AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLVI, 1 WHOLE NO. 181

# TOPICS FROM THE LIFE OF OVID.

Biographies of Ovid began to appear in the Middle Ages and became more and more numerous during and after the Renaissance until they culminated in the very careful and erudite *Vita* of ninety quarto pages by John Masson early in the eighteenth century. Masson's work, together with a number of the earlier efforts, which are always incomplete and often absurd, may be found in the Appendix of Burmann's edition, Amsterdam, 1727, a perusal of which will richly reward any scholar who wishes to interest his students in Ovid.

Among Roman poets Ovid is almost the only one of whom something approximating a full and reliable biography can be written, and yet very few modern editors have availed themselves of the opportunity. The accounts of Ovid's life contained in our modern editions are almost always perfunctory, incomplete, and inaccurate.[1] Masson's work is apparently no longer read.

The ancient evidence which must be used to reconstruct the life of Ovid consists chiefly of statements by the poet himself. There are, however, important remarks in other Latin writers, notably Seneca the Elder, and concerning the poet's name and racial affinities some help is derived from inscriptions. Practically all of the literary evidence was well known in the fifteenth century, and Masson prints and discusses almost every scrap of

[1] The best biography in English may be found in S. G. Owen's edition of Tristia I, Oxford, 1902, cf. the same scholar's article in the Encycl. Britannica, and, on the causes of Ovid's exile, his recent edition of Tristia II, Oxford, 1924. Mr. Owen's work is carefully based throughout upon the ancient material. Many of the editors who do not supply a good biographical sketch make partial amends by printing and annotating the Autobiog., Tr. iv. 10.

it. It is not my purpose to thresh over again all of this old straw, but in a subject of this kind there are always opportunities for new interpretations, and long familiarity with the poems from exile, which contain a very large part of the evidence, has convinced me that here and there even the best of our handbooks can be corrected and supplemented. On some points the neglected views of early scholars can now be better supported and brought back into honor, on others new light can be thrown by considering factors hitherto unobserved, on still others I venture merely to summarize, for reasons of general interest, parts of the ancient evidence. In a few cases the results of recent philological work on other poets may be made to contribute something to the biography of Ovid.

## Birthplace, Name, Race.

In the opening lines of his Autobiography Ovid tells us that he was born at Sulmo and, in a genuinely Ovidian periphrasis, that the date was March 20th, 43 B. C. He often mentions his native place, but this reference, Sulmo mihi patria est (Tr. iv. 10, 3), is of special interest because the letters S. M. P. E. have become a sort of municipal device for modern Sulmona, where they occur on public documents, on the façades of monuments, and on the book which is held in the hands of the so-called statue of the poet in the court of the Collegio Ovidio. The Italians delight in honoring their great dead and the poet's name lives not only in the Collegio Ovidio, the chief school of the town, but also in the Corso Ovidio, its main street. A few miles from the town on the steep flank of a mountain lie some Roman supporting walls which are called the Villa Ovidio. Not far away is the Fonte d'Amore, with which in the song and folklore of the region Ovid's name is connected. In the Middle Ages he was a great magician.[2]

In May, 1922, when the snow still clung to the higher slopes, it was my good fortune to visit the region, and a beautiful region it is. Probably no lovelier vale exists in the world. As one looks down upon it from the heights traversed by the railway,

[2] On this paragraph cf. M. Besnier in the *Mélanges Boissier* (1903), pp. 57-63.

it is still, as Ovid describes it, gelidis uberrimus undis—like a great, well-watered garden backed by mountains which tower more than eight thousand feet above the sea. All this beauty is unknown to the average tourist, for there are no good hotels! And so it happens very fortunately that the town preserves its ancient simplicity and is quite unspoiled by crowds of souvenir hunters.

Sulmo was one of the chief towns of the Paelignian race whose glory Ovid calls himself (Am. iii, 15, 8) and his family was of old equestrian standing (Tr. iv, 10, 7 f.). Thus in the main, although the cognomen Naso probably indicates, as we shall see, a Latin strain, the poet's blood was that of the Paelignian stock; he belonged to one of those sister peoples of the Latins whose common mother we call the parent Italic race. They spoke a dialect which must have been closely allied to Oscan, and in the great rising of the Italian allies against Rome the Paelignian town of Corfinium, renamed Italicum, had been selected as the capital of these 'Confederate States of Italy.' But in Ovid's time the Paeligni considered themselves part of the great Roman commonwealth.

That Ovid's family was in fact Paelignian is shown by the inscriptions of the region. The name Ovidius is found on inscriptions only among the Paeligni, and indeed names in -idius, -iedius, etc., seem to be especially characteristic of that region. Variants of the name are Oviedis, Oviedius, Obidius, and probably Ofdius and Aufidius.[3] W. Schulze in his monumental study of Roman names explains Ovidius as a derivative of Ovius, originally a praenomen.[4]

The cognomen Naso—the name by which the poet always calls himself—is, according to Schulze, genuinely Latin. How long the family had made use of a cognomen is unknown—probably not long, for in the conservative mountain districts two names, not three, were the rule in Ovid's time. It is unknown also how the family came to take a Latin cognomen, but in Ovid's boyhood intimacy with the Messallae there is a hint that the poet's father, very probably his grandfather, had re-

[3] Cf. Schulten, Klio, II, 192. Of 67 names on inscriptions of Sulmo 10 are of this general type.

[4] Abhandl. Göttingen, 1904, pp. 202, 437.

lations with this great Roman family and so with Rome.[5] It was hardly the poet, as has been suggested, but perhaps one of these immediate forbears who had a nose of the Cyrano de Bergerac type.

## Chronology of Ovid's School Days and Early Literary Career.

Ovid's account of his education (Tr. iv, 10, 15-30) begins with his childhood. After giving the date of his birth (Mar. 20, 43 B. C.) and that of his brother (Mar. 20, 44 B. C.) in lines 5-14, he adds (15-16),

> protinus excolimur teneri curaque parentis
> imus ad insignes urbis ab arte viros.

Cf. 19-20, where he confesses that poetry had stealthy attractions for him while he was still a boy (*iam puero*). Moreover, he states that he and his brother assumed the *toga virilis* during the course of their training (27-30),

> interea tacito passu labentibus annis
> liberior fratri sumpta mihique toga est,
> induiturque umeris cum lato purpura clavo,
> et studium nobis, quod fuit ante, manet.

It is clear, therefore, that whether the *insignes urbis ab arte viri* were exclusively rhetoricians or partly the grammatici who had charge of boys before they were entrusted to the rhetoricians, the two brothers were studying in Rome some time, probably some years, before they matured. Now since the *toga virilis* was normally assumed at about the age of sixteen and since boys often entered the rhetorical schools at thirteen or fourteen, we may date Ovid's maturity about 27-26 B. C. and his entrance into the rhetorical schools about 30-29 B. C.

