

G. O. HUTCHINSON

SOME NEW AND OLD LIGHT ON THE REASONS FOR OVID'S EXILE

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 203 (2017) 76–84

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

SOME NEW AND OLD LIGHT ON THE REASONS FOR OVID'S EXILE*

The most common view now on the reasons for Ovid's exile is that, of the two which he alleges, the unknown *error* is the real one, the *carmen* not real. The argument is that the *Ars Amatoria* was published in or before AD 2 (the usual view), but Ovid was exiled in AD 8 (the universal view). Why a reaction in 8, not at the time? A new inscription provides the answer.¹

Only part of the causal context for the exile is accessible to us. We should not be seeking secrets in Augustus' mind or Julia's bedroom. The banishment of a well-known figure was a public action, justified in an official and strongly-worded *edictum* (cf. *Tr.* 2.131–8, 5.2b.13–14, 57–8). We should think how Augustus is seeking to affect opinion publicly. The *Ars Amatoria* played a major part in what Augustus wished to convey; we can consider his meaning in this regard. Since the specifics of the *error* were concealed in the edict, and are not clear to us, further speculation on it appears unprofitable.²

The inscription has been published authoritatively by Professor W. Eck (2016b), and discussed by him in a whole series of important articles (2013a, b, 2015, 2016a, c). Two bronze tablets contain fragments of a law for the city of Troesmis, in the late second century. Only one passage concerns us here (Tab. B.4–11). The text below attempts to address its local difficulties.

... oporteat. <ad> eius qui sacerdotium petet | quot (i.e. quod) minor ann(or)um XXXV sit rationem annorum habendam, | quae utiq(ue) legis Iuliae de maritandis ordinibus latae kap. VI | cauta conprehensaque sunt quaeq(ue) utiq(ue) commentari ex | quo lex P(apia) P(oppaea) lata est propositi Cn. Cinna Magno Vol(eso) Val(erio) | Caeso cos. IIII kal. Iulias kap. XLVIII cauta conprehensaque | sunt et confirmata legis P(apiae) P(oppaeae) k(ap.) XLVIII conseruanda qui quaeq(ue) | comitia habebit curato.

4 <ad> Hutchinson³ eius Eck: eum tab. 4–6 oporteat. eius [Eck] . . . habendam | quaeq(ue) utiq(ue) alia uia Hutchinson 6 latae Eck: lata tab. 7 sunt: est Eck (ut quae [u. 6] rationem exciperet) 10 sunt: est Eck

On 28 June AD 5, then, a *commentarius* was brought out which formed the basis of the *Lex Papia Poppaea* passed in the second half of AD 9. Why, one might ask, did Augustus not simply arrange for the legislation to be passed in AD 5? Dio helps us out. He tells of protest by the *equites* earlier in AD 9 (56.1.1–2), it seems during celebrations of Tiberius' victory: an embarrassingly public occasion (cf. Suet. *DA* 34.1). He says οἱ ἱππῆς πολλῇ ... σπουδῇ τὸν νόμον τὸν περὶ τῶν μῆτε γαμούντων μῆτε τεκνούντων καταλυθῆναι ἠξίου. This law is not simply the *Lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus*, from about 27 years ago, but a law which Augustus is now trying to get passed. In a speech to the unmarried, Augustus says (56.7.3) καὶ οὐδὲ ἐκ ταῦτα (an obligation to marriage which he has indulgently softened) μέντοι κατήπειξα ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον τρία ἔτη ὅλα πρὸς παρασκευὴν ὑμῖν ἔδωκα, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον δύο. ἀλλ' οὐδὲν οὐδ' οὕτως

* I am grateful to Professor C. P. Jones and Dr G. Kantor for much valuable help, and to Professors W. Eck and A. Bettenworth for most useful advice. I had written a draft before Eck 2016b, which speaks briefly of Ovid (604); Professor Eck will say a little more on him, he kindly informs me, in a volume edited by K. Welch and J. Osgood.

¹ Nisbet 1995, 158–9, for all the habitual charm of his writing, illustrates the implausibility of making Augustus' act express rage at a second edition (c.1 BC: his n. 73). For the resultant discounting of the *Ars* as cause, cf. e.g. Gibson 2003, 36–7, with further references. On the date of the *Ars* cf. Hollis 1977, xiii, 65–73; Gibson 2003, 37–43. Space prohibits discussion of the view that Ovid's exile was a fiction (Fitton Brown 1985, cf. Williams 1994, 3–4; I know the arguments of Bérchez Castaño 2015 only from Criado 2016). If Ovid is here playing with belief, he is not doing so with the centrality and wit he displays on the theme elsewhere.

² Ovid gives significance both to *carmen* and to *error*; the single passage *Pont.* 3.3.72 hardly shows a difference in significance important to Ovid's whole case. *Pont.* 4.13.41 could present the reverse (*quondam* suggests *prima* may denote importance, cf. e.g. *Tr.* 5.8.38, *Pont.* 4.15.4).

³ Inscriptions often spell *ad* as *at* (cf. Tab. A.11); preposition and haplography could even cause the double corruption *-at ad eius* (> *-at ad eum*) > *-at eum*. For the sense 'with regard to', cf. Kühner–Stegmann³ i.749–50, *TLL* i.545–7, *Dig.* 13.1.17 pr. 1, 22.5.11 pr. 1; for the word-order, e.g. Cic. *Off.* 1.88.

