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OVIDIAN INTERTEXTUALITY: SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON TR. 1 AND MET. 11

SIMONA MARTORANA

Abstract: Having summed up the principal issues of the Tristia, as well as the ways in which scholars have approached Ovid’s exile works during the last few centuries, I will make a comparative analysis between Tr. 1.2-4 and Met. 11.410-748, the episode of Ceyx and Alcyone. The close intertextual connections that emerge from this analysis suggest not only that the fundamental textual source for Tr. 1.2-4 is indeed Ceyx’ episode of the Metamorphoses, but also that these three poems, by sharing a common model, are interrelated, thus constituting a sort of unitary block. The aim of the paper is to show how Ovidian intertextuality may be profitably employed to shed light on Ovid’s modus operandi in arranging his works: indeed, the poet not only draws from other authors, but, especially in this case, also predominantly takes inspiration from his previous poetry and adapts it to a new context.

INTRODUCTION
Ovid’s Tristia, as well as other exile works such as the Epistulae ex Ponto and the Ibis, have long been neglected by Ovidian scholars. Especially from the period of Romantic criticism onwards, they have been considered the worst products of Ovidian poetry, and
for this reason their literary value has been dramatically underesti-
mated.

In the last decades, however, Ovid’s exile poetry has undergone a
process of revaluation: it has not simply been studied as merely a
biographical document of Ovid’s life after he underwent the sen-
tence of banishment, as was previously the case, but its artistic con-
tent has also been rediscovered and appreciated.

Following this new inclination, in this paper I posit the existence
of a strong intertextual relationship between the three poems of Tr.
1 (2, 3, 4) and the myth of Ceyx and Alcyone of Met. 11. To achieve
this, after providing a brief overview of the existing scholarship on
Ovid’s exile works, I will make a comparative analysis of the three
poems and the passage of Met. 11 mentioned above. The final goal
is to uncover new literary aspects of Tr. 1.2-4, by demonstrating
that these three poems share an artistically refined textual source,
I.e., Met. 11.410-748.

I. OVID’S TRISTIA: AN OVERVIEW

Before they were considered in light of their artistic and literary
value, Ovid’s exile works had been analysed from a predominantly
historical and biographical perspective, with the sole aim of shed-
ding light on the circumstances of the poet’s banishment (A.D. 8).
Thus, in order to investigate Ovid’s exile, scholars used to look

---

1 See, e.g., La Penna 1959, LXXII: “Nelle opere dell’esilio ... l’immaginazione è
stagnante, il motivo querulo è monotono.” For an overview on Ovid’s exile
poetry see Claassen 2008; Williams 2002, 233-45.
2 See Dickinson 1973; Luck 1977; Hinds 1985, 13-32; Claassen 1986; Lechi 1993;
3 For the links between Metamorphoses and Tristia see Huskey 2006, 335-57,
who examines some literary patterns recurring in both works.
4 See, e.g., Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1926, 298-302; Fränkel 1945; Norwood
1963, 150-63; Thibault 1964; see also Green 1982, 202-20, who suggests that
Ovid’s exile was principally a political choice of Augustus, rather than a result
of his cultural policies. Fitton Brown (1985, 18-22) even denies the reality of the
exile.
more carefully at the poems that reference or hint at exile, especially at the causes of exile, as well as at the contemporary political context. More specifically, Ovid himself mentions a carmen (that is the Ars Amatoria) and an error (Ovid’s political interest towards, or more accurately involvement in, a party hostile to the princeps Augustus) as largely responsible for his banishment.\(^5\) Regarding the Ars Amatoria, scholars agree that this work was highly ironic and insolent towards Augustus’ contemporary family policy,\(^6\) through which the emperor attempted to encourage legal marriages and prevent adultery and concubinage.\(^7\) However, while it may have invited the disapproval of the emperor, this work should not be considered the main cause of Ovid’s exile. It was in fact published ca. A.D. 1,\(^8\) while the banishment of Ovid occurred in A.D. 8. The seven-year separation between the publication\(^9\) of Ars Amatoria and his banishment suggests that the work was not directly related

\(^{5}\) See Ov. Tr. 2.207: Perdiderint cum me duo crimina, carmen et error.

\(^{6}\) It is important to underline that in 18-17 B.C. the leges Iuliae were issued, through which the princeps tried to increase morality and to promote as well as legitimize marriage unions, condemning adultery as crimes tout court: in fact, the leges Iuliae encouraged both marriages and procreation (see, e.g., the so-called ius trium liberorum, which provided families with three or more children with some facilitations). See Dalla and Lambertini 2006, 104-5; see also Barry 1996, 80-96.