This conclusion is supported by another passage (Ex P. II, 3, 69-82) in which Ovid gives rather precise information about his relations with Messalla Corvinus and his two sons, Messalinus and Cotta Maximus. In this passage, addressed to Cotta, Ovid states that Messalla was the first to give him courage to make

[5] See below, pp. 6 f.

public his poetry,[6] that Cotta or Maximus, as Ovid usually calls him, had been *born* his friend and that he (Ovid) had given him the first kisses while he was still in the cradle, and that Cotta's brother (Messalinus) could not recall the time when the poet had first done him reverence. This last is the most important statement for our present purpose. The date of Messalinus' birth has usually been fixed at 36-35 B. C. because he was consul 3 B. C. and the earliest age at which a man could hold the consulship under Augustus' law of 27 B. C. was at the completion of thirty-two full years (Mommsen, Staatsr. I², 553 ff.). Moreover Graeber has called attention to the fact that his father, Messalla Corvinus, who was in Athens as a student in 45 B. C., joined Brutus and Cassius, and afterwards Antony, so that he probably had no time to marry before 40 B. C. Thus Messalinus can hardly have been born before 39 B. C. and Graeber prefers 36 B. C.[7] The testimony of Ovid confirms this

[6] Cf. also P. I. 7, 28-29 (to Messalinus)

nec tuus est genitor nos infitiatus amicos,
hortator studii causaque faxque mei,

Tr. IV. 4, 27-30 (almost certainly to Messalinus)

nam tuus est primis cultus mihi semper ab annis—
hoc certe noli dissimulare—pater;
ingeniumque meum—potes hoc meminisse—probabat,
plus etiam quam me iudice dignus eram,
deque meis illo referebat versibus ore, etc.

[7] P. Graeber, *Quaestt. Ovid.* i (1881), p. xvii, cf. *Prosopog. Imp. Rom.* Doubt should not be expressed in the latter work as to whether Messalinus was the older son. Ovid's testimony settles this point. Tib. ii, 5 proves that Messalinus became a XV vir sacris faciundis not later than 19 B. C. and Kirby Smith (note *ad loc.*) infers from the inscr. of 17 B. C. (Eph. epig. 8, 233) in which his name is last in the list, that his appointment was then recent. This evidence is in harmony with Ovid's, as Graeber proves, since the quindecimvirate could be held by a mere stripling and Messalinus may have been only fifteen or sixteen at the time of his appointment.

Cotta Maximus was much younger than his brother, but the date of his birth is quite uncertain. If we argue from the date of his consulship, 20 A. D., he may have been born as late as 13-12 B. C. and Ovid often calls him *iuvenis* in the *Ex P.* and (probably) the *Tr.*, i. e. c. 8-17 A. D. Ovid kissed him in his cradle so that his birth cannot be dated earlier than 31 B. C. and the date was probably considerably later since he was old enough in the year of Ovid's exile, 8 A. D., to

conclusion, for the poet's attentions to Messalinus began at a time when the latter was so young that he could not remember them. This must have been when Messalinus was not more than five or six years old, i. e. 31-30 B. C., for Ovid was born in 43 B. C. and could hardly use the word *colere* (P. 2, 3, 79) of his attentions to Messalinus until he himself had passed beyond his early boyhood. On the other hand, if Ovid had been (say) sixteen (27 B. C.) at the time to which he refers, Messalinus would have been old enough, eight or nine, to remember it.

The passage thus supports the date 36-35 B. C. for Messalinus' birth—a date already inferred from that of his consulship, etc.—and also implies that Ovid was in Rome and intimate with the Messallae as early as 31-30 B. C.[8] In fact the passage implies in general that Ovid, while he was still a boy, was a client of Messalla, cf. especially 73-74, quod cum vestra domus teneris mihi semper ab annis culta sit (cf. also Tr. 4, 4, 27). It is indeed possible that the poet's relations with the family of Messalla began before 31 B. C. and that the boys studied at Rome not only with the rhetoricians but also took there the earlier course under a grammaticus.[9] The couplet (Tr. IV. 10, 15-16)

protinus excolimur teneri curaque parentis
imus ad insignes urbis ab arte viros

certainly allows this interpretation. If this is true, it may be suspected that Ovid's father had some connection with the house

hold some position in Elba, cf. *Ex P.* II. 3, 84. Graeber's date for his birth, 25-24 B. C., is probably not far wrong. The facts indicate that he was the fruit of a second marriage and the *Prosopog.* suggests that his mother may have been a Calpurnia, but Ovid (*Ex P.* iv. 16, 43) implies that she was an Aurelia (so Borghesi). Nipperdey's conjecture (on Tac. Ann. iii. 2) that the consul of 20 A. D. was not this man but his son is refuted by the *Prosopog.*

[8] De la Ville de Mirmont, La jeunesse d'Ovide (p. 51) suggests that Ovid may have been in Rome in 31 B. C., but his only argument is that even if Sulmo possessed a *grammaticus*, Ovid's father (like Horace's) preferred to take him to Rome, and 31 B. C. when Ovid was 12, would have been the normal date.

[9] Cf. De Mirmont. Masson (pp. 35 f.) dates the arrival of the brothers in Rome and the beginning of their *grammatical* studies c. 34-33 B. C. when they were 9 or 10. He gives no reasons.

of Messalla and that he was thus led to have the boys educated in Rome where they could have the protection and encouragement of the great man. Perhaps Messalla was *patronus* of Sulmo. But at least 31 B. C. is the earliest date at which it is reasonably certain that Ovid and his brother were in Rome.

While Ovid was still a boy and before he assumed the garb of manhood, he was already dabbling in poetry (Tr. iv, 10, 19-30) much to the disgust of his hard-headed old father, who frequently reproved him, calling poetry a *studium inutile* and clinching his argument with the remark that even Homer left no money! How modern it all sounds! One of the old *Vitae* [10] relates, upon no authority, an anecdote which probably hits off the situation very well. Once, says the author of the *Vita,* when the father was chastising his son for wasting time on verses, the boy cried out (in verse!),

parce mihi! numquam versificabo, pater!

This may be rendered in corresponding doggerel,

Father, O spare me now! Verse I will never compose!

This anecdote is obviously based on the famous lines in which Ovid speaks of the stealthy attractions of the Muse, quotes his father's reproof and his own attempt to write prose, and closes with the confession that verse came to him of its own accord, for whatever he tried to write was verse,

et quod temptabam scribere versus erat.

He 'lisped in numbers,' then, because he could not help himself.

But although he contrasts his brother's aptitude for the bar with his own fondness for poetry, the preparatory grind to which the two boys were subjected contained one study which exactly suited him because it helped him in his poetic composition. This was rhetoric, and in rhetoric he became very proficient, as his works prove superabundantly. But we have other interesting testimony. Ovid does not mention any of his teachers by name.[11] Seneca the Elder is more explicit. From

[10] In Villenave's Edition, Paris, 1809, p. ix. See De Mirmont, *op. cit.*

[11] Unless, as seems improbable, Gallio was one of his teachers.

him we learn much about Ovid's rhetorical studies and incidentally a good deal about the influence of rhetoric upon his poetry. Indeed Seneca throws so much light upon Ovid's career in the rhetorical schools and the poet's bent for rhetoric is so much a part of himself that I shall be forgiven if I present a brief summary.[12]

## Ovid in the Rhetorical Schools.

Seneca's testimony is that of an actual listener. He had heard Ovid declaim. He tells in brief that Ovid was considered a *bonus declamator;* that he was an *auditor* of Arellius Fuscus and Porcius Latro and admired the latter so much that he transferred many of his *sententiae* to his own verses;[13] that he liked *suasoriae* but rarely declaimed *controversiae* and then only the type called *ethicae,* for the argumentation necessary for *controversiae* was irksome to him.

