* to describe Cephalus' hunting style, Ovid feminizes Cephalus and alludes to the story in which he willingly took on the passive role in a sex act, usually the domain of women, to gain the objects of his desire (P. Green 21–22). Cephalus' connection to Diana and Actaeon's dogs also casts him as the aggressor in the scenario and foreshadows a transgression of boundaries. Later, the same right hand that was glutted with the slaughter of wild beasts will be stained with his own wife's

blood.²⁰ The appearance of *satiata* in reference to Cephalus connects him with the unpredictable female *ira* that this participle modifies throughout the rest of the poem.

The verb *satiare* appears in the next book in reference to Erysichthon, who also crosses boundaries. When, despite clear warnings against the impiety of his actions, he cuts down a tree of a nymph beloved to Ceres, Ovid figures the felling of the tree in explicitly violent terms.²¹

When Ovid introduces the story, he describes the act as a rape: *ille etiam Cereale nemus violasse securi / dicitur et lucos ferro temerasse vetustos* (8.741–42). The words *violare* and *temerare*²² both have strong undercurrents of sexual violation. As Erysichthon strikes the first blow, Ovid connects this act with sacrificial slaughter:

cuius ut in trunco fecit manus inopia vulnus,
haud aliter fluxit discussus sanguine cortex,
quam solet, ante aras ingens ubi victima taurus
concidit, abrupta cruor e cervice profundi. (8.761–64)

²⁰The list of hunting implements that Cephalus does not use, in a string of polysyndeton, emphasizes his bloodied hand at the end: *ne mecum famuli nec equi nec naribus acres / ire canes nec lina sequi nodosa solebant: tutus eram iaculo; sed cum satiata ferinae / dextera caedis erat...* (7.806–09).

²¹As Richard Thomas notes, the felling of trees often proved dangerous, not only in Greek mythology but also in historical texts: speaker of Lysias 7 defends himself against cutting down a sacred olive tree (263). Particularly when the grove was sacred, and in Ovid's world, where every rock, tree, and stream could contain a numinous spirit, does "uneasiness emerge" in the act of cutting down trees (263). Erysichthon's refusal to heed obvious warnings, then, paints him as a particularly sacrilegious figure, and "there is absolutely no doubt that... punishment will ensue" (264).

²²According to the *OLD*, *temerare*'s second usage is "to violate sexually" or "to violate a marriage" (*temerare* 2). In the rest of his works, Ovid repeatedly uses *temerare* in this sense. In the *Amores*, for example, the speaker complains that the *lena* Dipsas "violated faithful bedchambers" (*thalamos temerare pudicos*, I.8.19), meaning his own relationship with the young woman from whom she is seeking patronage. In the *Ars Amatoria*, the speaker points out that the faithful Patroclus did not attempt to rape or woo Achilles' beloved: *non Actorides lectum temeravit Achillis* (1.743). Though *temerare* can simply mean "to violate, desecrate" (*OLD temerare* 1), its use in close conjunction with *violare* and its alternative definition of sexual violation gives this word a sexual connotation.

Ovid casts Erysichthon's attack on the sacred tree first as a rape, then as slaughter, blurring the lines between these two violent acts.

As punishment, Ceres sets Fames on Erysichthon to damn him with implacable hunger:

inque epulis epulas quaerit, quodque urbibus esse,
quodque *satis* poterat populo, non sufficit uni,
plusque cupit, quo plura suam demittit in alvum,
usque fretum recipit de tota flumina terra
nec *satiatur* aquis peregrinosque ebibit amnes
utque *rapax* ignis non umquam alimenta recusat
innumerasque trabes cremat et, quo copia maior
est data, plura petit turbaque voracior ipsa est... (8.832–39)

Though Erysichthon himself is literally insatiable, Ovid uses the verb *satiare* not in reference to Erysichthon, but within a rambling epic simile. Erysichthon's insatiability, it seems, so transgresses the bounds of the human appetite that it must be figured in terms of natural forces. In the end, Erysichthon's appetite proves so implacable that he eats his own body: *ipse suos artus lacero divellere morsu / coepit et infelix minuendo corpus alebat* (8.977–78). The addition of autophagy to this story is unique to Ovid (Thomas 264): here the poet takes pains to tie sexual violation and eating together as closely as possible. Erysichthon, then, commits an act of violence that seems a mixture of rape and murder and is subsequently punished by an angry goddess with a hunger so insatiable that he then destroys his own body to feed it. This kind of utter insatiability, characteristic of Juno in the *Aeneid*, feminizes Erysichthon much as the feminine participle *satiata* cast Cephalus in a female role. In the end, Erysichthon has completely lost control over his own body to such an extent that he consumes it himself.