\(^{7}\) Actually, the Ars Amatoria is quoted many times, both in Tristia (see, e.g., 1.1.109ff.; 3.14.5-6; very famous is the passage of Tr. 2.225-34, in which Ovid states that the three books of Ars Amatoria did not deserve Augustus’ attention, since he had to attend to more official tasks) and Epistulae ex Ponto (2.9.71-6), and sometimes it is defended strongly (in Pont. 3.3, Ovid addresses Cupid and in 50 he states that with the poem he did not intend to disturb legitos … toros; Cupid himself answers that in fact artibus et nullum crimen inesse tuis, 70), sometimes is accused and the poet wishes for it to be burned (Tr. 3.14.5-6).

\(^{8}\) The date of composition of Ars Amatoria varies between 1 B.C. and A.D. 1.

\(^{9}\) In ancient Rome, especially in Ovid’s times, “to publish a work” meant, generally, to circulate it among a group of friends or read it aloud in front of a small audience. See Pecere 2010.
to the sentence of exile: indeed, the emperor could have condemned the *Ars Amatoria* before. It is thus more probable that the actual reason for the banishment was Ovid’s *error*, which according to scholars would have been the poet’s affiliation to political parties which were hostile to Augustus.¹⁰

Thus, the content of the *Tristia* appears more extravagant than other Ovidian poems: the previous works of Ovid differ in their themes, genres and aims, but all them are characterized by a high degree of irony, a highly recurring theme in Ovidian poetry.¹¹ By contrast, Ovid’s exile poetry is characterized by a more cautious and reflexive attitude due to the dramatic circumstances affecting the poet’s life at that time: indeed, he presents himself as defeated and suffering. This does not mean that mythological content and literacy are entirely absent from these works; indeed, mythology is often presented in connection with Ovid’s personal situation, as is the case in *Tr. 1.1.79-92*. Here several mythological characters, among them Phaeton and Icarus, are mentioned as literary transpositions of the actual condition of the poet. Ovid has dared too much and committed a mysterious *error*: like Phaeton and Icarus, who unsuccessfully attempted to fly too high, he has disastrously fallen.

This exile work also presents many literary references. In *Tr. 1.2*, for instance, we see the epic *topos* of the storm: this *topos*, which

---


¹¹ The most famous example is the opening of the *Amores*, where, in the first line, the poet starts with *Arma gravi numero ...*, a well-known Vergilian formula that stems from the opening of the *Aeneis*. This formula makes the reader think that Ovid is also starting an epic poem. However, the poet quasi disappoints the expectations of the reader with an ironical reference to Cupid, who steals a “foot” from the line, changing the poem into an elegy (*Am. 1.2-4*): *... materia conveniente modis. / Par erat inferior versus – risisse Cupido / dicitur atque unum surrupuisse pedem.*
will be dealt with in more depth later, appears to be closely related to the Odyssean metaphor of the troubled sea-journey. This pattern often refers to Ovidian poetry itself, or to the biography of the banished poet, so that the ship tortured by rains and winds represents the poet himself and his works: this identification occurs more often in the Tristia than in other exile works.

As noted, the mythological universe is a constant presence in Ovid’s poetry, even in his exile works, and it is this mythological content which represents the starting point of that which I wish to demonstrate within the following pages, by arguing that the initial core of Tr. 1.2-4 is in fact drawn from Ovid’s epic poem, the Metamorphoses. In these three poems from Tr. 1, the poet adapts a mythological frame that had previously been employed – in the episode of Ceyx and Alcyone of Met. 11 – in a more personal, and in some ways more real, context: his earliest experiences of exile.

II. INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCES BETWEEN MET. 11.410-748 AND TR. 1.2-4

Exile is the central macro-theme of the Tristia, a collection of poems made up of 5 books of elegies, with the elegiac complaint of the banished poet its main expression. Beyond this leitmotiv, however, the poems of the Tristia are varied, and may differ from each other in terms of content, linguistic and stylistic patterns.