A few remarks will make Seneca's words clearer. Arellius Fuscus and Porcius Latro, who are undoubtedly included among the teachers whom Ovid calls *insignes urbis ab arte viros* (Tr. iv. 10, 16), were ranked among the four leading rhetoricians of the age.[14] Another of Seneca's four was certainly one of Ovid's friends. This was L. Junius Gallio, who adopted Seneca's oldest son. Ovid addresses to Gallio one of his Pontic Epistles (iv. 11) and Seneca (Suasor. 3, 7) quotes a remark of Gallio's about 'his friend' Ovid.[15]

It is easy to see why Ovid preferred the *suasoria* to the *controversia.* The *suasoria* was often a sort of speech in character:[16] Alexander considers whether to enter Babylon even though the prophets had threatened him with danger; Cicero debates

[12] The chief passage is Controvers. II 2, 8-12, but there are many other references, cf. the Index of A. Kiessling's Teubner text of Seneca (1872).

[13] The two examples given (Am. I, 2, 11 f. Met. xiii, 121 f.) show that Ovid was influenced by Latro both in his earlier period and in his maturity.

[14] Seneca, Contr. x, pr. 13. Quintil. x 5, 18 (of Latro).

[15] This is the interesting passage in which Ovid's principle of imitating Vergil is given; non subripiendi causa, sed palam mutuandi, hoc animo ut vellet agnosci.

[16] Cf. Boissier in Daremberg and Saglio, s. v. Declamatio.

whether to burn his writings when promised safety by Antony if he will do so. Thus the young declaimer, having assumed the rôle of some famous personage who was confronting a crisis, could give free rein to his fancy. Ovid's *Heroides* have been called *suasoriae* in verse. He was in his element when he could supply words and sentiments to some lay figure—especially if that figure was feminine. With the *controversia* he had to do something more. The *controversia* was a fictitious civil case, a sort of mock trial—though to the Romans there seems to have been nothing 'mock' about them in spite of the absurdity of many of the cases. Thus the *controversia* involved different points of view, the working up of the case and careful order and argument—all of which put too many fetters on Ovid's exuberant imagination: molesta illi erat omnis argumentatio, says Seneca. It is more than likely also that he was not fond of the hard work.

And yet Seneca has preserved in outline one of the poet's infrequent declamations of this type.[17] The case is stated as follows:

A husband and wife swore that neither would survive the other. The husband having set out on a journey to foreign parts sent a messenger to tell his wife that her husband had 'departed' (decessisse)! She threw herself from (se praecipitavit) a window(?). But she recovered, and her father ordered her to leave her husband. She refused and was disowned.

Ovid defended the husband, taking the line (color) that a man deeply in love is without moderation and sense! A love under control which commits no imprudence, no folly, etc. is old man's love: *senes sic amant!* The husband admits his error, promises to be more careful in future. But if the father persists, he says: 'Take back your daughter! I deserve punishment! I will go into exile,' etc. etc.

As ever, Ovid is here the erotic expert, and Boissier in his pleasant little essay[18] on the schools of declamation remarks, 'already at school he was what he always was!'

Ovid must have been very young at the time, for Seneca says:

[17] Controv. II 2 (10).

[18] Printed in Boissier's Tacite, pp. 197-235.

oratio eius *iam tum*[19] nihil aliud poterat videri quam solutum carmen—a fitting comment on Ovid's own statement that whatever he tried to write was verse.

Seneca attaches to his account of Ovid's skill in declamation a striking criticism of his verse: verbis minime licenter usus est (i. e. in his declamations) nisi in carminibus, in quibus non ignoravit vitia sua sed amavit.[20] In proof of the last statement he relates an interesting anecdote. Once when Ovid's friends suggested that three of his verses ought to be expunged, the poet agreed on condition that he himself should except three which his friends should not be allowed to touch, each side to write out their three for a committee of arbitration. Both sides selected the same three verses! Seneca cites the authority of one of the umpires, Albinovanus Pedo, a good soldier, a poet, and a friend of Ovid's (P. iv. 10), for two of the verses—both Ovidian to the *n*th power:

> Semibovemque virum semivirumque bovem,
> (a man who was half of a bull and a bull who was half of a man!)
>
> et gelidum Borean egelidumque Notum
> (and chill was the wind of the North! unchill was the wind of the South!)

The doggerel is not much worse than Ovid's word play! The third verse is not given, but any reader could easily find hundreds in Ovid that would serve. It is extremely interesting to know that the mere prettinesses of Ovid were criticized by his own friends who were so sure of their judgment that they were willing to submit the decision to arbitration. How much Falernian, we wonder, was bet on this occasion!

But Ovid, although he was aware of this weakness, stood to his guns, and Seneca's final remark is worth quoting in full:

[19] Cf. also II, 2, 9, where Seneca, after digressing to show that Ovid imitated Latro, returns to his account of the *controversia* with the words Tunc autem *cum studeret* habebatur bonus declamator, i. e. even in his student days.

[20] Cf. Contr. 9, 5, 17, Ovidius nescit quod bene cessit relinquere—he couldn't let well enough alone!

ex quo adparet summi ingenii viro non iudicium defuisse ad compescendam licentiam carminum suorum sed animum. aiebat interim decentiorem faciem esse in qua aliquis naevos fuisset. To the poet these pet verses were indeed blemishes, but like the cast in Venus' eye, the courtplaster on the face of an eighteenth-century dame, or the warts on that excellent gentleman to whom Mark Twain once alluded, they were blemishes which served to enhance the beauty of their environment.

The fact that the criticized verses occur respectively in the *Ars amatoria* (II, 24 semibovemque etc.) and the *Amores* (II, 11, 10 et gelidum etc.) furnishes no very precise evidence as to the date of this friendly controversy. It is clear that the verses must have become known either through recitation or publication, but, so far as the *Amores* are concerned, we have no reliable means of assigning this particular poem to any definite date within the long period which began with Ovid's first public recitations of the Corinna poems and ended with the final edition of the whole work. Most of the *Amores,* however, must have preceded the *Ars amatoria* which was published c. 1 B. C. and marks the latest phase of Ovid's erotic poetry. If we date the contest after 1 B. C. we are forced to the conclusion that Ovid, at the age of forty-two or forty-three, was still betting Falernian with his friends on questions of this sort. Such a conclusion is not impossible, but it does not seem very probable. Seneca's picture is one of men who back their opinions with an ardor that is not yet stale, and we may hazard the surmise that the contest occurred after Ovid had recited a part of the *Ars amatoria*—several years before the poem was completed. This is vague, but it is clear at least that the incident may help us to know what manner of man the poet was in the years of his maturity.