CONCLUSION

All these occurrences of the verb *satiare* combine to create a picture of the female mind in Ovid's version of Greek myth: prone to sudden, unpredictable rage, driven by latent, unquenchable sexual desire, and satisfied only by bloodshed. Those instances that refer directly to goddesses occur during moments of extreme gore: Niobe and Hercules beg Latona and Juno, respectively, to stay their pain, and Diana is described as stuffed to the point of bursting with Actaeon's slaughter. Even the appearances of *satiare* that do not directly modify an angry goddess tap into the conflation of sex, violence, and eating that pervades the episodes of divine female punishment. Actaeon, punished for polluting Diana's sacrosanct virginity, is devoured by his own dogs, who turn against him. After he violates a tree sacred to Ceres, Erysichthon is infected with such ravenous hunger that he eats himself. Cephalus, whose hand is described as satiated with blood, is associated with the characteristics of the female mind that *satiare* denotes and accidentally, according to him, spears his own wife.

Furthermore, Ovid pointedly does not associate the verb *satiare* with its Vergilian subject, Juno. Instead, he repeatedly foregrounds the sexual motivations that drive both her and Diana. In bringing these vengeful goddesses' sexualities to the forefront, Ovid closely connects their *ira* with their sexual preoccupations. Juno is no longer Rome's political foil, but has reverted to the sexually thwarted, vengeful wife of Greek myth. In this portrayal of her, Ovid not only returns to the inherent Greek-ness of these myths, but also reinterprets Vergil's version of events. In his prologue, Vergil explains the reasons behind Juno's hatred of the Trojan people:

...manet alta mente repostum / iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae, / et genus invisum, et rapti Ganymedis honores (1.26–28). As Denis Feeney has pointed out, this characterization combines both “the historical perspective of Ennius and the mythical perspective of Homer” (1991: 131). Instead of providing a mixture of political and mythical motivations for Juno’s behavior, Ovid focuses solely on the mythical background of Juno’s anger by highlighting her sexual disappointment, thereby portraying her as the vindictive, insatiable Hera of Homer’s *Iliad*.

Furthermore, Ovid’s Juno never reconciles with her husband as Vergil’s Juno does in *Aeneid* 12. When Vergil’s Juno agrees to let the Trojans settle in Italy, her mythological grievances are resolved, but her historical allegiances remain: Juno and Jupiter reach a truce, however uneasy, while still leaving room for the Punic Wars down the road (Feeney 1991: 148). Ovid, however, leaves Juno’s anger unabated: she remains throughout the *Metamorphoses* the vengeful daughter of Saturnus.

This inherently Greek portrayal of the queen of the gods could seem simply a byproduct of Ovid’s subject matter (a series of Greek myths), but it has political implications as well. Ovid’s use of *sat-* words links to a larger agenda in the *Metamorphoses*, namely a portrayal of the gods that is at odds with Augustus’ religious program. This depiction of the gods, in particular of Juno and Diana, would fit in with the resistance to Augustan religious reform that many²³ have seen in the poem. Throughout his rule, Augustus ‘reformed’ Roman religion, restoring²⁴ and building forty-two temples, reviving traditional Roman cults, and taking over and

²³See, for example, Johnson (2008) and Segal (2001) for a fuller discussion of Ovid’s resistance to Augustan reform. Views on Ovid’s attitude towards Augustus have also dubbed him nominally supportive of the emperor—i.e., Otis (1966), Little (1972)—or pro-Augustan, for example, Galinsky (1975).

²⁴Augustus says that he ‘restored’ 42 temples, but scholars agree that these restorations almost entirely rebuilt the original structures (Galinsky 2007: 71).

transforming games like the *ludi saeculares* (Beard 172). Under the guise of restoring traditional Roman religion, Augustus carefully curated his public monuments to implicitly uphold his rule: each of these forty-two temples either refers directly or indirectly to the emperor or has imperial associations (Beard 197).