Of the three poems to be examined here (Tr. 1.2-4), Tr. 1.2 and 1.4 show much greater similarities, especially in respect to their themes and lexical choices: indeed, both of them are reports of violent sea storms,\(^\text{12}\) even though Tr. 1.4 is much shorter than 1.2.\(^\text{13}\) In this regard, as has been observed in some commentaries,\(^\text{14}\) the

\(^{13}\) The fact that the poem reports something that occurred immediately after the start of the journey has led some scholars to consider Tr. 1.2 as the very first poem of the entire work, in chronological terms. See Della Corte 1973, 210-21 and Posch 1983, 120ff.
\(^{14}\) Luck 1977, 25.
storm of 1.2 is highly artistically refined, while 1.4 appears to be more realistic and is characterized by fewer literary topoi. As for the contents, it is not certain whether these storms in fact occurred with the level of violence described, or whether the descriptions of them were enhanced by the poet’s imagination. In any case, sea storms represent a very widespread literary topos:\textsuperscript{15} the presence of this topos is a confirmation of what has already been noted, namely that literary references are not absent from the Tristia, but may co-exist with details from the actual experiences of the poet.\textsuperscript{16}

Tr. 1.3 does not concern a sea storm, but rather Ovid’s description of his last night in Rome, when he received the sentence of exile and was forced to suddenly leave the caput mundi.\textsuperscript{17}

Given this frame, the next paragraph will begin to shed light on certain specific features of Tr. 1.2-4 (which have escaped previous analyses) by identifying a motif that runs through all three of these poems, that is the constant, continuous intertextual relationship between Tr. 1.2-4 and Met. 11.410-748, the episode of Ceyx and Alcyone.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15} See Herescu 1932-1933, 119-37; Friedrich 1956, 77-87. On sea storms in Ovidian works, see Bate 2004, 295-310.

\textsuperscript{16} See Lamarque 1972, 75-89; Griffin 1985, 28-34.

\textsuperscript{17} According to some scholars, this poem would have been written before both Tr. 1.2 and 1.4 and, for this reason, should be placed after what appears to be Tr. 1.1. According to other theories, the composition of 1.3 would have occurred after 1.2 and 1.4, since these two poems seem to be closely related to each other (both describe sea storms); hence, they would have been composed in the same period of time, constituting a unitary section with respect to chronology. See, e.g., Graeber 1881; Della Corte 1973; Luck 1977.

\textsuperscript{18} Within existing commentaries, this relationship is noted only for 1.2, and appears to have been almost entirely passed over for 1.3 and 1.4. Luck (1977) remarks in fact the presence of some intertextual connections between Met. 11.410ff. and Tr. 1.2; he observes only one correspondence between Met. 11 and 1.4 (47), and does not mention the intertextual links with Tr. 1.3 at all. On the other hand, Della Corte (1973, 220) appreciates the presence of a connection between the “episodio delle Metamorfosi” (Met. 11.410ff.) and Tr. 1.3, though, in
As the episode of Ceyx and Alcyone is rather long, I will consider only the sections that present a more significant intertextual relationship with Tr. 1.2-4. Specifically, I will examine the passages concerning Ceyx’ departure and his farewell to his wife, her subsequent desperate reaction (415-73), and the sea storm (474-572), while the ekphrasis on Somnus and his home (583-649) will be skipped since it is not relevant to this paper. I will, however, consider some passages of the apparition of Ceyx’ ghost and the discovery of his corpse (650-748).

As for the storm of Met. 11.474-572, it recalls previous epic models. In this respect, it is worth noting that the *topos* of sea storms is recurrent in the epic genre more than in others. In this case, the most important reference is Aen. 1.34-123 and 3.192-200, though other occurrences are Od. 5.282-381 and Ap. Rhod. Argon. 2.1102-12: all of these are important references for Tr. 1.2 as well. However, among all the passages quoted, it seems that Met. 11 deserves the most attention as a source text, since it represents a model created by Ovid himself and recalled by the poet in one of this particular case, the scholar mentions this occurrence very briefly. By contrast, in the commentary on Tr. 1.2, Della Corte draws more attention to the connections to the Ceyx and Alcyone episode of Met. 11.410-748.

---

19 A complete version of this myth occurs first in Hes. Cat. 10a.83-96 and 10d (M.-W. = PMich) and in Apollod. Bibl. 1.7.4. However, the story of the alcyon is also mentioned in l. 9.561-4; Eur. IT. 1089-93; Hyg. Fab. 65; Ps.-Luc. Alc. For a commentary of this episode in the Metamorphoses see Bömer 1980, 343-425; Griffin 1997, 175-270; Reed 2013, 343-71; see also Griffin 1976, 321-4; Lateiner 2013, 53-73.