### First Public Appearance as a Poet.

Some of the verses which Ovid scribbled in his boyhood were known to his more intimate friends, and it was the great Messalla who, having known Ovid well when the latter was but twelve or thirteen, perhaps still younger, first encouraged him to make his work public.[21] This first public appearance is described by

[21] See pp. 4 ff.

the poet in lines which are intended to convey a rather precise indication of his age at the time, Tr. iv. 10, 57-60:

carmina cum primum populo iuvenalia legi
barba resecta mihi bisve semelve fuit.
moverat ingenium totam cantata per urbem
nomine non vero dicta Corinna mihi.

From this passage scholars have inferred that when Ovid first appeared in public to recite, as the context shows, some of the *Amores,* he was from twenty to twenty-five years of age. Within these limits few authorities fix his age at twenty or twenty-one; most prefer twenty-two or more.[22] These conclusions are based upon what seems to me a misunderstanding of the evidence and I believe that Ovid was not yet twenty at the time of his earliest *recitationes.*

It should be noticed, before we pass to a detailed examination of the evidence, that the current view does not harmonize well with the rather full information we possess concerning Ovid's early life. We know that, like Catullus and Propertius, he was an extremely precocious literary talent, that he lived in an age devoted to poetry, associated with dozens of poets, and was intimate from boyhood with the family of Messalla in which was centred one of the leading poetic coteries of the day. There is something inherently improbable in the view that such a man did not himself become publicly known as a poet until he had attained the age of twenty-two, or even twenty-four or twenty-five. This view rests upon two lines of argument—both, in my opinion, unsound.

The first point concerns the words barba resecta . . . bisve semelve, which are in fact at the centre of the question. In these words scholars have found a reference to Ovid's first shave and the ceremony called the *depositio barbae.* The references to this ceremony show that it might occur when a man was eighteen (Sueton., Calig. 10), twenty-two (id. Nero 11-12), or twenty-four (Dio, 48, 34, 3, of Octavian). It is admitted that no definite age can be fixed for the *depositio,* but since—and this is the second point—the earliest reference in the *Amores* is that

[22] Owen prefers twenty, Schanz twenty-two, Masson twenty-one.

to the death of Tibullus (III, 9) in 19 B. C., when Ovid was about twenty-four, some scholars have hesitated to set the date of his *depositio* much earlier. Others, realizing that the references to the *depositio* [23] supply no reliable argument and chiefly influenced by the second point, have inferred that Ovid was twenty-four or twenty-five. This last method has at least the merit of bringing the earliest known reference in the *Amores* into harmony with one of the ages at which the *depositio* is known to have occurred.

Before proceeding to the details of a different interpretation it will be well to examine the preceding lines for possible hints as to chronology. In vv. 41-56 Ovid gives a select list of the poets older than himself whom he reverenced 'at that time' (temporis illius, 41) closing with the names of two, Vergil and Tibullus, who died 19 B. C. Vv. 53-54, suggested by the mention of Tibullus, are a parenthesis on the four eligists. At v. 55 the main thought is resumed, reverting to 41 ff.: As I reverenced the older poets, so was I reverenced by the younger, for my poetry quickly became known. The contrast shows that Ovid was still young, although his fame was already secure, at the time which he has in mind, and in order to explain this early fame he emphasizes the fact that he was nevertheless a veteran in poetry, for his first and immediately successful appearance in public had occurred when he was *very* young, 57 ff. cum primum, etc.

'That time' which he has in mind is approximately defined by lines 31-40 to which the phrase refers. His brother, who was born March 20, 44 B. C., and was exactly one year older than Ovid (5-14), died at the age of twenty, i. e. 24 B. C. Ovid held the first offices granted to tender youth (33-34), but renounced an official career, when the senate was within his reach, chiefly because of his desire to devote himself to poetry. He was nineteen when his brother died. Possibly his official experience had already begun, but it is not probable, for the triumvirate (probably *triumviratus capitalis*) to which he aludes was one of the posts, collectively called *vigintiviratus* and

[23] On the *depositio* in general, cf. Friedlaender on Petron. cc. 29 and 73, Mayor on Juv. 3, 186, and, with special reference to Ovid, Masson's *Vita*, p. 54.

preliminary to the quaestorship, which were administered by young men of twenty to twenty-three who were destined for the senatorial *cursus*. Moreover the words *curia restabat* and the necessity of deciding that he would remain a knight (35-36) show that Ovid was nearing the quaestorship.[24] He was therefore about twenty-three,[25] when the Muses claimed him wholly as their own (39-40). The poet is thus thinking of 'that time' which began approximately in 24 B. C. and extended to about 20 B. C. when, on the eve of the quaestorship, he retired from public life. The phrase *barba resecta* must refer to some occurrence within or before this period.

The opening lines of the poem prove, if any proof is needed, that Ovid is writing not merely for the general public but for later generations, and it is not in his manner to be vague. It seems highly improbable, therefore, that in a phrase the very purpose of which is to denote extreme youth he should refer to a ceremony, the *depositio,* which might even on our meagre evidence occur at any time within a space of six years. Who even among his contemporaries would have known at just what age Ovid's *depositio* took place? These difficulties will be removed, however, if the phrase *barba resecta* can be shown to refer, not to the *depositio,* but to another custom the meaning of which was free from such ambiguity—the custom then common, if not universal, among young men of the better classes, of allowing the first beard to grow but keeping it in order by an occasional trimming until the time arrived for the *depositio.* In a word Ovid means that when he first appeared in public as a poet his beard had been trimmed, not shaved, but once or twice.

This interpretation conforms with the ordinary meaning of *resecare,* 'to cut,' 'cut off,' 'clip,' 'shear,' etc. In no one of the dozen instances listed in Burmann's *Index* does the word mean 'to shave,' unless we read that meaning into the phrase under discussion. But statistics as to the meaning of *resecare* (*secare*), *radere* (*abradere*), *caedere* (*recidere*), *tondere, metere,* etc. prove little since, as in English, a word meaning 'to cut'

[24] Cf. also *Fasti* iv, 374-384: Ovid achieved the perquisite of a senatorial seat at the games. Such privileges were granted before the quaestorship to young men who were looking forward to that office.

[25] So Masson, p. 56.

was capable at times of meaning 'to shave,' a kind of cutting. Moreover it might be argued that in poetry of a rather dignified type such as elegy, any term which smacks of the barber-shop would naturally occur infrequently, and in fact there is in Burmann's *Index* not a single case of *radere* or *tondere,* the words which most nearly approach the technical meaning, in the sense of 'shave.' It is of greater moment that the phrase *barba resecta* occurs in two other passages, the first of which helps to define its meaning. In A. A. I, 518, the man who expects to please the ladies should have not only clean teeth, clean nails, etc., but

nec male deformet rigidos tonsura capillos:
sit coma, sit scita barba resecta manu.