For example, Augustus rebuilt the Temple of Jupiter Feretrius, one of the oldest temples in Rome said to have been originally dedicated by Romulus, in 32 BCE and dedicated the Temple of Jupiter Tonans in 22 BCE to commemorate his narrow escape from a bolt of lightning. In both dedications, Augustus refashioned the king of the gods with imperial associations: by renovating Romulus' temple, he aligned himself with the founder of Rome. In his construction of the Temple of Jupiter Tonans, as well, he recast an ancient aspect of Jove with new, imperial connections and emphasized the legal aspect of Jupiter's divinity (Scheid 181). In 28 BCE, he dedicated the temple to Apollo on the Palatine; not only did this temple commemorate his victory at Actium, but it was also adjoined to his palace in a construction that combined imperial rule and religious patronage in one building. According to Galinsky, "the gods' renewed patronage of Rome was now literally set in stone" (2007: 75). In 7 BCE, Augustus also dedicated the *Porticus Liviae*, which most likely contained a shrine to *Concordia*: *te quoque magnifica, Concordia, dedicat aede / Livia, quam caro praestitit ipsa viro* (Ov. *Fas.* 6.637–8).²⁵

²⁵The Temple of Concord, as well, was renamed the Temple of Concordia Augusta after Ovid's exile on the thirty-seventh anniversary of Augustus' assumption of that name and was made into a lavish showplace (Galinsky 2007: 75). In this temple, Greek artworks were displayed in a new, Roman context: Alessandro Barchiesi argues that the Greek painting of Marsyas in chains shows the capture and transfer of Greek culture to Rome (2005: 293). A sculpture of Juno also appears in this temple, not as the vindictive Hera, but alongside Apollo in a grouping that Pliny called a 'palpable expression of concord' (HN 34.73) (Galinsky 1996: 297). B.A. Kellum argues that this specific sculpture grouping acts out the reconciliation of *Aeneid* 12 (280).

Throughout his religious reforms, Augustus attempted to remoralize Rome in part by playing up the more civil aspects of deities that often act unjustly, destructively, and excessively and by revamping them according to new, imperial associations. The Romans had long refashioned Greek deities to encompass more civic personas, as well. For example, Aphrodite, the Greek goddess of uncontrollable desire and carnal sex, has become the Roman *alma Venus genetrix* and taken on a maternal role as the mother of Aeneas, a role she had already begun to assume with Caesar's construction of the temple of Venus Genetrix. Mars, too, originally a god of pure destruction, became Mars Pater, a civic promoter of Roman strength and justice. In his temple to Mars Ultor, Augustus attempts to harness a more violent and primeval side of the god of war in seeking justice for his murdered father. Each god and goddess has a place in Augustus' imperial program. While Vergil provides political motivations for these deities' behavior alongside their mythical impetuses and portrays them as essentially Roman in a mythical world before Rome existed, Ovid rehellenizes them, putting the chaos back into the portrayal of the gods that Augustus is using to support his rule. This chaos, impulsiveness, and unpredictability pervade the *Metamorphoses*, and the portrayal of the gods' nature as capricious and the goddesses' as vengeful and insatiable does not align with Augustan religious reforms.²⁶

Ovid's repeated use of the verb *satiare* evokes this chaos. By borrowing a word that Vergil used so pointedly of Juno throughout the *Aeneid*, Ovid signals to his reader that his own usage of it is no coincidence. But instead of applying this word to Juno alone, Ovid uses it much more diffusely, binding Latona and Diana (another important goddess to the Romans) too, as

²⁶Ovid, moreover, was aware that his poetry could be read subversively: to cover his bases, he inserted formal announcements that his *Ars Amatoria* did not violate the *lex Julia*. For example, in the prologue he entreats, *este procul, vittae tennes, insigne pudoris, / quaeque tegis medios instita longa pedes* (1.31–32). And again in Book 2: *en iterum testor: nihil hic nisi lege remissum / luditur; in nostris instita nulla iocis* (2.599–600).

well as Erysichthon and Cephalus, in a web of associations between sex, eating, and bloodshed.²⁷ No clear and absolute pattern of words with *sat-* roots emerges across the *Metamorphoses*—even though it is closely connected with the feminine, it is not applied only to women, and it disappears in the second half of the poem—but the web of associations it creates is so visceral and disturbing that the pattern need not be perfect to stand out. Ovid’s use of *satiare* draws attention to a crossing of boundaries: his female deities are gluttoned not with food but with bloody vengeance in conflicts that revolve around sexual concerns; in the end, sexuality (or a lack thereof), eating, and bloodshed blend into each other so that it becomes difficult to tell where one stops and the other begins.

Ovid transforms a Vergilian epithet of Juno into such a disturbing nexus of concepts that it gives the reader pause: the religious reforms that Augustus was pushing depended on divine concord, but the web of associations that *satiare* evokes portrays a much more visceral, primordial, and unsettling side of these goddesses. The transgressive and excessive violence connected with the word *satiare* clashes jarringly with the divine *concordia* that Augustus emphasized. By creating this web of unsettling and violent associations around these goddesses, in particular around the goddess of marriage, Ovid chips away at the polished portrayal of divine peace touted in Augustan religious reforms and reminds his reader that no matter how rosy the picture may seem, these gods retain an appetite for violence that may be insatiable.

