FIRST AMONG WOMEN: OVID, *TRISTIA* 1.6 AND THE TRADITIONS OF 'EXEMPLARY' CATALOGUE

Stephen Hinds

With a striking closural gesture, Ovid begins the final elegy of the final book of the *Tristia* by retroactively dedicating the entire collection to his spouse:

> quanta tibi dederim nostris monumenta libellis,
> o mihi me coniunx carior, ipsa uides
> (*Trist.* 5.14.1–2)

> You see how great a monument I have given you in my books, O wife, dearer to me than myself.

The gesture is not entirely straightforward: of the fifty elegies which make up these five books, just seven are addressed by the poet to his wife, four of which are to be found in *Tristia* 5 itself. (Two further spousal elegies will follow in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1–3.) However, if we move back in time from *Tristia* 5, c. 12 CE, to the first, highly experimental, book from exile in 9 CE, we shall find that Ovid's first poem to his wife, positioned at the mid-point of that inaugural book, does indeed stand out as one of the most distinctive experiments in his new mode of exile elegy. This poem, read without foreknowledge of Ovid's later books from exile, *could* have been prolegomenal to a sustained elegiac exploration of the poet's marital relationship, and it constructs itself as such: Ovid addresses his wife, compares her (to her advantage) to a number of women celebrated in myth, literature and history, and ends by promising her that, etiolated though his poetic resources are by exile (*Trist.* 1.6.29–32), he will marshal all the strength still at his disposal to bestow on her the gift of poetic immortality:

> quantumcumque tamen praeconia nostra ualebunt,
> carminibus uiues tempus in omne meis
> (*Trist.* 1.6.35–6)

> Yet so far as praise of mine has power, you shall live for all time in my song.

In this sense, *Tristia* 1.6 offers an inaugural pledge which invites comparison with the inaugural pledge offered to an earlier elegiac woman, a *domina* rather than a *coniunx* or *uxor* of course, in the third poem of Ovid's *Amores*:

> nos quoque per totum pariter cantabimur orbem,
> iunctaque semper erunt nomina nostra tuis
> (*Am.* 1.3.25–6)
>
> You and I too shall be sung in like manner through all the world, and my name shall always be joined with yours.

Even if, in practice, the commitment to the new sub-genre of spousal love elegy announced in *Tristia* 1.6 turns out to be an intermittent one,[1] the fact that the collection's final poem redescribes the *Tristia* as, precisely, the fulfilment of that commitment should sharpen our interest in *Tristia* 1.6, an elegy which could have been, and in a certain sense was, programmatic for a new departure in Augustan personal poetry. The present chapter builds upon a pioneering 1965 discussion of the poem by Ted Kenney, already picked up in a 1985 piece of my own, to reread *Tristia* 1.6 as an *ad feminam* exploration by Ovid of various literary and cultural taxonomies available to situate and to measure the praise of a good woman within the interlocking worlds of myth, poetry and the Augustan principate.[2]

1. *First among mythological heroines*

As a sub-genre, Ovid's spousal elegy is marked above all by a combination of praise and protreptic: in both respects the achieved and desiderated virtue of Ovid's wife is negotiated through a cataloguing of *exempla* of similarly praiseworthy women in mythology. Thus, *Tristia* 5.14 itself offers a climactic inventory of wives who exhibit loyalty in adversity:

> aspicis ut longo teneat laudabilis aeuo
> nomen inextinctum Penelopaea fides?
> cernis ut Admeti cantetur et Hectoris uxor
> ausaque in accensos Iphias ire rogos?
> ut uiuat fama coniunx Phylaceia, cuius
> Iliacam celeri uir pede pressit humum?

> morte nihil opus est pro me, sed amore fideque:
> non ex difficili fama petenda tibi est
> (*Trist.* 5.14.35–42)
>
> Do you see how Penelope's loyalty is praised in the long reaches of time and how her name never dies? Do you perceive how Admetus' wife and Hector's are sung, and Evadne, daughter of Iphis, who dared to mount the lighted pyre? How Laodamia lives in fame, that Phylaceian spouse, whose husband touched with his swift foot the ground of Troy? It's not your death I need, but your love and loyalty: not by hard ways are you asked to seek for fame.

Such uses of mythological inventory to construct typologies of female virtue are of course well-established and familiar. Immediately suggestive of the broad currency of such mythological *exempla* in the Hellenistic and Roman literary imaginations is a list at Hyginus, *Fab.* 256 *quae castissimae fuerunt*, which includes Penelope, Laodamia and Alcestis, along with Evadne, Hecuba, Theonoe and Lucretia.[3]

Back in *Tristia* 1.6, just such a mini-catalogue occurs half-way through the elegy, featuring three heroines who will be adduced in later elegies too, and will comprise three of the five heroines catalogued in *Tristia* 5.14:

> nec probitate tua prior est aut Hectoris uxor,
> aut comes extincto Laodamia uiro,
> tu si Maeonium uatem sortita fuisses,
> Penelopes esset fama secunda tuae
> (*Trist.* 1.6.19–22)
>
> In uprightness neither does Hector's wife hold a place prior to you, nor Laodamia, companion of her husband in death. If you had been allotted the Maeonian poet, Penelope's fame would be second to yours.

Whereas in *Tristia* 5.14 these great wives of myth are exemplars whom Ovid's wife should strive to imitate in her own somewhat easier trials (*non ex difficili* …), here in *Tristia* 1.6 the claim is that Ovid's wife has *already* matched and transcended the great wives of myth. (Such ebb and flow in Ovid's level of confidence in his addressee is characteristic of his epistolary relationships in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* at

[1] I.e. as compared with the sustained investment of the *Amores* in poetry to or about the elegiac *domina*.

[2] Kenney (1965), 39–41; Hinds (1985), 27–8. On Ovid's wife in the exile poetry at large see Nagle (1980), 34–5 and 43–54; Helzle (1989); Lechi (1993), 29–31; and O'Gorman (1997), 115–22. My treatment here develops some observations in my own draft commentary on *Tristia* 1.6, serving thus as an earnest of my intent to deliver the whole of *Tristia* 1 to Ted Kenney, for Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, before too many more of his birthdays pass.

[3] Cf. here the suggestive remarks of Feeney (1992), 33–4, on 'the analogical form of much Roman love-poetry, in which one sees a compulsive mapping of lover and beloved onto the famous pairs of the mythical or historical past'.

large.) Thus Andromache, designated by reference to her husband Hector, encounters in Ovid's wife one whom she cannot surpass in *probitas*. Next, in a parallel *exemplum*, it is Laodamia who is *nec ... prior*. Laodamia's husband Protesilaus is not named; but that does not preclude us from registering an etymological irony in Ovid's denial of 'priority' to the wife of *Protesi-laos*, 'first of the host', and first Greek to disembark (and die) at Troy.[4] The final *exemplum* is Penelope: Ulysses' wife is the ultimate type of spousal devotion; but even Penelope's fame would be ranked *secunda* behind that of Ovid's wife, had Homer only known her.