Here *resecta* clearly means 'trimmed,' 'clipped.' If it meant 'shaved,' we should have in *coma . . . resecta* the picture of a lover with the tonsure of a convict! In contrast with the neatly cut hair and well trimmed beard of civilized society Ovid describes the long hair and full beards of the Getae, Tr. V. 7, 18:

non coma, non ulla barba resecta manu.

The custom of wearing a neatly trimmed beard was no new thing in Ovid's day. Cicero refers several times [26] to those who adopted it—especially to young fellows like Curio, Calvus, and others who were such thorns in the flesh of the great triumvirs—as *barbatuli.* There is in the word a contempt which arises not only from political feeling but also from the half-amused condescension of one of the older generation who had put aside the *barbula* among other childish things. But all *barbatuli* were not contemptible, for the custom was widespread and men of good standing seem not to have shaved regularly until they were about forty.[27] Clodia, like the ladies to whom Ovid refers (A. A. 1, 518, above), was fond of *barbatuli,* and it is from a passage of the *Pro Caelio* (c. 14) that we gain the clearest conception of the fashion. Speaking of Clodia's lovers, the great orator asks whether he is to deal with her in the harsh,

[26] In Cat. ii. 22, ad. Att. 1, 14, 5 (cf. Tyrell and Purser), I, 16, 11. Cf. also Ellis on Catull. 37, 19, T. Frank, *A. J. P.* XL (1919), 397-398.
[27] Marquardt, *Privatleben,* p. 600.

old-fashioned style or gently and politely in modern fashion: si illo austero more ac modo, aliquis mihi ab inferis excitandus est ex barbatis illis—non hac barbula qua ista delectatur, sed illa horrida quam in statuis antiquis et imaginibus videmus. Ovid's *barba resecta* represents Cicero's *barbula.*

Whether Ovid, like Nero and Trimalchio, ever deposited his beard in a golden box, whether indeed he deposited it at all, we do not know. Certainly in the phrase barba resecta . . . bisve semelve, he is describing himself as in the earliest stages of the *barbatulus* period. Even in the hirsute days of old the age when the young beard first needed clipping must have varied somewhat with individuals, as it does to-day. Ovid himself assigns fresh-growing beards to Romulus and Remus at the age of eighteen (F. iii, 59-60), which agrees with the historical case of Caligula who shaved and dedicated his beard at the same age. The author of the Laus Pisonis possessed a young beard before his twentieth summer (Laus Pis., 260-261), while Macrobius speaks of a youthful adornment on the cheeks after twenty-one (In somn. Scipionis, i. 6). But these cases are mere illustrations. Most young men, if we recall our own youth, begin to shave before they enter college at the age of eighteen, and if it were still the fashion to wear a *barbula,* it is certain that they would be sporting it in freshman year. It is certain also that Ovid must have been normal in this respect or else, when he wished to indicate a definite period of his youth for all men to understand, he would not have described it as the age of his first beard-trimming. On the contrary he used words which he believed would carry a fairly definite meaning, not foreseeing, confident of fame though he was, that his words would be read by generations of men but imperfectly acquainted with the customs and language of his native land.

This somewhat extended tonsorial discussion leads, therefore, to the conclusion that Ovid was reciting his *Amores* in public and became instantly popular when he was but eighteen years of age, c. 25 B. C. The date can certainly not be set much later. The conclusion is in harmony with everything that we know about Ovid, it is in harmony with the fact that in that southern climate the minds of young men mature in many ways more rapidly than is the rule with us, and it is not contradicted

by that reference to 19 B. C. in Am. iii. 9, which has been already mentioned. It is in fact unlikely that this poem is one of the earliest of the *Amores*. The poems which Ovid first recited were inspired by Corinna and the first complete edition of the *Amores* comprised five books. The three-book edition—the only one extant—was pretty certainly formed from the earlier one, chiefly by a process of omission and condensation, for Ovid had a tendency to destroy his work, cf., for example, the passage which immediately follows the one we have been discussing (Tr. iv. 10, 61-64). If the epicede on Tibullus (Am. iii. 9) was ever included in the earlier edition, it must have been one of the later poems—standing, say, in Book IV or V. When Ovid reissued the work in three books he left it in the same relative position so that it now stands in the last book. It is mere accident that it contains the earliest reference in the *Amores,* and indeed the *Amores* contain very few references to anything which can be dated—no others, I think, which are free from doubt.

## Ovid and Tibullus.

Ovid's list of the older poets whom he reverenced in his youth (Tr. iv. 10, 41-55) contains seven names. The language indicates that only the first four poets were intimate friends: Aemilius Macer, Propertius, Ponticus, and Bassus. The careful statement about Horace implies at most that he had heard that poet recite, but Horace recited very infrequently[28] and perhaps the phrase tenuit nostras . . . Horatius aures is purely figurative; certainly there is no evidence that Ovid was ever intimate with him. Vergil he had barely seen, and Gallus cannot properly be included in the list since his name is added merely to complete Ovid's canon of the four elegists. He died in Egypt in 26 B. C., when Ovid was seventeen, and it is doubtful whether Ovid had ever met him.

The passage raises several questions, the most interesting of which, in my opinion, concerns Tibullus—the more interesting because scholars do not seem to have raised it, much less answered it. The reference is in vv. 51-52:

[28] Sat. i. 4. 73.

Vergilium vidi tantum nec avara Tibullo
tempus amicitiae fata dedere meae.

Scholars long ago explained the words about Vergil as due to the fact that Vergil's health was frail and in his later years he lived much in retirement at Naples.[29]

But the statement about Tibullus calls for more explanation than it has received. The tone of the couplet is one of deep regret. Ovid has just named five poets whom he had abundant opportunity to know or hear, but Vergil and Tibullus are linked together as men whom he would gladly have known well if he had had the opportunity. The juxtaposition is important. Ovid's words imply that he was acquainted with Tibullus but that there was not an opportunity, or not a sufficient opportunity, to form that friendship (*amicitia*) which was, at least formally, a closer bond with the Romans than it is with us. He reproaches the *avara fata* for this;[30] Tibullus died so prematurely that Ovid could not become his friend in the time in which this would otherwise have been possible, 19 B. C., and the later years. It seems, therefore, that he had no sufficient opportunity for friendship before 19 B. C.—the year in which, on the authority of Domitius Marsus' famous epigram, Tibullus died:

Te quoque Vergilio comitem non aequa, Tibulle,
Mors iuvenem campos misit ad Elysios,
ne foret aut elegis molles qui fleret amores
aut caneret forti regia bella pede.

Probably the attention of scholars has not been arrested by Ovid's words because of the clear implication that the early death of Tibullus robbed him of the time necessary for friendship with that poet. Satisfied with this they have not asked the question: Why was there not sufficient time before 19 B. C.? The moment we begin to compare what we know of the lives of the two poets before 19 B. C., we see that this question certainly demands an answer.

On Ovid's own testimony Tibullus was the leading Roman elegist after the death of Gallus. Ovid greatly admired him,

[29] Cf. Ribbeck, Röm. D., p. 227.