οὐτ' ἀπειλῶν οὔτε προτρέπων οὐτ' ἀναβαλλόμενος οὔτε δεόμενός τι πεποίηκα. They have been given three years to comply, then another two years: if we count inclusively (and do not press ὅλα), that is some kind of legislation in AD 5, and then a further extension in AD 8.⁴

Suetonius' picture is similar: *leges retractavit et quasdam ex integro sanxit, ut sumptuariam et de adulteriis et de pudicitia, de ambitu, de maritandis ordinibus. hanc cum aliquanto seuerius quam ceteras emendasset, prae tumultu recusantium perferre non potuit nisi adempta demum lenitate parte poenarum et uacatione trienni data auctisque praemiis. sic quoque abolitionem eius publico spectaculo pertinaciter postulante equite ...* (DA 34.1–2). The only misunderstanding here is in *perferre non potuit nisi ...*: the draft legislation of AD 5, though in form like an ordinary law, was not actually passed as a *lex* by the people then. (καταλυθῆναι is less unequivocal on the law's status; καταλυθῆναι ἡξίου corresponds to *abolitionem ... postulante*.) As just the three years' delay was conceded then, in AD 5 (cf. τὸ μὲν πρῶτον), Suetonius is not contradicting Dio by omitting the extension of AD 8. Similarity between Dio and Suetonius runs to the rhetorical *sic quoque* and οὐδ' οὕτως (with what follows in Suetonius cf. Dio 54.16.7); it is evident that Dio at 56.7.3 is not merely speechifying but drawing on a source.

Clearly, Augustus could not simply arrange to have legislation passed in AD 5: the people had to pass it; parts of the people were extremely unwilling, and continued to be. The intensified form of the law *de maritandis ordinibus* produced a strong conflict of wills between people and *princeps*. This hardly surprises: before even the less severe version of the law in 19 or 18 BC, we see clear signs of opposition to social legislation: cf. Liv. *Praef.* 9, Propertius 2.7, Hor. C. 3.24.25–32. Perhaps those laws themselves were preceded by some public indication on Augustus' part (cf. Prop. 2.7.1–3?). This *commentarius* should be seen as a way of easing the legislation in, a sort of white paper in British terminology. The procedure is particularly striking when the *Lex Papia Poppaea* is itself a revision of the *Lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* (cf. Suet. l.c., and the works of jurists *ad Legem Iuliam et Papiam*, cf. RS ii.802–4). Augustus is trying to get his law through by proceeding gradually. He is obliged even in AD 9 to make some concessions. The *Lex Papia Poppaea* none the less constitutes, as Suetonius makes clear and the renewed opposition presupposes, a marked increase in severity on the law *de maritandis ordinibus*.⁵

In AD 8 itself Augustus likewise mixes pragmatic caution and ideological determination. The further extension allowed in this year does not look like part of the original plan; Augustus evidently judged it expedient. At the same time, Augustus makes two public gestures (assuming for now that Ovid leaves in 8). He banishes both Ovid and his granddaughter Julia (Tac. *Ann.* 4.71.4, AD 28, *illic uiginti annis exilium tolerauit* – unless Tacitus is counting inclusively and the date is AD 9). Julia's banishment was the punishment for adultery (Tac. l.c., 3.24.1, Suet. DA 65.1). It seems from Tac. *Ann.* 3.24.2 as though she was banished through a strongly-worded edict: *nam culpam inter uiros ac feminas uulgatam graui nomine laesarum religionum ac uiolatae maiestatis appellando clementiam maiorum suasque ipse leges egrediebatur*. The edict against Ovid was certainly severe in expression: cf. *Pont.* 2.7.53–6 (Ovid absent, Augustus' tirade not oral) ... *addita sunt poenis aspera uerba meis*. It accused him of teaching adultery in his *Ars Amatoria* (*Tr.* 2.211–12 ... *turpi carmine †factus† / arguor obsceni doctor adulterii*; cf. *Pont.* 3.3.57–8). The *princeps*' public presentation shows him treating sternly not only adultery but the causes of adultery, in his own family and (less painfully) in the pre-eminent poet of the day.⁶

⁴ For this and the following two paragraphs see Eck, esp. 2016a. The brief account here merely shows Ovidians some of the evidence, and stresses AD 8. For the consuls see *Inscr. It.* xiii.1 p. 61. Jörs 1894, 49–56, cf. 1893, 55–60, was roughly right in supposing an earlier law, though in AD 4; cf. Wardle on Suet. DA 34.1, Eck 2016b, 602–3. Contrast with Jörs Mette-Dittmann 1991, 63.

⁵ For Propertius 2.7 cf. Moreau 2003. On *commentarius* see Eck 2016b, 605. Such procedure with a *lex* remains something different from the draft *senatus consultum*, if *commentarius* means that, at Tabula Larinas line 4.

⁶ It is important that the gesture against Ovid is Augustus' own (cf. *Tr.* 2.131–2 *nec mea decreto damnasti facta senatus* etc.); contrast the treatment of Labienus, whose work was burned *ex senatus consulto*, Sen. *Contr.* 10 pr. 8 (cf. Cornell 2013; Dio 56.27.1 looks different). First-person emphasis, and moral intensity, appear in the edict of AD 8 quoted at *Dig.* 48.18.8 pr. (cf. e.g. Bauman 1974, 45–6); for such aspects cf. e.g. *Edicta* IV.4–16, X, XIV, XV in Malcovati 1944.