20 A similar version of storm and shipwreck is told by Schol. ad Ar. Av. 250.

21 According to some scholars, the importance of such a *topos* in Latin literature is due to the many sea journeys the Romans actually experienced (Leigh 2010, 265-80).
his later works, *Tristia*; for this reason, we will speak of Ovidian intertextuality.\textsuperscript{22}

As we will see below, this intertextual relationship may be extended to *Tr. 1.4*, which presents the same *topos* of a sea storm, and to 1.3, which shows *iuncturae* that are also similar to Ceyx’ episode, though it does not report a sea storm. The sea storms of 1.2 and 1.4 are staged not as mere reports of events that occurred (given that these events have a basis in fact), but (especially concerning 1.2) are also enriched by literary patterns, presenting themselves as artistically refined, and are very likely inspired from an elaborated model, as may be the case with *Met. 11*.

On this basis, that the sea storms of *Tr. 1.2* and 4 represent typical patterns found among many previous poetic models, it may seem difficult to state that *Met. 11* is the only and principal textual source for these poems, since they may be linked to other typical representations of sea storms reported by other famous authors. However, in the following pages, I will show that not only *Tr. 1.2* and 1.4, but also *Tr. 1.3* are characterized by a close intertextual relationship with *Met. 11.410-748*. Hence, the intertextual links between *Met. 11* and the first poems of *Tristia* would not merely concern the references to sea storms (which, once again, are highly recurring *topoi* in Latin poetry and, thus, do not *per se* demonstrate proof of a close intertextual relationship), but also other lexical and

---

\textsuperscript{22} See Casali 2009, 341-54. However, the influence of other poets should not to be underestimated (since the poetic technique of classical poets was in fact based on the *aemulatio*/imitatio of previous authors. See Conte 1984, 35-9), though I would argue that, in the process of composition of *Tr. 1.2*, Ovid may have drawn more directly from his principle sources, being the closest model he had, easily recalled and brought to memory – namely his own epic poem. This model was the closest text source in terms of proximity of time, knowledge/memory of the poet, since it was his own work. Hence, in this case it seems worth positing the existence of an “internal intertextuality” (see, e.g., Jenny 1976, 257-81; Cappello 1998, 39-41), i.e., the occurrence of identifiable textual and literary references within the work of a same author.
thematic elements of *Tr.* 1.3: Ovid’s departure from Rome, the farewell to his wife, and her consequent reaction.

Thus, by considering *Tr.* 1.2-4 as a unitary section within this work, and noting that the three poems can all be shown to have an intertextual connection with Ceyx’ episode of the *Metamorphoses*, it is possible to conclude that Ovid’s references to *Met.* 11 while writing *Tr.* 1.2-4 were not incidental; on the contrary, they show that the model that consistently permeates these lines of *Tristia’s* first poems is in fact *Met.* 11.410-748.

In order to demonstrate this hypothesis, I will make a comparison between certain passages of *Met.* 11.410-748 and *Tr.* 1.2-4, highlighting their similarities in terms of stylistic and linguistic patterns, as well as their themes. To this end, I propose the following three tables, which report the passages of, respectively, *Tr.* 1.2 (Tab. 1), 1.3 (Tab. 2), 1.4 (Tab. 3), on the left, and the relevant passages of *Met.* 11, on the right. In these tables, I have set the verbal repetitions, similarities in word order and analogies of syntax in bold; the more thematic similarities between the passages are underlined, demonstrating how the passages of the two works also share similar contexts and settings.

**Table 1**

**Tr.* 1.2

1) *Ipsa graves spargunt ora loquentis aquae.* (14)

2) *Me miserum, quanti montes volvuntur aquarum!*  
   *Iam iam tacturos sidera summa putes,*

**Met.* 11\textsuperscript{23}

1) *quippe sonant clamore viri, stridore rudentes,*  
   *undarum incursu gravis unda, tonitribus aether.* (495-6)

2) *fluctibus erigitur caelumque aequare videtur pontus et inductas aspergine tangere nubes;*

\textsuperscript{23} The lines of *Tristia* are quoted following André 1968, while the *Metamorphoses* are cited according to Tarrant 2004.
Quantae diducto subsidunt aequores valles!
Iam iam tacturas Tartara nigra putes. (19-22)

et modo, cum fulvas ex imo vertit harenas,
concolor est illis, Stygia modo nigrior unda,
ster nitur interdum spumisque sonantibus albet.
ipsa quoque his agitur vicibus Trachinia puppis,
et nunc sublimis veluti de vertice montis
despicer e in valles imumque Acheronta videtur,
nunc ubi demissam curvum circumstetit aequor,
sus picere inferno sumnum de gurgite caelum. (497-506)