[30] Cf. Marsus' *non aequa* . . . mors iuvenem.

often refers to him, paraphrases him at times, and followed his example in many ways. Tibullus was composing and publishing his verse as early as 30 B. C. and continued before the public as late as 22-21 B. C., possibly still later.[31] Ovid was in Rome by 31-30 B. C. and first came before the public c. 25 B. C. with the same type of poetry as that of Tibullus. Moreover—and this is especially striking—both were intimate with Messalla and his family. It seems at first sight very surprising, therefore, that within the period from 30 to 19 B. C. there was not sufficient opportunity for real friendship between the two poets.

A study of the lives of both shows, however, that opportunities for close and prolonged association were probably rare and at the same time enables us to sketch those lives with a surer hand.

We may begin with certain obvious facts. Messalla was absent from Rome nearly all the time from the campaign of Actium (31 B. C.), in which he took a prominent part, to the date of his triumph over the Gauls of Aquitania, September 25, 27 B. C. Tibullus, who, unlike Ovid and Propertius, was a good soldier[32] in spite of his yearnings for the simple life, was with Messalla during the Aquitanian campaign (I. 7, 9) and started with him on an eastern expedition only to be taken ill at Corcyra (I. 3, 1 ff.). Perhaps after his recovery from this illness, he rejoined Messalla in the East. There is, however, no real proof of this, in spite of his long description (I. 7, 13 ff.) of eastern countries, nor is it possible to determine the relative order of the eastern and the Aquitanian expeditions. At any rate Tibullus was absent from Rome for long periods between 31 and 27 B. C., while Ovid at this time was a schoolboy, twelve to sixteen years

[31] Tib. II. 5, on the induction of Messalinus into the college of *XV viri sacris faciundis* is probably the latest poem of Tibullus. Kirby Smith argues that this poem could not have been written 'long before the poet's death in 19 B. C.' (see p. 24). To this we may add that if Messalinus was born c. 36-35 B. C. (see pp. 5-6), he could hardly have become a *decemvir* before he was fifteen, i. e. c. 21 B. C. Smith, however, considered II. 6 to be the latest poem, but see p. 21 note.

[32] *Vita Tibulli:* cuius (i. e. Messallae) etiam contubernalis Aquitanico bello militaribus donis donatus est. Cf. Tibul. I. 7. I do not share the skepticism of Postgate, Michaelis, etc. concerning the trustworthiness of the *Vita*.

of age. Thus until 27-25 B. C. there was probably little opportunity for the two to form more than an acquaintanceship.

What was the situation in 27 B. C. and the years immediately following? Messalla was in Rome for his triumph in 27 B. C. and we may assume that Tibullus shared in that display; he certainly celebrated it along with Messalla's birthday,[33] which occurred at about the same time, although his love for the country may have frequently drawn him away from the city. At about this period Ovid, at Messalla's suggestion, ventured to appear in public and became famous for his poems on Corinna. Here then was an opportunity for Ovid to make the acquaintance of Tibullus, probably in the house of Messalla. But his own statements prove that it could not have been more than an acquaintanceship. The time, therefore, could not have been of long duration, and since Messalla and presumably Tibullus were in Rome or its neighborhood for several years, we may assume that Ovid was absent. This assumption becomes probable when we remember that Ovid both studied in Athens and travelled in Asia and Sicily.

The dates of these journeys have never been fixed on the basis of any reliable evidence, although the student sojourn at Athens has naturally been assigned to some period within Ovid's youth and there has been a general tendency to connect with it the trip to Asia and Sicily. The statements of Ovid are as follows (Tr. I. 2, 77-78):

> nec peto, quas quondam petii studiosus, Athenas,
> oppida non Asiae, non loca visa prius.

This passage occurs in the description of a severe storm which burst upon Ovid's ship while he was voyaging from Italy towards

[33] He also alludes to Messalla's reconstruction of the Via Latina (I. 7, 57-62). This was, according to the Prosopog. (III 365) 'apparently' about 26 B. C. Tibullus' words vv. 59-60,

> namque opibus congesta tuis hic glarea dura
> sternitur, hic apta iungitur arte silex,

indicate that the work was still going on (cf. the present tenses) when he was writing I. 7. 'Apparently,' therefore, seems unnecessary.

Messalla was also appointed Praefectus urbi in 26 B. C., although he resigned that office after five days.

Greece on his way to Tomis. The poem was probably written in the winter of 8-9 A. D. He alludes to Asia and Sicily (Ex Pont. II, 10, 21 ff.):

> te duce magnificas Asiae perspeximus urbes,
> Trinacris est oculis te duce visa meis;
> vidimus Aetnaea, etc.

and then, after mentioning a number of places in Sicily, ending with the region of Syracuse, he says

> hic mihi labentis pars anni magna peracta est.

This letter, one of the pleasantest of all the poems from exile, was addressed to Ovid's friend, the poet Macer,[34] in reminiscence of their journeys together. Its date is c. 12-13 A. D.

Another reference to Ovid's sojourn in Asia occurs in Fast. VI, 417-424, where he is speaking of the Palladium,

> cetera iam pridem didici puerilibus annis,
> non tamen idcirco praetereunda mihi
> * * * *
> creditur armiferae signum caeleste Minervae
> urbis in Iliacae desiluisse iuga.
> Cura videre fuit; vidi templumque locumque.

[34] This Macer is probably to be identified with Pompeius Macer, the epic poet (P. IV. 16, 6) and the relative of Ovid's third wife (P. II. 10, 10), not with Aemilius Macer, the didactic poet (Tr. IV. 10, 43). Kirby Smith preferred the latter whom he is inclined to identify with the Macer of Tib. II. 6, which he believes to be the latest poem of Tibullus. But Aemilius Macer was already growing old, c. 24 B. C., cf. Tr. IV, 10, 43, and is less likely to have undertaken a foreign *campaign*, and moreover Tib. II. 6, 1-6 imply that the Macer there mentioned was in love or was a love poet. This harmonizes better with what is known of Pompeius Macer. Further, although Aemilius Macer died in Asia 16 B. C., according to Hieronymus, Pompeius Macer was the son or grandson of Theophanes of Mytilene, Pompey's friend, and would have known Asia well, cf. Schanz, viii. ii, 1, pp. 362-363. Masson, *Vita*, pp. 43-44, suggests that Pompeius Macer is the man whom Augustus sent out as ἐπίτροπος of Asia, cf. Strabo, xiii, p. 618 c, and fixes Ovid's journeys c. 27-23 B. C. when he was very young. He emphasizes *puerilibus annis*.

It seems not improbable that Ovid may have accompanied Macer to Asia on the expedition alluded to by Tibullus II. 6. This poem would not in that case be the latest.