My designation of this compact group of three *exempla* in 19–22 as a *catalogue* of female *probitas* may seem tendentious; but I am taking my lead from a couplet later in *Tristia* 1.6 itself, which enacts precisely such a move from microcosm to macrocosm in its treatment of mythological exemplification:

> prima locum sanctas heroidas inter haberes,
> prima bonis animi conspicerere tui
> (*Trist.* 1.6.33–4)
>
> You ought to have first place among the revered heroines;
> first place, in recognition of the goodness of your mind.

The argumentative link between 19–22 and 33–4 is close; so close, indeed, that many recent editors transpose 33–4 to follow 19–22 directly – not that the link needs such a transposition to be intelligible.[5] If the exiled poet were Homer (21), or if he were a stronger poet than he is (29–32, quoted two paragraphs hence), it is not just against the trio of Andromache, Laodamia and Penelope that the goodness of Ovid's wife would win first place in fame, but against every other *sancta herois* of mythology too.

Two allusive strands in *Trist.* 1.6.33–4 sharpen this couplet's reference to the traditions of mythological catalogue. First, it constitutes a clear recycling of a conceit which a previous Augustan elegist, Propertius, had addressed to *his* (ailing) beloved in anticipation of her death and arrival in the Underworld:

> et tibi Maeonias omnis *heroidas inter*
> *primus* erit nulla non tribuente *locus*
> (Prop. 2.28a.29–30)

[4] An etymologizing interpretation of Protesilaus' name is already visible in Homer: *Il.* 2.698–702. Given the 'exile as death' motif which is so early established in the *Tristia*, there is an extra point to this second mythological *exemplum*: like Protesilaus, Ovid is an *extinctus uir* (*Trist.* 1.3.21–4, 89–90; and, in the present elegy, cf. 31–2 *uiui ... | extinctum*) who enjoys unusual *post-mortem* devotion from a living wife.

[5] The case for transposition is argued by Luck (1967–77) ad loc. With Kenney (1965), 41 and n. 4, I am inclined to blame any unclarity in this part of the elegy on lines 23–8 (see section 3 below); the present paper, like Hinds (1985), 28, finds good reasons to keep lines 33–4 where they are. (My Cambridge commentary will offer a fuller discussion of the matter.)

> And among all the heroines of Maeonian Homer first
> place will go to you, granted by their common consent.

Propertius' specific reference is to the celebrated 'catalogue of heroines' summoned from Hades in book 11 of the Homeric *Odyssey*. He goes on at a later point in his elegy's argument to list some of these catalogued women by name – including Tyro, the very *herois* who would yield *primus ... locus* to the Propertian *domina* in the couplet just quoted (cf. *Od.* 11.235 ἔνθ' ἦ τοι πρώτην Τυρὼ ἴδον εὐπατέρειαν 'the first I saw was Tyro, born of noble sire'):[6]

> sunt apud infernos tot milia formosarum:
> pulchra sit in superis, si licet, una locis!
> uobiscum Antiope, uobiscum candida Tyro ...
> (Prop. 2.28c.49–51)
>
> There are so many thousands of the fair in the world
> below: let one beautiful woman remain in the places here
> above, if it may be! You have Antiope, you have bright
> Tyro ...

And what of Ovid's appropriation of the Propertian couplet in *Trist.* 1.6.33–4? Our poet follows Propertius in giving literary historical specificity to his version of the conceit about first-place ranking – but with a quiet change in the literary historical context in question. *prima locum sanctas heroidas inter haberes*: among which heroines would Ovid's wife rank first? Most obviously, she would rank first among heroines such as those named in this *Tristia* poem, viz. the trio of Andromache, Laodamia and, pre-eminently, Penelope in 19–22 (another group of *Maeonias ... heroidas*, perhaps, to replace the Tyro-led group invoked by Propertius[7]). But also, surely – and here is the other allusive strand in 33–4 to which I referred – she would rank first in *Ovid's own poetic collection of Heroides* or *Epistulae Heroidum*, itself a 'catalogue of women' writ large (and, as it happens, presented as a catalogue by Ovid himself as early as the inventory of his amatory works in *Amores* 2.18).[8] If 33–4 is read where it is transmitted in the elegy, the immediately preceding verses lend especially strong support to this interpretation through the overt contrast which they draw between Ovid's present and past poetic powers:

[6] Note that, with the almost certain humanist conjecture *Antiope* for the transmitted *est iope*, the first line of Propertius' list pairs Tyro with the heroine who follows immediately after her in the Odyssean catalogue (*Od.* 11.260).

[7] I.e. Ovid's reference to the *Maeonium uatem* in 21 patterns with his verbal allusions to Prop. 2.28a.29–30 in 1.6.33–4 to activate a play between Propertian and Ovidian sets of 'Maeonian heroines', presided over respectively by Tyro and Penelope.

[8] The remainder of this paragraph restates an argument made at Hinds (1985), 28, but newly and differently developed here.

ei mihi, non magnas quod habent mea carmina uires,
nostraque sunt meritis ora minora tuis!
siquid et in nobis uiui fuit ante uigoris,
extinctum longis occidit omne malis.
prima locum sanctas heroidas inter haberes …
(*Trist.* 1.6.29–33)

Alas that there is no great power in my songs, and that my utterance is smaller than your merits! If ever in former times I had some living vigour, all is dead and extinguished as a result of my long misfortunes. You ought to have first place among the revered heroines …

With this specific allusion to Ovid's own traditions of mythological catalogue, a pointed conceit emerges, parallel to the 'competition' for primacy between Tyro and Propertius' *domina* in the earlier elegist's version of the conceit. If Ovid, weakened by exile, had but the strength to do justice to his wife's merits, and if she were awarded first place among Ovid's *Heroides*, which heroine would thereby be relegated to second place? Why, none other than Penelope, whose epistle currently opens that collection: in other words, Ovid's covert 'what if …?' speculation concerning himself would precisely double his overt 'what if …?' speculation concerning Homer back in verses 21–2:

tu si Maeonium uatem sortita fuisses,
Penelopes esset fama secunda tuae.

In a manœuvre found elsewhere in *Tristia* 1 too, Ovid has here 'rewritten' part of his own pre-exile *oeuvre* in such a way as to enlarge the epistemological scope of the exile poem itself.[9] The claim of Ovid's wife to equal and transcend the heroines of mythology now rests not just upon a few couplets in this single short elegy, but upon an implied catalogue even longer and more ambitious than Homer's in *Odyssey* 11: namely, the entire corpus of Ovid's *Heroides*, all of whose treatments of female courage and suffering[10] now become retroactively subordinate, on Ovid's 'what if …?' scenario, to the story of a *Herois* closer to home.