Ovid's relegation looks to have a firm context in Augustus' proceedings at the time. But there remain questions to answer. First, the *Lex Papia Poppaea* primarily revises the *Lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus*, not the *Lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* (the *Digest's* numerous extracts from works on the *Lex Iulia et Papia* do not concern adultery; likewise the few explicit differentiations, *RS* ii.803–4, including the scorned Tert. *Apol.* 4.8). The protests in AD 9 are about pressure to marriage, not punishments for adultery. Do gestures that show the princeps' stance on adultery have anything to do with his stance on marriage? Clearly they do. The laws *de adulteriis et de pudicitia* (Suet. *DA* 34.1) and *de maritandis ordinibus* evidently went together, and embodied an attitude that encouraged marriage both morally and politically: licentious living, at its most extreme in adultery, was to be discouraged, especially in the higher classes; children who were undoubtedly legitimate were to be produced in suitable numbers.

A valuable source is the official song performed at the Secular Games, and other poetry by Horace. In the *Carmen Saeculare* the maidens and boys (6) celebrate the *prolis ... nouae feraci | lege marita* (18–21; the *Lex de maritandis ordinibus*), and *Pudor ... priscus* returns (57–8). This combines both elements, children and morality. *Odes* 4, a few years later, has *nullis polluitur casta domus stupris, | mos et lex maculosum edomuit nefas, | laudantur simili prole puerperae, | culpam poena premit comes* (5.21–4; the *Lex de adulteriis*). The stance on adultery remains important, and the production of legitimate children matters. Deplorable lifestyles have been checked at 4.15.9–14 – perhaps both laws are evoked – with good effects for ways of life and, by analogy with the past, for the growth of Roman power. Cf. *Epist.* 2.1.1–3 *Cum ... res Italas armis tuteris, moribus ornes, | legibus emendes*. The depiction of adultery at *C.* 3.6.17–48 begins *fecunda culpa saecula nuptias | primum inquinare et genus et domos* (there are consequences for families), and goes on *non his iuuentus orta parentibus | infecit aequor sanguine Punico* (the First Punic War).⁷

Later, Ovid too connects adultery and children, particularly in the higher classes; in denying the *Ars Amatoria* taught adultery, he stresses his own innocence, even towards lower-class wives: *nec quisquam est adeo media de plebe maritus | ut dubius uitio sit pater ille meo* (*Tr.* 2.351–2; cf. *Pont.* 3.3.53–4). The same poem talks of Augustus' *legum ... tutela tuarum, | et morum, similes quos cupis esse tuis* (some irony here, perhaps; cf. Dio 54.16 below), and his restless war *cum uitii* (233–6). The *Lex Iulia de adulteriis* specifically remains important to Augustus in these years; Ovid tells Romulus at *Fast.* 2.139 *tu rapis, hic castas duce se iubet esse maritas*.⁸

The Horatian passages, and Propertius 2.7, indicate Dio's accurate understanding of the issues. In 54.16 (18 BC), he mentions the *Lex de maritandis ordinibus*, then depicts dismay from senatorial fathers (?) at the ἀκομία of women and young men which makes arranging marriages difficult (1–2; cf. *licentia* Hor. *C.* 3.24.28–9, 4.15.10). They call on Augustus to deal with this problem too (καὶ ἐκείνην), and mock his own previous affairs with women. Dio proceeds directly to an anecdote, on a young man who marries a woman he has committed adultery with; Augustus' own conduct with Livia seems especially pertinent to his embarrassment (cf. Suet. *DA* 69.1). The section ends with more on the *Lex de maritandis ordinibus*. The interconnection of areas is apparent. The whole depiction of the senatorial discussion conjures up an atmosphere very different from what we know of later principates, and is unlikely to be Dio's invention. In his speech to unmarried *equites* in AD 9, Augustus claims they want licence καὶ ὑβρίζειν καὶ ἀσελγαίνειν in relationships with women (56.7.1). This could well be invention, but catches the tone of Augustus' approach. Dio's comment that Papius and Poppaeus themselves were unmarried (56.10.3) probably descends from wry observations at the time; the humour in 54.16 is akin. The material generally indicates how a clash

⁷ Eck's admirable stress on lineage and blood (2016a, 298) in the *Lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* and *Lex Papia Poppaea* is relevant to the legislation on adultery too. His argument (2016a, 296–9) on the significance of the whole *populus Romanus* in the *Leges Iuliae* is important; but the present discussion is concerned especially with the higher classes (cf. Eck 2016b, 604). Thomas on Hor. *CS* 17–20 runs into one the *Lex de maritandis ordinibus* and *patrum ... decreta*; this seems doubtful, but the prominence of the senate here is of interest. Cf., with regard to the *Lex Iulia de adulteriis*, e.g. (dates of legislation unknown) *Dig.* 48.5.15.1, 30.8 (addition to *Lex Iulia de adulteriis*), Talbot 1984, 455, 457.

⁸ Aug. *RG* 8 combines increasing the population and the restoration of tradition through laws (usually taken to include the laws on marriage, cf. both Scheid and Cooley on 8.5). With 8.5 *redluxi* cf. Hor. *CS* 57–9, *Odes* 4.15.12. Augustus' edict on procedure with slaves from the second half of AD 8 was quoted by Paulus in *De Adulteriis* (*Dig.* 48.18.8 pr.), though there are controversies here (cf. e.g. Pettinger 2012, 130–1).

over ways of life underlies the dispute over legislation. It is clear how gestures on adultery are easily and inevitably connected with the legal moves of AD 5–9: both contribute to Augustus' cohesive presentation of his own stance and of the behaviour he is assailing.