3) Quocumque aspio, nihil est, nisi pontus et aer,
   Fluctibus hic tumidus, nubibus ille minax.
Inter utrumque fremunt inmani murmure venti. (23-5)

3) cum mare sub noctem tumidis albescere coepit
fluctibus et praeceps spirare valentius eurus. (480-1)
ecce cadunt largi resolutis nubibus imbres,
inque fretum credas totum descendere caelum,
inque plagas caeli tumefactum ascendere pontum. (516-8)

4) Rector in incerto est nec quid fugi atve petatve
   Invenit: ambiguis ars stupet ipsa malis,
   ... Dumque loquor, vultos obruit unda meos.
   Opprimet hanc animam fluctus frustraque precanti

4) ipse pavet nec se, qui sit status, ipse fatetur
scire ratis rector, nec quid iubeatve vetetve:
tanta mali moles tantoque potentior arte est. (492-4)
... Ceyx socerumque patremque invocat (heu!) frustra. ...
dum natat, absentem, quotiens sinit
Ore necaturas accipiemus aquas.
(31-2, 34-6)

5) At pia nil aliud quam me dolet exule coniunx:
   Hoc unum nostri scitque
gemitque mali. …
O bene quod non sum mecum
conscendere passus,
   Ne mihi mors misero bis pa-
tienda foret! (37-8, 41-2)

6) Nec levius tabulae laterum
    feriuntur ab undis
   Quam grave balistae moenia
    pulsat onus. (47-8)

7) Qui venit hic flunctus, flunctus
    supereminet omnes:
   Posterior nono est undeci-
    moque prior. (49-50)

8) Est aliquid, fatoque suo fer-
    roque cadentem
   In solita moriens ponere cor-
    pus humano,
Et mandare suis alicia et sperare
    sepulcrum
   Et non aequoreis piscibus esse
cibum. (53-6)

   The passages reported above concern the topos of sea storms. The
   first passage (1) refers to the beginning of the storm, where the po-
et wishes not “to waste useless words purposelessly” (verba … frus-
stra non proficientia, 13) since the swollen waves (graves … aquas, 14)
drench his face and prevent him from speaking; even the “terrible
Notus,” the wind, pushes back his words and prayers (15). In Met. 11.495-6, the storm is raging with great violence: the oun esta (496) very closely recalls the ouna .24

In Tr. 1.2.19-22 (2) it is reported that the ship, due to high waves, at one point seems to touch the sky and overcome the mountains (19), at another appearing to sink into the underworld, to the deep Tartarus (Tartara nigra, 22). This is a hyperbolic literary topos that is also reported in Aen. 3.564ff., but especially in Met. 11.497-506,26 where the situation is described in almost the same way. Here, we also find certain lexical similarities: see, for example, tacturos / tanger; quanti montes / de vertice montis; valles / in valles (see Tab. 1).27

In Tr. 1.2.23-5 (3), the poet reports that pontus et aer (23),28 i.e., “sea and sky,” are mixed together,29 since the former is very high due to the swollen waves, the latter seems about to fall on the earth, as the clouds are so full of water (24): the distinction between them is no longer clear. A very similar description occurs in Met. 11.516-8, where the sky seems to descendere, “go down,” into the sea, while the sea seems to ascend into the sky.

The fourth group (4) of quotes refers to the fact that the rector, i.e., the helmsman, seems to have forgotten how to drive the ship (rector in incerto est, 31): the nautical ars (“skill”), invented by men, is useless against nature (32). The relationship with Met. 11.492-4 is evident and, in this case, the influence of Vergilian or other previous models seems to be absent:30 for example, see the parallel con-

---

24 For the expression of 495, see Aen. 1.87; undarum ... unda (496) is a polypoton.
25 See Griffin 1997, 208.
26 See also Aen. 1.103: ... fluctusque ad sidera tollit.
27 Griffin 1997, 209: “Ovid also uses the topos at Tr. 1.2.19-22.”
28 See Aen. 3.193: Caelum undique et undique pontus.
29 See Met. 1.15: ... utque erat et tellus illlic et pontus et aer.
30 Neither in the commentaries of the Tristia, nor in those of Metamorphoses are the intertextual links of this passage with the epic poem of Vergil mentioned.
structions *nec quid fugiatve petatve / nec quid iubeatve vetetve* and the repetition of words such as *rector, ars, malis* in both passages. In this situation, Ovid reports that he is not able to pronounce a single word, as the spurs of water beat his face (*ora, 36*): this description recalls the shipwreck of *Met. 11.566-7*, specifically the moment in which Ceyx, swimming desperately to reach a piece of wood or a shore (*dum natat*), repeatedly tries to invoke the name of his wife while his mouth is inundated by sea water.\(^{31}\)