A competition for mythological primacy thus shades into a competition for poetological primacy. The suggestion above about the 'rewriting' of the *Heroides* can be pressed a little further still – but not until we consider the beginning of *Tristia* 1.6, in which the traditions of catalogue poetry are already operative in ways which deserve fuller attention than they have received.

[9] See again Hinds (1985), with extended discussions of *Tristia* 1.1 and 1.7.

[10] As Roland Mayer suggests to me, the epithet *sanctas* in 1.6.33 combines in this context with the evocation of Penelope to characterize Ovid's set of *Heroides* through its more admirable rather than its less admirable members.

2. *First among elegiac women*

nec tantum Clario est Lyde dilecta poetae,
nec tantum Coo Bittis amata suo est,
pectoribus quantum tu nostris, uxor, inhaeres,
digna minus misero, non meliore uiro
(*Trist.* 1.6.1–4)

Not so greatly was Lyde loved by the Clarian poet, not so greatly was Bittis loved by her Coan, as you are deeply entwined, wife, in my heart, worthy of a less wretched, not a better, husband.

Ovid's opening address to his wife compares his love for her to the love of Clarian (= Colophonian) Antimachus for a woman called Lyde and to the love of Coan Philitas for a woman called Bittis. As in the middle of the elegy, Ovid here uses an inventory of famous erotic relationships to define his union with his wife; but whereas in 19–22 the *exempla* came from the unions of heroes, in 1–4 the *exempla* come from the unions of poets themselves. Why these particular poets? First, surely, because, like Ovid, these poets celebrated their beloveds in elegy: our poet is offering a generic pedigree for his poem. But why Greek elegists rather than Augustan elegists (as in *Am.* 1.15.27–30, *Trist.* 4.10.51–4 and *Trist.* 2.445–68), and why *these* Greek elegists, who are never invoked in this combination anywhere else in Roman literature? Antimachus is elsewhere defined at Rome less by his elegy than by his epic *Thebaid*; it is *Callimachus* and Philitas who are the canonical pair of approved Hellenic antecedents in Augustan elegy (Prop. 2.34b.31–2, with 45; Prop. 3.1.1; Ov. *Rem.* 759–60; cf. Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.58). The pairing at *Trist.* 1.6.1–2 should probably not be explained, as it sometimes is, by a claim that Lyde and Bittis were their poets' wives rather than their mistresses, and hence afforded specific precedent for Ovid's elegiac poetry to an *uxor* rather than to a *domina*: that claim, which derives from one admittedly important *testimonium* on Antimachus (quoted below), is firmly contradicted by the balance of other circumstantial evidence and now commands decreasing support.[11]

To come up with an alternative hypothesis, let us look more closely at what we know of Lyde and Bittis as poetical characters. Now the fact is that we know next to nothing about Philitas' alleged poetry for Bittis: not a single extant fragment of Philitas can be ascribed with confidence to a 'Bittis' poem, and Ovid is one of only two writers in

[11] Lyde as wife: [Plut.] *Cons. ad Ap.* 9.106b–c (quoted below). Lyde as *hetaira*: Clearchus ap. Athen. 13.597a; Wyss (1936), ix; Kenney (1965), 39; and most recently Matthews (1996), 27, with a succinct but comprehensive review of the question.

antiquity who even bears witness to the existence of such a subset of Philitas' *oeuvre* (more on that point later). For now, then, let us leave Philitas and Bittis to one side.

We have more information about Antimachus' poetic celebration of Lyde: and what we know with some confidence is that it took the form of a catalogue elegy, titled with the beloved's name, in which Antimachus explored his feelings for Lyde, and his grief at her untimely death, by measuring his and Lyde's own love-story against an extended narrative inventory of heroic misfortunes, probably for the most part also erotic, drawn from mythology.[12] (For Latinists, interest in the *Lyde* has usually been restricted to a long-standing speculation about the origins of Augustan 'subjective' love elegy in a Hellenistic and pre-Hellenistic category of erotically framed catalogue elegy which the *Lyde* (c. 400 BCE) seems to represent: as we shall see below, the present treatment may offer a novel way of revisiting that speculation.) Some sense of the governing autobiographical (or 'autobiographical') *mise-en-scène* of the *Lyde* can be divined from a thumbnail sketch of Antimachus' poem by the early third-century BCE elegist Hermesianax in his *Leontion* (on which, again, more later):

> Λυδῆς δ' Ἀντίμαχος Λυδηίδος ἐκ μὲν ἔρωτος
> πληγεὶς Πακτωλοῦ ῥεῦμ' ἐπέβη ποταμιοῦ·
> †δαρδανη† δὲ θανοῦσαν ὑπὸ ξηρὴν θέτο γαῖαν
> κλαίων, †αἰζαον† δ' ἦλθεν ἀποπρολιπὼν
> ἄκριην ἐς Κολοφῶνα, γόον δ' ἐνεπλήσατο βίβλους
> ἱρὰς, ἐκ παντὸς παυσάμενος καμάτου.
> (6 Wyss = Hermesian. fr. 7.41–6 Powell ap. Athen. 13. 597b)
>
> And Antimachus, smitten with love for the Lydian girl
> Lyde, went to the stream of the Pactolus river and …
> when she died he buried her beneath the dry earth,
> weeping, and … he left her behind and went to lofty
> Colophon, and filled his sacred scrolls with lamentations, finding rest after all his pain.

But the overall programme of the *Lyde* seems to emerge most clearly from a passage of pseudo-Plutarch's *Consolatio ad Apollonium*, in which the author commends Antimachus for his effective strategy of poetic self-consolation in the face of personal grief:

> ἐχρήσατο δὲ τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἀγωγῇ καὶ Ἀντίμαχος ὁ ποιητής.
> ἀποθανούσης γὰρ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτῶι Λύδης, πρὸς ἣν φιλοστόργως
> εἶχε, παραμύθιον τῆς λύπης αὑτῶι ἐποίησε τὴν ἐλεγείαν τὴν καλουμένην
> Λύδην, ἐξαριθμησάμενος τὰς ἡρωικὰς συμφοράς, τοῖς ἀλλοτρίοις
> κακοῖς ἐλάττω τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ποιῶν λύπην …
> (7 Wyss = [Plut.] *Cons. ad Ap.* 9.106b–c)
>
> The poet Antimachus also employed a similar method [of consolation]. For after the death of his wife [? see above] Lyde, whom he loved very dearly, he composed, as a consolation for his grief, the elegy called *Lyde*, in which he enumerated heroic misfortunes, and thus made his own grief less by means of others' ills ….