All that is needed for the exile to be seen as such a gesture is Augustus' claim that the *Ars Amatoria* taught adultery. But the relation between gesture, context, and poem may be considered further. Possibly Augustus had not read the poem. At one point Ovid imagines someone read it to him (*Tr.* 2.77–8 – not effective as irony), at another he claims to think it unsurprising that Augustus has not read it (237–42; cf. *Pont.* 1.2.87–8: ignorance inferred in a different matter); in a legal case decided by the *princeps*, such sloppiness could seem slightly implausible. Possibly Augustus' edict simply exaggerated: Tacitus thought overblown the language used against the Julias. Ovid, however, takes the assertion on teaching adultery literally, perhaps because he can refute it. Indeed, there is a curious neatness in the match between the charge against the poem and the explicit counteraction of that charge within it. Ovid refers already at *Tr.* 2.247–52 to such an evasion early in the poem (*AA* 1.31–4 – *pagina prima Tr.* 2.304; cf. e.g. *Pont.* 3.3.51–8). He might in theory have added these evasions to the text recently; a less unattractive possibility is that he had added them in response to the criticism which greeted the poem when it appeared (*Rem.* 357–96: the criticism is not explicitly limited to the *Ars*, but will be particularly related to it, and may explain the whole *Remedia*). The criticism as stated is for obscenity rather than causing adultery, but that juncture would be an apt one for cautious insertions. First editions, however, were not easily removed from scrutiny or circulation. We see this from Cicero's *Academica*: part of the first version, twice replaced in a month or so, has still survived (note too Plut. *Luc.* 42.3–4). Another point at which pressure is now indicated is AD 5: Augustus' renewed intensity on social legislation would be a suitable moment for making things crystal-clear.⁹

Conjectures aside, the poem can be viewed as insulting the *Lex de adulteriis*. Thus (*AA* 2.557–600) young men are advised not to *deprendere* their girl-friends; the warning tale of Mars and Venus is told; Venus mocks her *maritus* (2.567) and imitates his limp; the Sun is apostrophized as setting a bad example in his *indicium*, with an implication that *indices* are paid; setting traps for the rival is discouraged; a final remark emphasizes that Ovid is not talking of illegality or matrons. The catching of wives, daughters, and their lovers in the act, and the theoretical notion of killing male adulterer or daughter, was one of the most striking features of this *lex* (quotations *Dig.* 48.5.24 pr., 30 pr.; cf. 48.5.2.2, 2.6, 15 pr., 1, 25 pr., 1, 26 pr., 2, 5, etc.). The thinnest of veils is interposed between the poem and the law.¹⁰

The legislation about marriage makes war on a lifestyle which Ovid's poetry could reasonably be seen as embodying. It is notable that the current *Amores* near the end suddenly indicates that the poet has a wife (3.13.1–2; to speak of a narrator would here miss the point). The frequent appearance of Ovid's virtuous third wife in the exile poetry is not accidental (cf. for her virtue e.g. *Tr.* 4.3.57, 71–84, *Pont.* 3.1.44). But why single out the *Ars Amatoria*, when the *Amores* come much closer to presenting adultery directly? The answer lies partly in the form: the poem gives advice. Teaching love is again and again the fault to which the exile poetry recurs (cf. e.g. *Tr.* 1.1.67–8, 2.253–4, 3.1.4, *Pont.* 1.1.7, cf. 1.1.12 – other works all right, cf. e.g. 2.2.103–4 – 1.4.41–2, 2.10.15–16 *artem dum tradit amandi, l doctrinae pretium triste magister habet*, 3.3.23–4 – with a different turn – cf. 37–40). One could say didactic poetry was known to teach no one anything – that was the job of prose; but such a view of didactic poetry is modern, and Ovid never uses it, handy as it would be. He does at points argue that everyone knows how to love anyway (*Tr.* 1.1.112), or

⁹ More could be said, in a broader discussion, on the context for Augustus' legal move in AD 5; Dr Kantor nicely writes of a 'reinvention of the régime' from AD 4, with Augustus adopting Tiberius and Agrippa Postumus, Tiberius adopting Germanicus. The *Lex de adulteriis* itself was altered (Suet. *DA* 34.1), possibly at this time, though less severely than the *Lex de maritandis ordinibus*. Alteration of the *Ars*: the idea of two versions is recommended by *Tr.* 1.9.61 *uetus hoc ... carmen*, 2.543–6 (cf. Syme 1978, 15–16). Ovid could be stretching things; but the poem sounds more distant than around AD 2. Ovid produced a new version of the *Amores*, and gives lines he says should be added to the *Metamorphoses* (*Tr.* 1.7.33–40; even if he is not serious, it shows practical possibilities); modern poems in the didactic tradition show texts in flux (Hutchinson 2001, 153). See also Gurd 2012, Martelli 2013.

¹⁰ On catching and killing cf. e.g. Treggiari 1991, 282–5, McGinn 1998, 146–7, Fayer 2005, 221–55. Stroh 1979, 348–50 sees the passage aims at the *Lex de adulteriis*, cf. Holzberg 1990, Steudel 1992, 183–9, Janka on 2.561–92, 575–6. Ovid exploits such scenes elsewhere too, cf. Hutchinson 2007, 32 and 2011, 246–7, 251, 255; but there his indication of the law is more oblique.

that he himself could not teach adultery because he is ignorant (*Tr.* 2.347–8). He does not argue that love is an unteachable feeling, or that tuition in love-affairs would be a ludicrous subject-matter for a didactic work. After all, a substantial tradition existed of similar works in Greek prose; the poem is linked to them even by its title. The modern world confirms that books on relationships and the sexes can find purchasers. *Tristia* 2 stresses rather that other didactic poets too teach reprehensible subjects, and that teaching is not limited to didactic poems. Of course, there is more to the *Ars Amatoria* than tuition, and the poem is full of humour and play (cf. *iocos Tr.* 1.9.61–2, 2.238, 241–2, 494; 5.1.19–22). One might contend, however, that the fun does not obliterate the canny advice. In any case, Augustus is unlikely to have thought it did; and the light-heartedness of Ovid's *Teach Yourself Love* adds insult (or cheek) to the injury. Not many years after the banishment, Cestius observed how Ovid had filled the age with amatory arts (*Sen. Contr.* 3.7.1).¹¹