This reference to Fabia (5) also occurs in 1.2.37-8 and 41-2: the poet explains that his wife suffers nothing but his exile (*nil aliud, 37*), but if only she knew of the dangers and pain Ovid were suffering during his sea journey (39-40), she would suffer far more. For this reason, the poet states to be happy to have not brought his wife with him (41-2). The relevant lines of *Met. 11.544-6* present a rather opposite situation. In this case, Ceyx – and not his wife – has in his mouth nothing but the name of Alcyone (*nulla nisi Alcyone est, 545*; this line recalls *Tr. 2.37*), but like Ovid, he is happy that his wife is not present (*gaudet abesse, 546*) and safe, even though he still misses her support in such terrible circumstances. This motif, as with the former, is not influenced by other sources, but only by the Ovidian account of *Met. 11*.

The quotes from 6 and 7 report a metaphor that is highly recurrent for sea storms: it seems to attack the sides of the ship (*latera*) as though they were city walls.\(^{32}\) The link with the two relevant passages of *Met. 11* has also been noted by Luck,\(^{33}\) who considers the mention of the ballista and the tenth *impetus* an intertextual reference to, respectively, *Met. 11.508-9* and 529-30.

Finally, in 1.2.53-6 (8), Ovid complains of the fact that, if he had died in the shipwreck, he would not have been able to be buried *in*

---

\(^{31}\) More widely, this invocation has been linked to the so-called *nomen in ore topos*; see Griffin 1997, 225-6.

\(^{32}\) See, e.g., *Aen. 1.104-5*.

\(^{33}\) Luck 1977, 30.
solita ... humo (54), i.e., in his homeland: this is another way to express the importance of being buried by friendly hands manibus ... amicis (Met. 11.562-5), which more generally alludes to the typical aspiration of receiving relatives’ grief after death.\textsuperscript{34}

It can be remarked that the similarities between the storms of Tr. 1.2 and Met. 11 are rather significant, both in terms of themes and lexical patterns. Thanks to this comparison, the intertextual link between Met. 11 and Tr. 1.2 appears to be very evident.

In the following Table, I will deal with the intertextual references from Tr. 1.3 to Met. 11. These passages from Tr. 1.3 are rather different from the previous ones, since 1.3 does not deal with sea storms, but reports another tragic moment for the banished poet, his moment of departure from Rome. Here he recalls a different situation, that of the farewell to his partner, though this is also highly typical in literature. For such a motif, Ovid could have taken into consideration many previous texts, even some of his previous works, such as the Heroides (the motif of the complaint of an abandoned lover, for example). However, the main textual source would appear in this case to be also Met. 11, an intertextual connection that reveals itself to be very significant when applied to a different situation.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{Tr.} 1.3 & \textit{Met.} 11 \\
1) Uxor amans flentem flens acri-
us ipsa tenebat. (17) & 1) talibus Aeolidis dictis lacrimisque
movetur sidereus coniux … (444-5)
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{34} Beyond these connections with Met. 11, it is worth noting that in his prayer to the gods of 1.2.96-105 (Si tamen acta deos numquam mortalia fallunt…, 97), Ovid mentions his error (99), the first responsible for his banishment. This error, however, was in fact a mistake due to naivety (stultaque mens, 100), not a crime (non scelerata, 100). From this and other references, scholars have tried to identify the reasons for Ovid’s exile; see, e.g., Luisi and Berrino 2002, 125-6.
2) Hac prece adoravi superos ego, pluribus uxor,
   **Singultu medio impediente sonos.**
   Illa etiam ante Lares passis adstrata capillis. (41-3)

3) **A! Quotiens aliquo dixi properante: ‘Quid urges?**
   **Vel quo festinas ire, vel unde, vide’. (51-2)

4) **Ter limen tetigi, ter sum revocatus, et ipse**
   Indulgens animo pes mihi tardus erat. (55-6)

5) Tum vero coniux umeris abeuntis inhaerens
   Miscuit haec lacrimis tristia verba meis:
   ‘Non potes avelli: **simul hinc, simul ibimus, inquit’,**
   ‘Te sequar et coniux exulis exul ero.
Et mihi facta via est, et me capit ultima tellus:
   Accedam profugae sarcina parva rati.
   Te iubet e patria discedere Cae-saris ira,
   **Me pietas: pietas haec mihi Caesar erit.**’ (79-86)