[12] The most current discussion is now Matthews (1996); but my own understanding of the *Lyde* is more directly indebted to Krevans (1993), and to a reading in typescript (back in 1994) of Krevans's long-anticipated book *The poet as editor: the poetic collection from Callimachus to Ovid*.

ἐξαριθμησάμενος τὰς ἡρωικὰς συμφορὰς …: as in the previous section of this chapter, a literary historical approach to *Tristia* 1.6 is leading us back to the idea of exemplification by catalogue. In our intertextual analysis of *Trist.* 1.6.33,

> prima locum sanctas heroidas inter haberes,

Ovid was seen to celebrate and to measure his love for his own poetic beloved through a deployment of the traditions of mythological inventory; now we find that the elegy's very opening move is to invoke a Greek poem which offers a precise anticipation of such a strategy of measurement. Georg Luck, however, urges caution in the face of any interpretation of Ovid's invocation of Lyde (and, with her, Bittis) as a literary historical position-statement:

> Er will nicht sagen, dass diese eine Elegie den umfangreichen Dichtungen jener beiden Griechen gleichwertig sei; er sagt nur, dass er seine Frau nicht weniger liebt als Lyde und Bittis geliebt wurden.[13]

Too much caution, I think. It would indeed be odd (as Luck implies) for Ovid to set up the brief 36 lines of *Tristia* 1.6 as a poetic production comparable to the ambitious, more-than-one-book work which we know the *Lyde* to have been. But if *Tristia* 1.6 is read not as an isolated 36-line elegy, but as a 36-line *programme* for future elegiac production (à la *Amores* 1.3), a comparison with the *Lyde* becomes entirely viable in terms of scale and poetic ambition.

More than that: it is worth pressing in this context the self-referential specifics of the 'what if …?' conceit at *Trist.* 1.6.33, which (as argued above) would subordinate not just catalogues of women in general, but Ovid's own *Heroides* in particular, to the heroism of Ovid's own wife:

> prima locum sanctas heroidas inter haberes ….

[13] Luck (1967–77) on *Trist.* 1.6.1–2.

What are these 'repositioned' *Heroides*, considered anew in the light of *Trist.* 1.6.1–4, but a ready-made Ovidian sequel to the *Lyde*, in which the poet's wife, like Antimachus' beloved, would preside over an elegiac Kollectivgedicht, several hundred lines long, of ἡρωϊκὰς συμφοράς? (The only structural difference would be that in Ovid's variation of the governing love-story, it is the poet himself, rather than his beloved, who would undergo the elegiac death.[14]) Most reconstructions of Antimachus' *Lyde* reasonably assume the poet's own love-story to have constituted a kind of preface or frame to the elegy's extended mythological *exempla*.[15] If that reconstruction is right, *prima locum … haberes* can thus gain another layer of precise literary historical allusivity: in the impossible aspiration of 33–4, Ovid's wife would have a 'firstness' like that of Penelope, in Ovid's 'resequenced' *Heroides*; but she would also have a firstness like that of Lyde, in the framing *mise-en-scène* of a post-Antimachan catalogue elegy.

One further detail in *Tristia* 1.6 may have its eye on the *Lyde*. What seems to worry Luck about the idea of reading into *Trist.* 1.6.1–4 any Ovidian aspiration to outdo Antimachus' *Lyde* in poetic competition is the lack of any reasonable proportionality in such an aim. But of course Ovid does not claim in *Tristia* 1.6 to succeed in any aspiration to match or outdo the *Lyde*, or any other piece of previous poetry (even his own). What he claims is that he *would have* been inspired by his wife to outdo all poetic competitors, *had he not been* so weakened by exile. Our elegy begins by invoking Antimachus' *Lyde* as a yardstick; near the end, it offers the following piece of self-criticism (quoted earlier):

> ei mihi, non magnas quod habent mea carmina uires,
> nostraque sunt meritis ora minora tuis!
> (*Trist.* 1.6.29–30)

There just may be a specific link between opening declaration and closural apology; and it is Luck himself who (*ad* 29–30) has acutely pointed it out: 'Um ein Werk wie die *Lyde* zu schreiben, braucht es μεγαλοφωνία, *os magna sonaturum* (Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.44).' In other words, Ovid may be implying in 29–30 a specific apology for his inability to write poetry for his wife on the ample plan of a *Lyde*.

Admired by Asclepiades,[16]

[14] Exile as death in *Tristia* 1: n. 4 above.

[15] See Cairns (1979), 219–20 (revisiting Day (1938), 11), and Matthews (1996), 32–7, on this reasonable inference from the *testimonia*. More speculatively cf. also Antim. *SH* 79 (= Callim. fr. 814 Pf. *dubium*), a contested fragment which ascribes to a poet who might be Antimachus the line 'I [or they] sat on the golden banks of the Pactolus'; the line has been related by many to Hermesian. fr. 7.41–2 Powell (quoted above), and hence argued to be an actual hexameter from the 'personal' portion of the *Lyde*: Pfeiffer (1949) ad loc., followed by West (1974), 169–70, Krevans (1993), 154–5, and Matthews (1996), 258–9.

[16] Alessandro Barchiesi suggests *per litteras* that Asclepiades' epigram may itself be germane to my discussion of *Tristia* 1.6: 'not only does it praise the *Lyde* but it has Lyde *in prima persona* speaking and advocating her first *locus* among women'. Compare too the σεμνοτης of Lyde here in line 2 with the *sanctitas* of Ovid's wife at *Trist.* 1.6.33.

> Λύδη καὶ γένος εἰμὶ καὶ οὔνομα· τῶν δ' ἀπὸ Κόδρου
> σεμνοτέρη πασῶν εἰμὶ δι' Ἀντίμαχον.
> τίς γάρ ἔμ' οὐκ ἤεισε; τίς οὐκ ἀνελέξατο Λύδην,
> τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου;
> (*AP* 9.63)
>
> Lyde is my name, and Lydian my stock; because of Antimachus, I am more revered than all women descended from Codrus. Who has not sung of me? Who has not read Lyde, the joint writing of the Muses and Antimachus?

and also by Posidippus (*AP* 12.168), the *Lyde* had an influential detractor in Callimachus; and it was precisely the poem's amplitude, its lack of Callimachean λεπτότης, which came in for the last-named poet's criticism at fr. 398, Λύδη καὶ παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν '*Lyde*, a fat and murky writing'[17] – which echoes and responds to the first and last lines of Asclepiades' just-quoted epigram.[18] What, then, of the fact that *Trist.* 1.6.29–30 reflects a specifically Callimachean vocabulary of small-scale aesthetics – with the Augustan elegist's usual profession of self-limitation customized to fit the exile's more sustained mode of self-depreciation?[19] In terms of ring-composition within *Tristia* 1.6, the familiar language of aesthetic apologetics in 29–30 could hardly be more appropriate (or, perhaps, more disingenuous): the 'largeness' of utterance whose absence in his exile poetry Ovid claims here to regret is precisely the largeness which produces proverbially unCallimachean works[20] … like the *Lyde*.[21]

[17] There is some room for discussion about the exact connotations of παχύς in Callim. fr. 398 (Krevans (1993), 156–9); what is not in doubt is that for Callimachus, as regularly in Greek, παχύς and λεπτός ('slender') function as opposites (Callim. fr. 1.23–4; Krevans (1993), 156 n. 50).