The other particularly salient aspect of the poem is its final book. The exile poetry stresses not the teaching of young men and women alike, but the teaching of women (e.g. *Tr.* 2.244 *Romanas erudiuntque nurus*, 253–62 *matrona*, 347 *nuptae*; note 449, 461–4 of Tibullus' teaching wives, *Pont.* 3.3.49–56 ... *non me legitimos sollicitasse toros. | scripsimus haec illis quarum* etc; much more unusual is *Tr.* 3.7.29–30 – both sexes). It is with the corruption of the woman, from girlhood to wifehood, that the depiction in *Odes* 3.6 is concerned; it is wives whom Augustus in *Fast.* 2.139 tells to be chaste; it is a virtuous wife who ends Propertius' last book. Adultery is, in Roman terms, a man sleeping with a married woman, not a woman sleeping with a married man; wives' unchastity must imperil lineage. Book 3 of the *Ars* makes clear near the start that it is addressing only women permitted by *leges* (57–8); but the concentration on the female perspective makes it quite different from most Augustan poetry on contemporary love-affairs. So constantly does the exile poetry emphasize teaching women that one might even wonder if Augustus' edict mentioned them. At all events, the structure of the *Ars* makes it especially provocative.¹²

One matter remains; it could make the evidence of the inscription less directly important, while leaving intact both the line of argument on the exile and the wider picture of Augustus' activity which the inscription suggests. The date of AD 8 for Ovid's banishment is now regarded as fixed; on investigation, its firmness wobbles. Older scholarship exhibits more debate. The two significant possibilities are 1) that Ovid was sent into exile in the winter of AD 8, and arrived at Tomis in spring or summer AD 9, or 2) that he was sent into exile in the winter of AD 9. Scaliger espoused 2).¹³

We have to weigh different passages against each other in the language they use of time. On the one hand, Ovid indicates that he had passed five *lustra* when he was ordered into exile, and when he wrote the *Ibis* in Tomis (*Tr.* 4.10.95–8, expressed in pseudo-Greek terms, *Ib.* 1 *tempus ad hoc lustris bis iam mihi quinque peractis*). The terminology does not give the events a fixed period – say, within a year of Ovid's fiftieth birthday (which was 20 March AD 8, cf. *Tr.* 4.10.5–6, 13–14). So at *Sil.* 17.331–5 Hannibal at Zama speaks of Carthage as *post trina labantem | lustra* (in the Second Punic War): that is over 16 years, first half of 218 to second half of 202.¹⁴

On the other hand, at *Pont.* 4.6.5–6 Ovid says that the five-year period he has spent in Scythia *iam tempus lustris transit in alterius*. This language does fix a time. The same poem speaks of Augustus' death (19 August AD 14). News of the event had reached Tomis; it does not perhaps sound as if it has just arrived, and certainly Ovid has composed a poem on the event and sent it for circulation in Rome. The date of the present poem would be at the earliest September AD 14. Suppose Ovid arrived at Tomis around September AD 9 (years 9/10, 10/11, 11/12, 12/13, 13/14; inclusive counting would not help, or suit the series to be mentioned below). Such an arrival would be implausibly late if Ovid leaves Italy in or before December

¹¹ For *amatoriis non artibus* read *non amatoriis artibus*? Title of the *Ars*: cf. Heinsius 1758, 259. Didactic poems and prose: cf. Hutchinson 2009.

¹² The *Amores* too become more shocking in the final book of the three-book version: cf. Hutchinson 2008, 185–6. The *Remedia* includes both sexes (cf. e.g. 49–50).

¹³ Scaliger 1658, 182 (with a slight slip over Ovid's age); so too Masson 1708, *Anno C. VIII*, Wartenberg 1884, 13–25, *al.*

¹⁴ At *Tr.* 4.8.33–4 the perspective seems to be from the present, so beyond a year; but this could be disputed. In *Tr.* 4.10.95–6 the Olympiads are taken as five actual years, because of the Greek inclusive πενταετηρίς (*Pind. Ol.* 3.21, etc.). Cf. Scaliger 1629, 382–3.

of 8 (*Tr.* 1.11.3). The journey appears from *Tristia* 1.10 to be conducted as far as Samothrace without long delays, say on an Aegean island. When Ovid leaves a ship actually bound in the end for Tomis to travel through Thrace on land, the reason seems unlikely to be a desire for prolonged dalliance in Thrace (cf. *Pont.* 4.5.33–6). The account could be false, but there seems no particular reason to think so. Even if Ovid arrived in Tomis as late as March of 9, it seems strained to say one five-year period is passing into another in September or later of 14. And if he arrived that March, *Tristia* 3.12, which is set in spring and should follow Tiberius' departure to Germany in 10, would have to describe Ovid's second spring at Tomis. But it should not be contemporaneous with 4.7.1–2, where the second spring appears to be described (*Bis uer sol adiit* etc.). It is evident that *Pont.* 4.6.5–6 gives a firmer indication of time than *Tr.* 4.10.95–8 or *Ib.* 1. Thus departure in the winter of 9 is to be preferred.¹⁵