Ovid's words do not prove that his visit to Athens and his travels in Asia and Sicily were all included in one long foreign tour, although the fact that in Tr. I. 2 the phrase *oppida . . Asiae* follows directly on *Athenas* may mean, and has been taken to mean,[35] that he went on from Athens to Asia and thence to Sicily, cf. Ex. P. II. 10. On the other hand it would not be safe to press the phrase *puerilibus annis* in the Fasti passage and infer that this was a different and an earlier visit to Asia. Such trips were not usually made until a boy's schooldays were over. But whether the journeys were closely connected or not, it seems probable, in view of the failure of Ovid and Tibullus to contract a friendship, that these absences of Ovid from Rome occurred during the period in which the two poets might otherwise have seen each other often, c. 27-19 B. C. This probability is strengthened by Ovid's implication that he could have become a friend of Tibullus if the latter had only lived longer—that, in fact, Ovid himself was in Rome for several years after 19 B. C., the year of Tibullus' death.

The sojourn in Sicily lasted *pars anni magna,* and if Ovid seriously devoted himself to study in Athens, he must have remained there several months. When we add to these months the time necessary to visit even the coast cities of Asia—the claras Asiae urbes, as Catullus called them—and when we remember how leisurely the Romans were wont to travel,[36] two years are not an excessive estimate of the entire absence from Rome. It is impossible to determine whether he made only one journey or more than one. If there was but one, there would have been time for it in the years 28-26 B. C., after Ovid had completed the more formal part of his education, or in 25-23 B. C., just after his literary *début.* There is no good reason for choosing between these two possibilities. The first becomes more probable if we emphasize *puerilibus annis* (F. vi. 417) and *studiosus* (Tr. i. 2, 77), the second if we assume that Ovid may have been called home by the death of his brother, the news of which could have reached him late in 24 or early in 23 B. C., just as, in an earlier generation, Catullus had been called away from his pleasures by a like sorrow.

[35] Cf. De Mirmont, *op. cit.*

[36] Cf. for example, Cicero's journeys to and from his province.

But although Ovid's journeys cannot be precisely dated, they must have occurred in the earlier rather than the later part of the period which closed with the death of Tibullus, since Ovid's brief official career can hardly have begun later than c. 23-22 B. C. Ovid and his brother were among those youths of good equestrian family who were destined from boyhood for the *cursus honorum* and wore as a symbol the laticlave (Tr. IV, 10, 29), which to be sure Ovid later 'narrowed,' i. e. renounced (*ib.* 35). It is fair to assume, therefore, that, brilliant as he was, he held the minor offices at the earliest possible age, and indeed he uses the phrase *tenerae primos aetatis honores* (*ib.* 33). Without overemphasizing the fact that this reference follows immediately the account of his brother's death, 24 B. C., he could not have been over twenty or twenty-one at the time so that 23-22 B. C. is a probable date [37] for the beginning of his official experience. In deference to his father's wishes, which must have been all the more urgent after the death of the older boy who had displayed such talent for the forum, Ovid persisted until, as I have suggested, the quaestorship was imminent, c. 20 B. C.

Just how onerous the duties of these minor officials were we do not know, but at least during his incumbency Ovid would have had much less time than usual for literature and literary friendships. The duties were heavy enough to provide him with a pretext for his renunciation of the senatorial career, Tr. IV, 10, 36-37:

> maius erat nostris viribus illud onus.
> nec patiens corpus nec mens fuit apta labori.

His attitude is that of a young man who had no taste for official life, who shunned hard work, and whose experience of the labor required by his first positions was quite enough. He saw ahead of him more and still harder work, and he shrank from it.

[37] So Masson, p. 46. Ovid may also have been in these years a decemvir stlit. iud. (F. 4, 384) although Mommsen (Staatsr. I², p. 504) denies that a single individual could hold *two* of the offices included in the vigintivirate and favors emending the Fasti passage to bis decem. Ovid's activity as a centumvir (Tr. II, 93-94, P. III, 5, 23-24) and as a private iudex (Tr. II, 95) cannot be assigned to any definite period.

It is, therefore, clear that down to about 21-20 B. C. there were obstacles connected with Ovid's own life which go far to explain the absence of an *amicitia* between him and the country-loving Tibullus. How is it with the life of Tibullus?

In 1912 Professor B. L. Ullman revived and placed on a firmer basis the view that Tibullus, for some time before his death in 19 B. C., was in retirement and far from well.[38] He accomplished this by a careful interpretation of Horace's Ode, I. 33, 1-4, and especially the Epistle I. 4, both of which are addressed to Albius, an elegist. This Albius, as the vast majority of scholars believe, cannot very well have been anybody else than Tibullus, and I do not intend to review the arguments. Rather I shall here supply further evidence for the correctness of Ullman's chief contention: that when rightly understood Horace's words testify to the ill health of Tibullus and to his own desire to divert his friend's mind from brooding and to cheer him up. Horace is aware that Tibullus has had a long fit of the blues and is really worried about him, but he puts on a bold face and says in effect, 'cheer up, old friend! You're all right if you'll only be sensible and think so.' If the epistle does not mean something like this I do not know what it means. To take it literally gives it a meaning so slight as to be unworthy of the mature wisdom of Horace when he was writing the Epistles.

Now this interpretation of Horace is supported by the fact that Ovid found no sufficient opportunity to establish a friendship with Tibullus. To the obstacles in the way of that friendship we may add the ill health of Tibullus which sent him into retirement some time before his death. Indeed the facts derived from Ovid render it probable that his retirement continued for a longer period than can be inferred from Horace alone, a year or two before 19 B. C.—the very period in which Ovid abandoned his official duties and gave himself over entirely to poetry.

All the facts suggest a date for Horace's epistle not long before the premature death of Tibullus. There has been a tendency, not unnatural under the circumstances, to fix the date of the ode also as late as possible, c. 23 B. C. But the ode is in Book I and it may therefore belong to a time considerably

[38] *A. J. P.*, XXXIII, pp. 153-160.

earlier. Tibullus was pretty certainly in Rome at the time of Messalla's triumph, in September, 27 B. C., and the ode may very well be assigned to the years immediately following when Tibullus was engaged upon the elegies of his second book, which he left incomplete and did not himself publish. In this case the ode bears witness to a fit of melancholy some years before that illness of Tibullus which is implied by the epistle.

The foregoing comparative study has thrown new light, as I believe, upon the lives of the two leading poets of Messalla's circle from about 27 to 19 B. C. It is impossible, of course, to determine the exact sequence or the exact chronological limits of details to which we have such incomplete references, but it may be hoped that the conclusions arrived at are not lacking in probability.

## Ovid's Wives and Stepdaughter.

Ovid was married three times, cf. Tr. IV. 10, 69-74. The first wife was given to him, probably at his father's command, when he was hardly more than a boy (*paene . . . puero*) and he characterizes her as *nec digna nec utilis.* The union was soon broken. He praises his second wife rather faintly as *sine crimine,* but this union also did not endure. His words leave the manner of his separation from these wives quite uncertain; he mentions neither death nor divorce. Nothing more is known of them except that one came from Falerii (Am. iii, 13, 1) and one must have been the mother of Ovid's daughter—probably the second wife, for, as has been conjectured,[39] Ovid would hardly have wounded his daughter's feelings by calling her mother, in his published work, *nec digna nec utilis.*

For his third wife Ovid seems to have had a real affection. She is frequently addressed in the poems from exile, almost always in very affectionate terms. Very rarely there is a note of peevishness arising from the poet's despairing feeling that she was not doing her utmost to secure a mitigation of the terms of his exile. There is no reason to think, however, that she did not do her best.