[18] Cameron (1995), 304; Matthews (1996), 28, with refs.

[19] … as elsewhere *passim* in Ovid's exile poetry: see Nagle (1980), 119–25, and (a spacious discussion) Williams (1994), 50–99.

[20] Needless to say, Ovid can thus play with Callimachus' negative characterization of the *Lyde* without regarding Antimachus' poem as somehow without interest or beneath his own allusive notice. Even for Callimachus himself, disagreement with the admirers of the *Lyde* mentioned above was probably a dispute among essentially like-minded poets (Knox (1985), 114–16); indeed, Callimachus' professed hostility to the *Lyde* may be readable as 'anxiety of influence' in the face of a poem which was probably more like the *Aetia* in scale, scope and conception than anything else in the previous elegiac tradition (so, persuasively, Krevans (1993), 156).

[21] Let me restrict to the present footnote a contentious piece of evidence which, if not unfounded, could add further fuel to my reading in this paragraph: viz. the theory that 'the big woman' disparaged at Callim. *Aet.* fr. 1.11–12, ἡ μεγάλη … γυνή, is, or somehow evokes, Antimachus' *Lyde*: τοῖν δ̓ἐ[δυοῖν Μίμνερμος ὅτι γλυκύς, ἁ κατὰ λεπτόν[…] ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή 'and of the two [poems?], that Mimnermus is sweet, the slender-styled […], and not the big woman, taught'. The *Scholia Florentina* seem to refer *both* terms of the couplet's comparison to Mimnermus. The most recent discussions (unlike some earlier ones) take the *Scholia* at their word here, but none the less read Callimachus' criticism at fr. 1.12 of the 'big woman' of one elegiac predecessor (Mimnermus in the so-called *Nanno*) as silently but pointedly evoking the 'fat woman' of a more immediate elegiac predecessor (Antimachus in the *Lyde*), who seems himself to have claimed Mimnermus as his fellow-Colophonian and model: so Cameron (1995), 315–16; cf. Krevans (1993), 155–6 with 151 (both adducing West (1974), 75–6).

It has been, and will continue to be, less easy to discuss the role of Philitas' Bittis than the role of Antimachus' Lyde in *Tristia* 1.6. For critics willing to speculate in a vacuum, it seems reasonable enough to suppose that Ovid's juxtaposition in lines 1–2 is indicative of a *Bittis* poem analogous in format to Antimachus' *Lyde*, a poem in which Philitas exercised his well-known virtuosity as an elegist.[22] The fact is, however, that other than *Trist.* 1.6.2, and an equally brief reprise in one of Ovid's later elegies to his wife,

> nec te nesciri patitur mea pagina, qua non
> inferius Coa Bittide nomen habes
> (*Pont.* 3.1.57–8)
>
> My pages do not permit you to be unknown, in which you have a name no less high in renown than Coan Bittis,

the only other certain extant *testimonium* to Philitas' Bittis-poetry anywhere in ancient literature occurs in a Hellenistic elegy which we have already mined for a *testimonium* to Antimachus' *Lyde*: viz. in the *Leontion* of Philitas' friend and pupil[23] Hermesianax:

> οἶσθα δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀοιδόν, ὃν Εὐρυπύλου πολῖται
> Κῶιοι χάλκειον στῆσαν ὑπὸ πλατάνοι
> Βιττίδα μολπάζοντα θοήν, περὶ πάντα Φιλίταν
> ῥήματα καὶ πᾶσαν τρυόμενον λαλιήν.
> (Hermesian. fr. 7.75–8 Powell ap. Athen. 13. 597b)
>
> And you know the poet whom the Coan citizens of Eurypylus set up in bronze beneath the plane tree, singing of his volatile Bittis, Philitas worn out by all his toils with words and forms of speech.

I do not intend to pursue the *Bittis* question any further here;[24] what I wish to do instead is to take a closer look at Hermesianax's *Leontion* itself, a poem which has never (to my knowledge) been allowed to serve as more than a secondary witness to the traditions of poetic catalogue in play here in *Tristia* 1.6. The extended fragment from the third and final book of the *Leontion* preserved in Athenaeus constitutes by far the most substantive witness we have to the kind of elegy which we think Antimachus'

[22] Another speculation about Callim. *Aet.* fr. 1.9–12 (cf. n. 21 above) could come into play here: viz. the idea that in lines 9–10 a long poem of Philitas, compared unfavourably with a short poem by the same poet (so the *Scholia Florentina*), and analogous in some way to 'the big woman' of line 12, could be none other than the *Bittis*: ἀλλὰ καθέλκει | … πολὺ τὴν μακρὴν ὄμπνια Θεσμοφόρος|ς 'But by far does bountiful Demeter outweigh the tall [woman?]'. On this speculation (attractively elaborated by Knox (1993), 67–8; cf. also Cameron (1995), 316–17), a long poem (or 'tall woman') in the first half of line 10 is the *Bittis*, while the remainder of the line identifies the short poem as Philitas' *Demeter*.

[23] For the relationship see Schol. Nic. *Ther.* 3 = Hermesian. fr. 12 Powell.

[24] Again, Knox (1993), 66–8, would be the starting-point for further inquiry.

Lyde (and perhaps Philitas' *Bittis*) to have been. Athenaeus introduces the 49 surviving couplets thus:

> ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ Μυρτίλος μέλλων σιωπᾶν "ἀλλὰ μικροῦ," ἔφη, "ἄνδρες φίλοι, ἐξελαθόμην ὑμῖν εἰπεῖν τὴν τε Ἀντιμάχου Λυδήν … παρέλιπον δὲ καὶ … τὴν Ἑρμησιάνακτος τοῦ Κολοφωνίου Λεόντιον· ἀπὸ γὰρ ταύτης ἐρωμένης αὐτῷ γενομένης ἔγραψεν ἐλεγειακὰ τρία βιβλία, ὧν ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ κατάλογον ποιεῖται ἐρωτικῶν, οὑτωσί πως λέγων·
> Οἵην μέν …
> (Athen. 13. 597a)
>
> At this Myrtilus was on the point of stopping when he said: 'But, my friends, I almost forgot to tell you of Antimachus' Lyde … I also omitted … the Leontion of Hermesianax the Colophonian; inspired by her after she became his beloved he wrote three books of elegiacs, in the last of which he gives a catalogue of love affairs in the following manner:
> "Such was she whom …"'.