Furthermore, the reader can hardly fail to be struck by the sequence of years marked out in the successive books of exile poems, from *Tristia* 4 on. The sequence of seasons within those years is not treated with such firm chronology and in any case is less clear to the reader, who is not told when Ovid's sojourn in Tomis began; but as regards years in exile or in Tomis, there is an evident pattern in the references to the second autumn (*Tr.* 4.6.19–20), the second spring (4.7.1–2), the third winter (5.10.1–2), the fourth winter (*Pont.* 1.2.25–6), the fourth autumn (1.8.27–8), five years (4.6.5–6), the sixth summer (4.10.1–2), and the sixth winter (4.13.39–40). The fourth book of the *Ex Ponto* is marked out externally as covering several years, unlike the trio of Books 1–3 (Books 1–3 belong in one year, and eschew chronological sequence, see 3.9.51–3). Thus 4.4 in AD 13 looks forward to the consulship of Pompeius in AD 14, 4.5 is written in the year of the consulship, 4.6 refers to Augustus' death, 4.9 looks forward from 15 or early 16 to the suffect consulship of Graecinus later in the year, and the ordinary consulship of L. Pomponius Flaccus in 17. Now, if Ovid was exiled in the winter of 8 and arrived even as late as the summer of 9, the sixth summer in Tomis would be that of 14 (9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14), the sixth winter in Tomis that of 14/15 (9/10, 10/11, 11/12, 12/13, 13/14, 14/15). Hence the sixth summer in Tomis (4.10) would occur before the five years in Tomis (4.6). This would throw the apparent sequence of years into disarray. With departure in the winter of AD 9, the summer and winter would be 15 and probably 15/16, and the pattern fits together nicely. (Dates for the beginning of spring start from early February: cf. *Fast.* 2.150.) It looks as though the winter of AD 9 is the more likely date for departure.¹⁶

Arguments from *Tristia* 2 do not work. 169 *adsueta tuis semper Victoria castris* is thought inconsistent with Varus' disaster in AD 9. But Manilius Book 1, written under Augustus, speaks of the disaster (898–900); yet soon afterwards 925 *sit pater inuictus patriae* implies Augustus has been *inuictus* hitherto. 225

¹⁵ The arguments at Wheeler 1988, xxxiii that Ovid travelled in leisurely fashion are not strong. If he received letters from Rome during the journey (which is disputed), that would not prove delays of months: Wheeler thinks Ovid arrives in the summer, or before. In any case, cf. e.g. Cic. *Att.* 6.5.1 (*obuias mihi litteras ... crebro mittas*); Ovid's route before his possible change of plan at Samothrace could be known beforehand or communicated (he could change because he thinks the voyaging dangerous). Wheeler's point that Ovid fails to mention any 'discomforts of a winter journey through the Thracian mountains' (contrast *Tr.* 1.10.23 *Bistonios ... pede carpere campos*) ignores the strategy of *Tristia* 1, which concentrates on travel in the winter seas and pauses to describe the journey precisely when Ovid is returning to travel by land (*Tristia* 1.10; the reference of 1.11 is unclear). *Pont.* 4.5.33–6 show that Ovid could have made more of the land journey had he wished. Wheeler seems to want a departure before the depth of winter to explain the absence of reference to winter in Thrace; but Ovid is to arrive in Tomis during the summer, in which case he has spent the mid-winter in Thrace, or before, in which case there are difficulties as mentioned. Better on the journey is Wartenberg 1884, 17–21; see also Luck on *Tr.* 1.10.23–4, intro. to 1.11.

¹⁶ Dates for spring beginning: see Robinson on Ov. *Fast.* 2.150. External dates in the poems fit the pattern neatly enough. Wheeler's date (e.g. xxxiv) of 16 January AD 13 for a triumph of Tiberius rests on a mistaken supplement (cf. *Inscr. It.* xiii.2.398–400). The triumph happened on 23 October (*Inscr. It.* xiii.2.135); the year is most often supposed to be AD 12. The news of the triumph need not arrive in spring at *Pont.* 2.1.1–2 (cf. 4.10.41–4). Suppose that it does: this will explain why the triumph is not mentioned in *Tristia* 5, which includes the third winter (10.1: winter of AD 12/13 on this view). Since *Ex Ponto* 1–3 disclaim chronological order, and the exile poetry avoids chronology within the year, it would not matter if 1.2 and 1.8 were later in the year than 2.1. 4.4 (AD 13) and 4.1 (before 4.4 but probably after *Tristia* 5) would fall in the same calendar year as 2.1; but so they would with the standard chronology of the exile. (The general circulation of Books 1–3 in late 13, cf. e.g. Syme 1978, 42, suits the suggested chronology better than fourth autumn 12, five years autumn 14.) Book 4 is actually unusual; it is also conceivable that its span of years should include two Pompeius poems from before 2.1, with the triumph occurring in 13. The dating of the triumph involves problems in Vell. 2.121.1–2, Suet. *Tib.* 20–21.1 (note *non multo post* and Aug. *RG* 8.3).

nunc tibi Pannonia est, nunc Illyris ora domanda is held to predate victory over the region in AD 9. But the passage in Ovid is actually describing how multitudinous tasks prevented Augustus from reading the *Ars Amatoria* before exiling Ovid: the numerous *nuncs* depict Augustus' action-packed existence rather than stating things he must do in the immediate future. This is shown by 227–8 *nunc porrigit arcus | Parthus eques timida captaque signa manu*. One minute you have Pannonia to vanquish ... 229 *nunc te prole tua iuuenem Germania sentit* would actually fit well with Tiberius' expedition from AD 10 on. Allusion to that expedition in 229–30, immediately before 232 *pars nulla est quae labat imperii*, would prevent that phrase from seeming awkwardly to ignore Germany.¹⁷