2) horruit Alcyone lacrimasque emisit obortas
   amplexusque dedit, tristique miser-rima tandem
   ore ‘vale’ dixit conlapsaque corpore
toto est. (458-60)

3) at iuvenes, quae rente moras Ceyce,
   reducunt ordinibus geminis ad fortia pectora
   remos. (461-2)

4) **ter conata loqui ter fletibus ora rigavit,**
   **singultuque pias interrumpente querelas.** (419-20)

5) ‘quod tua si flecti precibus sententia nullis,
   care, potest, coniunx, nimiumque es certus eundi,
   me quoque tolle simul. Certe iacta-bimur una,
   nec nisi quae patiar metuam;
   pariterque feremus, quicquid erit, pariter super aequora
   lata feremur.’ (439-43)
   ‘... ibimus una!’ (676)
   ‘at certe velem, quoniam peritus abibas,
   me quoque duxisses! tecum fuit utile, tecum
   ire mihi; neque enim de vitae tempo-
   re quidquam non simul egissem, nec mors discreta
   fuisset.
nunc absens perii, iactor quoque fluctibus absens, et sine me me pontus habet ...’ (696-701)

6) Egredior ...

Squalidus, inmissis hirta per ora comis. (89-90)

6) luridus, exanimi similis, sine vestibus ullis, coniugis ante torum miserae stetit; unda videtur barba viri madidisque gravis fluere unda capillis. (654-6) ‘pallentem nudumque et adhuc umente capillo Infelix vidi ...’ (691-2)

7) Illa dolore amens tenebris narratur obortis

Semianimis media procubuisse domo,
Utque resurrexit foedatis pulvere turpi

Crinibus et gelida membra levavit humo,
Se modo, desertos modo complorasse Penates,

Nomen et erepti saepe vocasse viri. (91-6)

7) ... conlapsaque corpore toto est.

(460)

ut nec vela videt, vacuum petit anxia lectum

seque toro ponit: renovat lectusque locusque

Alcyones lacrimas, et quae pars, admonet, absit. (471-3)

percutit ora manu laniatque a pectore vestes

pectoraque ipsa ferit; nec crines solvere curat:

scindit ... (681-3)

ora, comas, vestem lacerat tendensque trementes

ad Ceyca manus ... (726-7)
In 1.3.17 (1), Fabia’s reaction to the farewell of the poet is similar to the passage in Met. 11.444-5,\(^{35}\) where Ceyx was moved by Alcyone’s tears, having just realized that her husband is about to leave on a sea journey.

Tr. 1.3.41-3 (2), reports Fabia’s weeping and ensuing shock (ante Lares passis adstrata capillis, 43) over the departure of her husband: this behaviour is similar to the reaction of Alcyone in Met. 11.458-60 (lacrimasque emisit obortas, 458), whose whole body collapses (corpore toto, 460).

In Tr. 3.51-2 (3), where the poet tries in vain to postpone his departure, aside from being affected by the elegiac topos of the lovers’ separation,\(^{36}\) these lines seem to have been influenced by Met. 11.461-2, particularly with regard to the moment in which Ceyx attempts to postpone his departure, expressed by the ablative absolute (quaerente moras Ceyce, 461).

In Tr. 3.55-6 (4), the same parallel construction (ter ... ter) of Met. 11.419-20 appears. Furthermore, passage 3.79-86 (5) shows a very significant thematic similarity with Met. 11. In this passage, the poet relates how his wife Fabia tried in many ways to follow him to his exile, by demonstrating that she was willing to leave with him (simul hinc, simul ibimus, 81). The same theme is reported in the passages of the episode of Met. 11, i.e., before the departure of Ceyx (439-43), when Ceyx appears in Alcyone’s dreams (in this case with an expression, ibimus una, 676, recalling 3.81\(^{37}\)), when she regrets not having left with her husband (696-701).

Tr. 3.89-90 (6) describes the shabby and neglected attire of the poet at the moment of his departure from Rome: these lines can be compared with Met. 11.654 and 691-2, which report Ceyx’ appar-

---

\(^{35}\) For the figura etymologica, see Pont. 1.4.53: Et narrare meos flenti flens ipse labores.

\(^{36}\) See Griffin 1997, 194.

\(^{37}\) See Orpheus and Eurydice in Met. 11.65-6.
tion in Alcyone’s dreams. In this case, Ceyx looks tormented and exhausted from the shipwreck.