If Antimachus catalogued the mostly erotic misadventures of heroic myth in order to come to terms with his love for Lyde (ἐξαριθμησάμενος τὰς ἡρωικὰς συμφοράς, in the Plutarchan *testimonium*), the erotic affairs which Hermesianax catalogues to memorialize his love for his elegy's eponymous Leontion (addressed three times in the second person in the extant fragment[25]) comprise a rather different inventory: these are the affairs of poets (and philosophers) themselves. It has been traditional to be a little rude about Hermesianax's catalogue: 'the loss of most early Alexandrian poetry has given to the long fragment from the *Leontion* an importance which it hardly merits' (E. A. Barber in *OCD*[1]); 'a catalogue of poets and philosophers in love that borders on the absurd' (Knox).[26] But, overrated or not, absurd or not, there are a number of cumulative reasons to think that Hermesianax's *Leontion* is implicitly in play here at the beginning of *Tristia* 1.6 as a third point of reference for Ovid in Greek catalogue elegy – alongside Antimachus' *Lyde* and Philitas' (conjectural) *Bittis*.

First, it is Hermesianax's catalogue, not Antimachus', which offers the closest typological precedent for our elegy's inaugural set of *exempla*: measurement of the poet's beloved not against women loved by heroes, as later in lines 19–22, but against women loved by other poets.

[25] Fr. 7.49 γιγνώσκεις; 73 γιγνώσκεις, ἄιονσα; 75 οἶσθα δέ (quoted above). Cf. Bing (1993), 625: 'We learn from the feminine participle in verses 73–4 that Leontion was the poem's addressee … ("you know Philoxenus and have heard …"). She was apparently a *docta puella* since the speaker repeatedly invokes her knowledge of the poetic heritage in this manner ("you know … Lesbian Alcaeus", 47–9; "you know Philitas", 75–7).'

[26] Knox (1993), 67. The most recent substantive discussions are by Bing (1993), 624–31 (with major moves towards rehabilitation), and Cameron (1995), 318–20 and 381–3 (without rehabilitation).

Second, the two specific *exempla* invoked by Ovid in these opening verses are ones which (as we have seen) actually occur in Hermesianax's catalogue of twelve poetic and three philosophical liaisons. More than that, the opening couplet of *Tristia* 1.6 constitutes the only explicit reference to Antimachus' *Lyde* in extant poetry after the third century BCE,[27] and the only explicit reference to Philitas' *Bittis anywhere at all* in extant Greek or Roman literature outside the *Leontion* (apart from Ovid's own reprise at *Pont.* 3.1.57–8). May not the most economical conjecture be that the *Leontion*-catalogue itself suggested to Ovid both his elegy's opening gambit and the specific pair of *exempla* which he here deploys?

My third reason for suspecting an operative allusion to the *Leontion*-catalogue in *Tristia* 1.6 derives from a point which my 1985 article registered only minimally. After lines 1–4 have measured Ovid's wife against women attached to poets, lines 19–22 measure her against women attached to heroes: but the latter set of *exempla* also hints at a kind of conflation with the former. If Andromache is paired with Hector (19), and Laodamia with Protesilaus (20),

> nec probitate tua prior est aut Hectoris uxor,
> aut comes extincto Laodamia uiro,

then our expectation in 21–2 (as, implicitly, in the *Tristia* 5.14 catalogue quoted at the outset) is that Penelope will be paired with Ulysses. What happens instead is that the comparison changes tack and Penelope is paired with Homer:[28]

> tu si Maeonium uatem sortita fuisses,
> Penelopes esset fama secunda tuae

'If you had been allotted Homer ... [sc. rather than me].' With Penelope we are still in the world of heroes; but with Homer we have returned to the world of poets, and their relationships with the women whom they love and write about: Antimachus, Philitas, now Homer. Homer? Most sensible commentators have resisted any fleeting implication that Homer and Penelope are eroticized here as a couple in the same sense as are all the other couples specified in *Tristia* 1.6; but I am not so sure. The fact is that a delightful conceit enrolling Penelope as Homer's beloved (i.e. not just his subject-matter) is explicitly attested just once in previous literature: viz. in the catalogue of Hermesianax's *Leontion*:

[27] Noted by Knox (1985), 113 n. 20. Recently, another possible poetic reference to the *Lyde*, ascribed by some to Antimachus' own *Delloi*, has emerged in P. Berol. 21340: Cameron (1995), 303–4 with 87–8, offering reports of the first wave of scholarly discussion.

[28] Such a shift in the terms of the *exemplum* is quite in the spirit of Ovid's self-fashioning in *Tristia* 1 at large: in the previous elegy, at *Trist.* 1.5.57–84, Ovid has compared himself at some length to Ulysses: back at *Trist.* 1.1.47–8 he had compared himself to Homer.

> λεπτὴν ἧις Ἰθάκην ἐνετείνατο θεῖος Ὅμηρος
> ᾠδῆισιν πινυτῆς εἵνεκα Πηνελόπης,
> ἣν διὰ πολλὰ παθὼν ὀλίγην ἐσενάσσατο νῆσον,
> πολλὸν ἀπ' εὐρείης λειπόμενος πατρίδος·
> ἔκλεε δ' Ἰκαρίου τε γένος καὶ δῆμον Ἀμύκλου
> καὶ Σπάρτην, ἰδίων ἁπτόμενος παθέων.
> (Hermesian. fr. 7.29–34 Powell ap. Athen. 13. 597b)
>
> Godlike Homer strung slender Ithaca with songs for the sake of shrewd Penelope. Weathering many pangs for her, he settled in that small island, leaving his spacious fatherland far behind. And he celebrated the race of Icarius, the people of Amyclus, and Sparta, grappling with his personal pains. (Tr. Peter Bing)

Lyde, Bittis, Penelope: can we doubt any longer that a specific engagement with the *Leontion* underpins Ovid's engagement with the traditions of erotic catalogue elegy here at the beginning of *Tristia* 1.6? This elevation of Hermesianax's poem to the status of primary source should not surprise us.[29] The *Leontion*-catalogue is itself something of a poetological response to previous traditions of catalogue poetry, a response encapsulated in the splendid fiction (more splendid even than that of Homer's affair with Penelope) which tells of Hesiod's love for a woman named 'Ehoie':[30]

> φημὶ δὲ καὶ Βοιωτὸν ἀποπρολιπόντα μέλαθρον
> Ἡσίοδον πάσης ἥρανον ἱστορίης
> Ἀσκραίων ἐσικέσθαι ἐρῶντ' Ἐλικωνίδα κώμην·
> ἔνθεν ὅ γ' Ἠοίην μνώμενος Ἀσκραικὴν
> πόλλ' ἔπαθεν, πάσας δὲ λόγων ἀνεγράψατο βίβλους
> ὑμνῶν, ἐκ πρώτης παιδὸς ἀνερχόμενος.
> (Hermesian. fr. 7.21–6 Powell ap. Athen. 13. 597b)

[29] Another instance of Hermesianax as source for Ovidian poetry: a tale ascribed to the second book of the *Leontion* has long been linked by scholars to the episode of Iphis and Anaxarete in *Metamorphoses* 14: Hermesian. fr. 4 Powell ap. Ant. Lib. 39 (Arceophon and Arsinoe) with Day (1938), 21 n. 1; cf. Myers (1994), 122–4, and Bömer (1969–86) ad *Met.* 14.698–764.