If the now conventional date for the exile is preferred, the new inscription has given a context which makes sense of it. If we opt for 9, we have a still more suitable context. After the disputes in the earlier part of 9, the *Lex Papia Poppaea* is passed in the second half; Ovid's banishment reinforces Augustus' stance on marriage. The law was probably passed before Varus' catastrophe in the autumn (cf. Dio 56.24.1). The edict on Ovid evidently set him a deadline for leaving, maybe the end of the year (*Tr.* 1.3.5–6, note *prope*, 11.3–4); there was a significant interval between edict and deadline (*Tr.* 1.3.7–8 *longa ... mora*). During this stage, Ovid was at one point on Elba (*Pont.* 2.3.83–90). Nothing stops the edict from being close to the passing of the law (say, both July); law and departure would certainly fall in the same six months.

The inscription would remain important for understanding the context: it makes clearer, and brings out from other evidence, the conflict of attitudes between Augustus and a significant part of the Roman people, most especially the *equites*. We are shown how important and difficult it was to gain the people's assent in these matters. Of course, beyond the actual passage of the law, there was the behaviour which the law aimed to produce: *quid leges sine moribus | uanae proficiunt ... ?* (Hor. *C.* 3.24.1–2). Ovid's banishment has its public meaning in this context; so does Ovid's answering poetry.

Here too the inscription matters. Since people's opinion was palpably important to Augustus, and his strategies for affecting it diverse, the poetry is likely to have struck the ordinary reader as a forceful campaign to create pressure. That reader would not initially have been in a position to think impossible some limited act of clemency, and the avoidance of bad publicity now and in the future. Even the claim that Augustus was inclining to forgiveness when he died (*Pont.* 4.6.15–16) would not have been penned if it appeared ridiculous; there was a sort of precedent. The insistent wish for a nearer place of exile (nearer to the *patria*, *Pont.* 1.2.128) is already voiced at *Tr.* 2.183–6; it must be suggested partly by what had happened with the Julias. Vehement popular pressure to let the Elder Julia return had met a vehement refusal ('sooner will fire mix with water ...'). The people persisted: with uncowed humour they threw fires into the Tiber. Later Augustus yielded to pressure (the people ἐξέβιάσατο): she was allowed onto the Italian mainland (Dio 55.13.1 (Xiph.), AD 3). The idea of Augustus' yielding after a period comes in Ovid too, *Tr.* 2.575–6, though their actual return is in question (consistent with this are 4.9.13, 5.4.17–18, 5.8.33–4, *Pont.* 4.6.15–16). The Younger Julia was exiled on an island 'not far' (Tac. *Ann.* 4.71.4) from the coast of Italy.

Another new inscription tells us that shortly after Augustus' death the nearby Istrians asked Tiberius to be moved as a city. Sex. Aelius Catus had recently moved large numbers of Getae (Strabo 7.3.10 303C. ii.270.25–8 Radt). The region too may give Ovid ideas (cf. *Tr.* 3.8.42, 4.4.52, 5.1.45–6 *modo ... barbariem rigidos effugiamque Getas*, 5.2b.25 (69) *finitimo ... Marte*, 29 (73), *Pont.* 1.2.103–4, the Istros inscription 7 διὰ τὸ προκεῖσθαι ἐν γίγτα τοῖς βαρβάροις, 10–11 τὴν ἐξο[ι]κ[η]σίαν [ἡ]τοῦμεν [suppl. Jones]).¹⁸

Ovid evolves his strategy as Augustus had evolved his; determined pertinacity combines with tactical shifts. In particular, Ovid moves from addressing Augustus and addressing others without names, to just addressing others without names, to addressing others with names. Epigraphy puts both the exile and the response to the exile into the stormy seas of their period.

¹⁷ Postgate's *et* in 231, adopted by Ingleheart, has the disadvantage of providing a sentence which does not refer to Augustus' exertions; Ingleheart's objection to the lack of parallelism between the couplets seems rather rigid (note *tutela*). For *ut ... quoque* cf. *Her.* 5.101–3. Ingleheart's defence of the text in 232 reasonably sees 231–2 as counteracting any negative impressions from what precedes. On *Tristia* 2 cf. Syme 1978, 38.

¹⁸ The inscription, vividly treated by Jones 2016, is probably from AD 15: see Kantor (2017); that date would suit *Ex Ponto* 4.7. Jones mentions Catus.