There is some evidence, though it is by no means conclusive, by which to approximate the date of Ovid's third marriage. The fact that his third wife had been married before and had a

[39] Cf. Owen, Ed. Trist. I, p. xviii, citing Constantius Fanensis.

daughter by this marriage is of little service in the effort to infer her age at the time of her marriage to Ovid, since Roman girls were often brides when very young. She might have been still very young when she came to Ovid. There is, however, some reason to think that she was past the first bloom of youth. In Pont. I. 4, 47 ff. Ovid speaks of her as iuvenis at the time when he left Rome, adding that she may have aged, as he has, because of his misfortunes; that her hair, like his, may have turned gray. This letter was written 12 or 13 A. D. and Ovid had left Rome 8 A. D. If there is any reality beneath Ovid's words, if he is considering the possibility a real one that her hair may have become gray in four or five years, then we should probably picture her as a lady between thirty and forty at the time of Ovid's writing, and he may have married her twenty years earlier (say) 8 B. C. This is, of course highly conjectural, but we may reach approximately the same result by other evidence.

This wife's daughter (Ovid's stepdaughter) was married to Suillius (P. iv. 8, 11-12)—not later, therefore, than 16-17 A. D. Now if this step-daughter is, as I am convinced, the same as the Perilla to whom Tr. iii. 7 is addressed, she was old enough to write poetry which Ovid thought worth criticizing before the date of his exile, that is, she may have been fifteen or sixteen in 8 A. D. If this is true, her mother was, at the same date, thirty or more, so that Ovid's allusion c. 12-13 A. D. to her gray hair, some five years later, becomes quite intelligible. It becomes fairly probable, therefore, that Ovid's third marriage can hardly have taken place later than c. 9-8 B. C.

There are two common misstatements current about Ovid's third wife: that her name was Fabia, and that she was the mother of Ovid's daughter. The second statement has already been corrected by implication, and there is no evidence to support it. The evidence against it is negative but is very strong: in the numerous passages addressed to his third wife Ovid never alludes to 'our' daughter. He alludes thrice to his own daughter (Tr. IV. 10, 75-76, I. 3, 19-20, F. vi, 219 ff.). From these passages we learn that she was married twice in her early youth, had a child by each husband, and was absent in Libya at the time of Ovid's parting from his wife.

The passage from which the inference has been made that

Ovid's third wife was a Fabia is P. I, 2, 136, where, addressing Paullus Fabius Maximus, Ovid says,

ille ego de vestra cui data nupta domo est.

His wife, then, who is proved by the following lines to have been acquainted with Marcia, Fabius' wife, and Atia Minor, Augustus' aunt, was 'from the house' of the Fabii. This does not prove that her name was Fabia, but merely that she was connected with or dependent on the Fabii.[40]

At any rate she was a lady of good social position, and both she and Ovid considered it wise that she should not share his exile, but should remain in Rome to work for his recall. They hoped that through Marcia and Atia she could influence Livia to appeal to Augustus.

Allusion has just been made to the probable identity of Ovid's stepdaughter, the daughter of his third wife, with Perilla, the young poetess to whom Tr. iii. 7 is addressed. Great confusion still prevails, in editions of Ovid, concerning Perilla. All the editors see that she wrote poetry and many of them are content with that. A few warn the reader correctly that she was not Ovid's daughter, but this warning has sometimes fallen on deaf ears. None appear to be aware of the reasons for identifying her with Ovid's stepdaughter—indeed, they forget that he had a stepdaughter. It seems worth while, therefore, to bring back into notice the convincing but apparently forgotten disquisition [41] of one of the Renaissance scholars, Constantius Fanensis, who died in 1490.

Constantius argued in brief that Ovid's words to Perilla (Tr. iii. 7, 18) utque pater natae duxque comesque fui, shows that she was not his daughter (some editors have been keen enough to see this!); that his (third) wife had a daughter of her own (Tr. V. 5, 19), and that Ovid would there say *nostra,* not *sua,* if the girl had been the daughter of both; and lastly that his step-

[40] Masson (p. 49) cites J. Lipsius' note on Tac. Ann. I. 2. Lipsius doubted whether she was related to Fabius or to Marcia; cf. also Némethy, Comment. ad Tristia, 1913, Excursus I. P. ii, 10, 10, mea . . . coniunx non aliena tibi, proves that she was related to Pompeius Macer with whom Ovid traveled in Asia and Sicily—probably through Macer's mother since his father or grandfather was Theophanes of Mytilene, a Greek; cf. Schanz, Röm. Litt., viii, ii, I, pp. 362-363.

[41] Printed in Burmann's Appendix, pp. 5-7.

daughter married Suillius P. IV. 8, 11-12. These last lines are convincing, so far as concerns the point that Ovid had a stepdaughter:

nam tibi quae coniunx, eadem mihi filia paene est,
et quae te generum, me vocat illa virum.[42]

The only conclusion that can be drawn from these passages, says Constantius, is that Perilla, Ovid's stepdaughter—the daughter of his third wife—married Suillius.

In support of this conclusion we may add that, apart from members of the ruling family, Perilla is the only person at Rome whom Ovid addresses by name in the *Tristia,* since, as is well known, he did not wish anybody to incur possible danger by such open connection with an exile. He knew, however, that there was no danger to his wife and family. He does not name his wife, but the manner in which he addresses her leaves not the slightest doubt as to her identity.[43] It is much more probable, therefore, that Perilla was a member of Ovid's family than that she was merely a young friend whose poetic gift he had fostered. Everybody knew who she was just as everybody knew who his wife was, and so he could name her, whether Perilla is her real name or a pseudonym which he had been in the habit of applying to her. Sometime in the interval of about six years between the composition of Tr. iii. 7 and P. iv. 8 she married that accomplished but shifty politician, Suillius, so that in addressing him Ovid refers to the young wife as her who is 'almost my daughter' (P. iv. 8, 11).[44]

ARTHUR L. WHEELER.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

[42] Cf. v. 90, pro socero paene . . . tuo.

[43] Uxor, coniunx, carissima, etc. His failure to name her has been attributed to metrical reasons. It seems more probable that he found the terms uxor, etc., more effective.

[44] The phrase non patrio carmina more canis (Tr. iii. 7, 12) has been interpreted 'not in native fashion,' i. e. Greek verses, or 'not in your father's fashion,' i. e. non-erotic verses. The word *patrius* occurs commonly in Ovid in both senses: 'native' and 'father's'; cf. Burmann's *Index.* But since Ovid adds at once, in explanation of this line, nam tibi cum fatis *mores* natura pudicos . . . dedit, and since he urges Perilla not to fear his own punishment provided her verse does not teach love (vv. 27-30), he seems clearly, in vv. 11-12, to be expressing the hope that she is continuing her poetic efforts, but not in his own erotic manner.