[30] These and other poetological jokes in the *Leontion* are explored with new insight and appreciation by Bing (1993), 626–31. On a tangent, does fr. 7.45–6 (quoted earlier) perhaps pun geographically on the idea of literary closure, in that *Colophon* is where Antimachus puts a κόλοφ ὸν first to his pain (ἐκ παντὸς παυσάμενος καμάτου), and then to his books (γόον δ' ἐνεπλήσατο βίβλους)? κόλοφ ὸν in the sense 'finishing touch' is well established in Greek: e.g. Plat. *Lg.* 674c κόλοφ ὸν ἐπὶ τῶι περὶ οἶνον λόγωι ῥηθέντι εἰρήσθω, with LSJ s.v.; according to Strab. 14.1.28 the usage derives from a proverb about the finishing power of the city's cavalry. Familiar linguistic territory, presumably, to any Colophonian poet. (However, it should be noted that as a specific term of book production 'colophon' is post-antique: see Pfeiffer (1968), 127 n. 1, a reference I owe to Roland Mayer.)

> I claim that even Boeotian Hesiod, master of every legend, left his home, and came, for love, to the Heliconian village of the Ascraeans, and courted the Ascraean girl, Ehoie, and weathered many pangs, and wrote down all his catalogues on scrolls while he sang, always starting up again with the girl. (Tr. Peter Bing)

It was of course with the formula ἢ οἵη, 'or such as she who', that each new character was introduced in the Hesiodic *Ehoiai*, or *Catalogue of Women*; and it is with just such an exemplary οἵην/οἵη that each of the two sections of the *Leontion*-catalogue itself begins (loves of poets, loves of philosophers). Allusive recycling of the Hesiodic transition-formula was probably standard in Hellenistic catalogue poetry at large: the inventory of boys loved by gods and heroes in the third-century (?) elegiac Ἔρωτες ἢ Καλοί of Phanocles seems to have been articulated with an ἢ ὡς formula, of the Hesiodic type (frs. 1.1, 3.1 Powell); and Athenaeus refers (590b) to a Sosicrates (?) of Phanagoreia who wrote an *Ehoioi* ('Or such men as'), perhaps treating male amours of the gods.[31] Hermesianax's happy conceit about the origins of the *Ehoiai* in the Hesiodic poet's obsessive celebration of a named beloved is as arch a foundational myth as one could ask for, then, for the erotic and elegiac reinventions of the 'catalogue of women' tradition in later Greek poetry in general, and in Hermesianax's own *Leontion* in particular; and it will surely have found an appreciative reader in Ovid. Albeit in a less spectacular way, *Tristia* 1.6 is itself a reinvention of the 'catalogue of women' tradition, which is no less concerned than the *Leontion* to explore and to tell stories about its own literary historical grounds of existence.[32]

In modern scholarly discussion, 'the origins of Latin love-elegy' have long been claimed, or denied, in the lost erotic catalogue elegies of later classical and Hellenistic Greece from the *Lyde* to the *Leontion*, elegies in which sets of extended narrative *exempla* seem somehow to have been framed by or subordinated to a 'subjective' celebration or memorialization of an eponymous dedicatee, the poet's own beloved.[33] Sometimes this speculation has been thought to be misguided or quixotic: the present chapter's small contribution in this area is to vindicate the terms of the speculation by reading *Tristia* 1.6 as an Augustan poet's conscious attempt to renew a literary historical connexion with these originary texts. *Tristia* 1.6, a short poem of 36 lines which measures its dedicatee, Ovid's own wife, against five non-narrative *exempla*, is not in itself a catalogue elegy of this kind; but in its explicit and implicit citation of traditions of mythological and poetological exemplification from *Lyde* to *Leontion*, in its

[31] On Phanocles and on Sosicrates (or Sostratus?) of Phanagoreia cf. Cameron (1995), 381–2; Hopkinson (1988), 177–8.

[32] As Alessandro Barchiesi suggests to me, the repeated *nec tantum* at the beginning of *Tristia* 1.6 can perhaps itself be read as a fleeting invocation of the heavily-marked formular modulations of catalogue poetry (*qualis … qualis …*, ἢ οἵη, etc.).

[33] The classic discussion is that of Day (1938), 1–36 (I invoke his monograph title in my quotation marks). Day's essentially sceptical conclusions are importantly rethought and reassessed by Cairns (1979), 214–28; for a snapshot of the issue see *OCD*[3] s.v. 'Elegiac poetry, Latin' (Hinds).

background patterns of intertextual ramification which find the Homeric and Hesiodic catalogue-poetry behind the Hellenistic, above all in its 'what if …?' reconfiguration of an Ovidian corpus of *Heroides* into a *Lyde*-like memorial for the poet's own wife. *Tristia* 1.6 can be argued to constitute a kind of *allusive reinvocation* of those elegiac traditions.[34] And as a compliment to his spouse, as a statement of what might have been were Ovid but operating at full pre-exile strength, this brief elegy offers a 'virtual' celebration of her primacy if it cannot quite offer the real thing: if she will not be endowed with an actual new *Lyde*, at least the poet's wife will be endowed with a fine imagining of what such an elegiac *monumentum* might have been.