Works cited

- Bauman, R. A. (1974), *Impietas in Principem: A Study of Treason against the Roman Emperor with Special Reference to the First Century A.D.* (Munich).
- Bérchez Castaño, E. (2015), *El destierro de Ovidio en Tomis: realidad y ficción* (Valencia) [nondum uidi].
- Cornell, T. J. (2013), 62. T. Labienus. Introduction, *FRHist* i.472–3 (Oxford).
- Criado, C. (2016), review of Bérchez Castaño 2015, *BMCR* 2016.09.51.
- Eck, W. (2013a), Das Leben römisch gestalten. Ein Stadtgesetz für das Municipium Troesmis aus den Jahren 177–180 n. Chr., in G. de Kleijn and St. Benoist (edd.), *Integration in Rome and the Roman World* (Leiden), 75–88.
- (2013b), La Loi municipale de Troesmis : données juridiques et politiques d'une inscription récemment découverte, *RHDFE*, 199–213.
- (2015), Akkulturation durch Recht: Die *lex municipalis Troesmensium*, in L. Zerbini (ed.), *Culti e religiosità nelle province danubiane* (Bologna), 9–18.
- (2016a), Die augusteische Ehegesetzgebung und ihre Zielsetzung. Die *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus*, die *lex Papia Poppaea* und ein *commentarius* des Jahres 5 n. Chr. als Grundlage der *lex Papia Poppaea*, *Maia* n.s. 68, 282–99.
- (2016b), Die *lex Troesmensium*: ein Stadtgesetz für ein *municipium civium Romanorum*. Publikation der erhaltenen Kapitel und Kommentar, *ZPE* 200, 565–606.
- (2016c), Die *Lex municipalis Troesmensium*: Ihr rechtlicher und politisch-sozialer Kontext, in C.-G. Alexandrescu (ed.), *Troesmis – A Changing Landscape: Romans and the Others in the Lower Danube Region in the First Century BC – Third Century AD* (Cluj-Napoca), 33–46.
- Fayer, C. (2005), *La familia romana. Aspetti giuridici ed antiquari. Concubinato. Divorzio. Adulterio. Parte terza* (Rome).
- Fitton Brown, A. D. (1985), The Unreality of Ovid's Tomitan Exile, *LCM* 10.2, 18–22.
- Gibson, R. K. (2003), *Ovid, Ars Amatoria Book 3: Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Cambridge).
- Gurd, S. A. (2012), *Work in Progress: Literary Revision as Social Performance in Ancient Rome* (New York and Oxford).
- Heinsius, N. (1758), *Commentarius in P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera Omnia*, ed. J. Fr. Fischer (Leipzig).
- Hollis, A. S. (1977), *Ovid, Ars Amatoria Book I: Edited with an Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).
- Holzberg, N. (1990), Ovids Version der Ehebruchsnovelle von Ares und Aphrodite (Hom. Od. θ 266–366) in der *Ars amatoria* (II 561–592), *WJA* 16, 137–52.
- Hutchinson, G. O. (2001), The Date of *De Rerum Natura*, *CQ* n.s. 51, 150–62.
- (2007), The Monster and the Monologue: Polyphemus from Homer to Ovid, in P. J. Finglass, C. Collard, N. J. Richardson (edd.), *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford), 22–39.
- (2008), *Talking Books: Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry* (Oxford).
- (2009), Read the Instructions: Didactic Poetry and Didactic Prose, *CQ* n.s. 59, 196–211.
- (2011), Telling Tales: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Callimachus, in D. Obbink and R. B. Rutherford (edd.), *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons* (Oxford), 239–61.
- Jones, C. P. (2016), An Inscription from Istros and Ovid's Last Poems, *ZPE* 200, 122–32.
- Jörs, P. (1893), *Die Ehegesetze des Augustus*, part of P. Jörs, Ed. Schwartz, R. Reitzenstein, *Festschrift Theodor Mommsen zum fünfzigjährigen Doctorjubiläum* (Marburg).
- (1894), *Die Ehegesetze des Augustus* (Marburg).
- Kantor, G. (2017), The Date and Circumstances of Quintus Iulius Vestalis, *ZPE* 203, 85–91.
- McGinn, T. A. J. (1998), *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome* (Oxford).
- Malcovati, E. (1944), *Imperatoris Augusti operum fragmenta*⁵ (Turin).
- Martelli, F. K. A. (2013), *Ovid's Revisions: The Editor as Author* (Cambridge).
- Masson, J. (1708), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Vita ordine chronologico sic delineata ut etc.* (Amsterdam).
- Mette-Dittmann, A. (1991), *Die Ehegesetze des Augustus. Eine Untersuchung im Rahmen der Gesellschaftspolitik des Princeps* (Stuttgart).
- Moreau, P. (2003), *Florent sub Caesare leges* : quelques remarques de technique législative à propos des lois matrimoniales d'Auguste, *RHDFE* 81, 461–77.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. (1995), *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* (Oxford).
- Pettinger, A. (2012), *The Republic in Danger: Drusus Libo and the Succession of Tiberius* (Oxford).

- Scaliger, J. J. (1629), *Opus de Emendatione Temporum: Hac postrema Editione, ex Auctoris ipsius manuscripto emendatius, magnaue accessione auctius* (Geneva).
- (1658), *Animadversiones in Chronologica Eusebii*, in *Thesaurus temporum: Eusebii Pamphili Cæsareæ Palæstinæ Episcopi Chronicorum canonum omnimodæ historiæ libri duo*² (Amsterdam).
- Steudel, M. (1992), *Die Literaturparodie in Ovids Ars Amatoria* (Hildesheim, Zurich, New York).
- Stroh, W. (1979), Ovids Liebeskunst und die Ehegesetze des Augustus, *Gymnasium* 86, 323–52.
- Syme, R. (1978), *History in Ovid* (Oxford).
- Talbot, R. J. A. (1984), *The Senate of Imperial Rome* (Princeton).
- Treggiari, S. (1991), *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian* (Oxford).
- Wartenberg, G. (1884), *Quaestiones Ovidianae, quibus agitur de Tristium, Ibidis, Epistolarumque, quae „Ex Ponto” inscribuntur, temporibus* (Diss. Berlin).
- Wheeler, A. L. (1988), rev. G. P. Goold, *Ovid VI: Tristia, Ex Ponto, with an English Translation*² (Cambridge, Mass., and London).
- Williams, G. D. (1994), *Banished Voices: Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry* (Cambridge).

G. O. Hutchinson, Christ Church, Oxford OX1 1DP
 gregory.hutchinson@classics.ox.ac.uk