²⁷The connection between satiety, sex, and violence extends beyond the word *satiare*. For example, Procne, Philomela, and Tereus are also caught up in a tragedy in which the boundaries between these concepts are blurred. See footnote 3 for a fuller discussion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, William S. 1997. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books 1–5*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- . 1972. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books 6–10*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. 2005. "Learned Eyes: Poets, Viewers, Image Makers." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. Edited by Karl Galinsky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 281–305.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro and Gianpiero Rosati, with a translation by Ludovica Koch. 2007. *Ovidio. Metamorfosi: Volume II, Libri III–IV*. Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla/Arnoldo Mondadori Editore.
- Beard, Mary, John North, and Simon Price. 1998. *Religions of Rome: Volume 1, A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bömer, Franz. 1969. *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen: Buch I–III*. Heidelberg: Winter Verlag.
- . 1976. *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen: Buch VI–VII*. 1976. Heidelberg: Winter Verlag.
- . 1977. *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen: Buch VIII–IX*. 1977. Heidelberg: Winter Verlag.
- Corbeill, Anthony. 2015. *Sexing the World: Grammatical Gender and Biological Sex in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Eder, W. 1990. "Augustus and the Power of Tradition: The Augustan Principate as Binding Link between Republic and Empire." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*. Edited by Kurt A. Raaflaub and Mark Toher. Berkeley: University of California Press: 71–122.
- Feeney, D.C. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Feeney, D.C. 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Franco, Cristiana. 2014. *Shameless: The Canine and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*. Translated by Matthew Fox. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Galinsky, Karl. 1975. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: An Introduction to the Basic Aspects*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2007. "Continuity and Change: Religion in the Augustan Semi-Century." In *A*

- Companion to Roman Religion*. Edited by Jörg Rüpke. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing: 71–82.
- Green, C.M.C. 1996. “Terms of Venery: *Ars Armatoria* I.” *TAPA* 126: 221–63.
- Green, Peter. 1979. “The Innocence of Procris: Ovid *A.A.* 3.687–746.” *CJ* 75.1: 15–24.
- Heath, John. 1991. “Diana’s Understanding of Ovid’s ‘*Metamorphoses*.’” *CJ* 86.3: 233–243.
- Hill, D.E. 1985. *Ovid Metamorphoses I–IV*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Janan, Micaela. 2009. *Reflections in a Serpent’s Eye: Thebes in Ovid’s Metamorphoses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, Patricia J. 2008. *Ovid before Exile: Art and Punishment in the Metamorphoses*. London: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Kellum, B.A. 1990. “The City Adorned: Programmatic Display at the *Aedes Concordiae Augustae*.” In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*. Edited by Kurt A. Raafaub and Mark Toher. Berkeley: University of California Press: 276–307.
- Kenney, Edward J. 2011. *Ovidio. Metamorfosi: Volume IV, Libri VII–IX*. Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla/Arnoldo Mondadori Editore.
- Little, Douglas. 1972. “The Non-Augustanism of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.” *Mnemosyne* 25: 389–401.
- Maltby, Robert. 1991. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Leeds: Francis Cairns Publications.
- Michalopoulos, Andreas. 2001. *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid’s Metamorphoses: Commented Lexicon*. Leeds: Francis Cairns Publications.
- O’Byrhim, Shawn. 1990. “Ovid’s Version of Callisto’s Punishment.” *Hermes*. 118.1. 75–80.
- O’Hara, James J. 1999. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Otis, Brooks. 1966. *Ovid as an Epic Poet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Prauscello, Lucia. 2008. “Juno’s Wrath Again: Some Virgilian Echoes in Ovid, *Met.* 3. 253–315.” *CQ*. 58.2: 565–70.
- Richlin, Amy. 2014. “Reading Ovid’s Rapes.” In *Arguments with Silence: Writing the History of Roman Women*.

- Rosati, Gianpiero. 2009. *Ovidio. Metamorfosi: Volume III, Libri V–VI*. Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla/Arnoldo Mondadori Editore.
- Rosenmeyer, Patricia A. 2004. "Girls at Play in Early Greek Poetry." *The American Journal of Philology* 125.2: 163–78.
- Scheid, John. 2005. "Augustus and Roman Religion: Continuity, Conservatism, and Innovation." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. Edited by Karl Galinsky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 175–96.
- Segal, Charles. 2001. "Jupiter in Ovid's 'Metamorphoses.'" *Arion* 9.1: 78–99.
- Thomas, Richard F. 1988. "Tree Violation and Ambivalence in Vergil." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. 118: 261–73.
- Zanker, Paul. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Translated by Shapiro Alan. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.