3. *Epilogue. First among women: Livia and the usurpation of exemplarity*

The concluding paragraph above includes the statement that Ovid's wife is measured in *Tristia* 1.6 against five specific examples of highly valued women. The elegy contains in lines 23–8 a sixth, rather different female *exemplum* too, one which sets Ovid's wife not beside the women attached to past poets or mythic heroes, but beside the wife of the most powerful man in Ovid's own world: Livia, consort of Augustus Caesar.[35] In general terms, the strategy is clear: the poet whose *Ars amatoria* has got him into such trouble disarms criticism by laying claim to partnership in a good Augustan marriage. However, in terms of the specifics of structure and logic, the passage in which Livia is adduced sits rather ill with the rest of the elegy – which is why, like Ted Kenney in his 1965 discussion, I have postponed discussion of it until the tail-end of my treatment. As Kenney remarks, the passage is awkwardly parenthetic to an argument which otherwise moves smoothly from line 22 to line 29.[36] If Ovid had been Homer, says the poet in 21–2, his wife would claim a renown which would leave Penelope in second place. Then this:

> siue tibi hoc debes, nullo pia facta magistro,
> cumque noua mores sunt tibi luce dati,
> femina seu princeps omnes tibi culta per annos
> te docet exemplum coniugis esse bonae,
> adsimilemque sui longa adsuetudine fecit,
> grandia si paruis adsimilare licet.
> (*Trist.* 1.6.23–8)

[34] There are welcome convergences of interest here with Alessandro Barchiesi, 'The self-positioning of *Heroides* 16–21 within the elegiac tradition', APA paper December 1997, developing Barchiesi (1993), 360–5, on the tendency of 'late' Ovidian elegy to meditate on and to renegotiate the history of the genre; cf. more generally the chapter 'Tradition and self-fashioning' in Hinds (1998), 123–44.

[35] On Livia in the exile poetry at large (including useful observations on *Tristia* 1.6), see now Johnson (1997), which appeared when this chapter was in final revision.

[36] Kenney (1965), 41. Nor is the flow of the argument significantly improved by the proposed transposition (mentioned earlier) of 33–4 to follow 21–2.

> Whether you owe this to yourself, schooled in loyalty by no teacher, and such character was given to you with life's new dawn, or whether that First Lady, revered by you through all the years, teaches you to be an example of the good wife, and by long association has made you like herself – if it is permitted to liken great things to small.

'Artistically this passage is worse than irrelevant: it is disastrous' (Kenney). His dissatisfaction comes not from some unfocussed modern discomfort with the conventions of imperial panegyric (uncomfortable though he and we may feel those conventions to be), but from an appreciation of very specific disruptions which the passage brings to the internal logic of the elegy's argument.

The fact is that Livia's usurpation of the poet's praise, especially in line 28, radically alters the argumentative dynamic of a poem otherwise concerned to exalt Ovid's wife. As Kenney points out, the polite down-grading of Ovid's wife in relation to Livia in line 28, *grandia si paruis* ..., undermines the whole basis of the compliments in 19–22: in 22 Ovid's wife surpasses *even* Penelope, the great archetype of marital fidelity; in 28 Ovid's wife, *and* therefore by implication Penelope, are rated insignificant on the Livian scale of good wives, so that one may reasonably wonder why the complimentary comparison with Penelope was worth making in the first place. The strain is no less marked for being temporary: the wifely merits which are 'small' beside the 'greatness' of Livia's in 28 will be great again in 29–30 (quoted in section 1 above) beside the smallness of the exiled Ovid's poetic resources.

Line 26 too becomes hard to read as Augustus' wife becomes the main focus of praise. Ovid envisages Livia teaching his wife to be *exemplum ... coniugis bonae*: evidently, in the context of the poem at large (and as in cognate locutions at *Trist.* 4.3.72 and *Pont.* 3.1.44), 'an example (for imitation), pattern, model' (*OLD* s.v. 6) rather than 'a typical example, instance' (*OLD* s.v. 2). That is how the translators and commentators take it, surely rightly: but what kind of 'pattern' or 'model' is this for good wifehood, which has to be so emphatically down-graded in relation to another pattern just two lines later (*grandia si paruis* ... again)?

The interpretative problems sketched above are symptomatic of a strain which formal panegyric will inevitably bring into a poem like this. Panegyric entails a raising of the stakes in the language of praise, and is always in danger of disrupting any other language of praise already in place. We might put it thus in the specific case of *Tristia* 1.6: a poem whose argumentative agenda is to negotiate a first-place ranking for one person cannot but be disrupted when another person is introduced whose claim to first-place ranking is absolute and non-negotiable. And this brings me to my final point. In a poem in which the 'firstness' of Ovid's wife is so emphatically and overtly at stake (1.6.19 *nec ... prior*, 22 *secunda tuae*, 33 *prima locum ... haberes*, 34 *prima ... conspicerere*), is not the poet's designation of Livia as the *femina ... princeps*, 'First Lady' (1.6.25), a singularly marked one? The fragile argumentative conceits of *Tristia* 1.6 will allow Ovid's wife to be 'first' in certain circumstances and on certain hypotheses: but only one woman in Rome has an *absolute* hold on the title *princeps femina*;[37] and she it is who is the ultimate arbiter of the standing of Ovid's wife, just as the *princeps* himself is (and has shown himself to be) the ultimate arbiter of Ovid's own standing. We may not like the usurpation of our poem's subtle systems of poeto-logical and mythological hierarchy by Livia: but what else have we a right to expect from the wife of Ovidian elegy's least sympathetic and most vindictive reader?

Ted Kenney does not seek to excise lines 23–8, but he does invite us to entertain the idea that the verses were a subsequent addition by Ovid to the original draft of his poem. He may well be right. I would supplement his verdict on the problematic passage in just one respect: it seems to me that the inconcinnity of 23–8 with the rest of the elegy is not so much inadvertent as deliberate. By importing Rome's *femina ... princeps* into his elegy's elaborate calculus of 'firstness', Ovid has acknowledged the disruptiveness of imperial panegyric: more than that, he has embraced and thematized it.[38]

[37] Here, in *Pont.* 3.1.125 and in *Epic. Drusi* 303 (as elucidated by Butrica (1993), 265–6) the phrase designates Livia with reference to Augustus, the *princeps*; in later instances it refers more generally to women of the imperial house or (in line with the range of the word *princeps* itself) to leading women at large: see *TLL* VI 461.7–9 (deleting Tac. *Hist.* 5.25 and adding Hygin. *Fab.* 274.13). Purcell (1986), 78–105, pressing the 'firmly political' connotations of *princeps*, argues that, as applied to Livia, the phrases *princeps femina* and *Romana princeps* (*Epic. Drusi* 356) are virtually titles, reflective of Livia's substantial public role in her husband's administration.

[38] Let me name both Kenneys, Anne (née Harris) as well as Ted, in dedicating this treatment of the poetry in which Ovid, in line with an imbalance in Roman customs of nomenclature, but also in line with his programme of anonymity for *Tristia*-addressees, commends his wife to posterity in every possible way – except in specifying a name for her! For their helpful comments and criticisms I thank this volume's editors, Susanna Morton Braund and Roland Mayer; also Alessandro Barchiesi, James Clauss, Catherine Connors, Denis Feeney and Nita Krevans.