Finally, Tr. 3.91-6 (7) describe more specifically Fabia’s reaction after the departure of the husband: Ovid would have taken this account from news reported to him later, while he was travelling towards Tomis. Even in this case, it is possible to acknowledge certain thematic similarities with Met. 11: Alcyone’s turmoil for Ceyx’ journey (460, 471-3); her desperation following Ceyx’ apparition in her dreams (681-3); and the discovery of his dead body (726-7).

Although it is not as clear as within Tr. 1.2, the intertextual relationship between Tr. 1.3 and Met. 410-748 has been shown to exist. Moreover, it occurs in a more subjective and, in some ways, elegiac frame, and is not only characterized by a recurring literary topos, as is that of the storm in Tr. 1.2, but rather represents a very private and personal experience for the poet. Hence, the fact that this poem also refers to Ceyx’ episode is very significant, since it demonstrates that between Tr. 1.2-3 and Met. 11.410-748, a constant intertextual connection is present.

This presence continues in the following poem, Tr. 1.4.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr. 1.4</th>
<th>Met. 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) <strong>Monte nec inferior prorae puppique recurvae</strong></td>
<td>1) ipsa quoque his agitur vicibus Trachinia puppis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insilit et pictos verberat unda deos. (7-8)</td>
<td>et nunc sublimis veluti de vertice montis. (502-3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

38 This description of the Metamorphoses recalls other epic models: see, e.g., Aen. 2.268ff., where the maestissimus Hector (“very unfortunate Hector”) appears in Aeneas’ dreams. See also the apparition of Sycaeus to Dido in Aen. 1.353ff.

39 Graeber (1881) on the basis of a mention of Tr. 1.10.9-10, argues that a ship came from Corinth and brought to the poets some news regarding the situation in Rome: from this news, Ovid would have deduced useful elements for building the elegy of 1.3, by mixing reality with literary topoi.
2) **Pinea** texta sonant, pulsi **stridore rudentes**, Ingemit et **nostris ipsa carina** malis. (9-10)

2) **quippe sonant clamore viri**, **stridore rudentes**, undarum incursu gravis unda, tonitribus aether. (495-6)

vastius insurgens decimae ruit impetus undae;
nec prius absistit **fessam oppugnare carinam**, quam velut in captae descendat moenia navis.

pars igitur temptabat adhuc **in vadere pinum**. (530-3)

3) ... **non regit arte ratem**

Utque **parum validus** non proficientia **rector**
Cervicis rigidae frena remittit equo,

Sic, non quo voluit, sed quo rapit impetus undae. (12-5)

3) **ipse pavet nec se**, qui sit status, ipse fatetur scire ratis **rector**, nec quid iu-beatve vetete:
tanta mali moles **tantoque potenti arte est**. (492-4)

4) **Quod nisi mutatas emiserit Aeolus auras**. (17)

4) **cum semel emissi tenuerunt aequora venti**, nil illis vetitum est ... (433-4)

5) **Increpuit quantis viribus unda latus!** (24)

5) sic, **ubi pulsarunt noviens latera ardua fluctus**, vastius insurgens decimae ruit impetus undae. (529-30)

*Tr.* 1.4 describes another violent sea storm, which presumably occurred in the Ionian Sea *(nos tamen Ionium, 3)*, even though it must be noted once more that it is very difficult to reconstruct the actual circumstances in which the events told by Ovid in *Tristia* 1 oc-
curred. Whether *Tr.* 1.2 is a literary reworking of the episode of a storm told more synthetically in 1.4 or is exactly the opposite (i.e., 1.4 is a shorter version of 1.2), or both poems report events that really occurred; in any case, the storm in 1.4 appears to be less artistically refined than that in 1.2. This difference may simply exist due to Ovid’s wish to insert a *variatio* among the poems. What is possible to say about 1.4 is that, as we shall see, its textual source is once again *Met.* 11.

In *Tr.* 1.4.7-8 (1) the motif of the wave overcoming the mountains occurs (*monte nec inferior, 7*), which is a “variation on the same theme”\(^{40}\) of *Tr.* 1.2.19-22; even in this case, however, it is possible to identify an intertextual link with *Met.* 11 (see 503, *veluti de vertice montis*).\(^{41}\)

The following lines, 1.4.9-10 (2), describe the attack of the waves against the ship. This motif has been already dealt with in the analysis of *Tr.* 1.2.47-50 (see above, Tab. 1.6 and 7), though another important source is *Met.* 11.530-3: for instance, the *iunctura* of *Tr.* 1.4.9 (*stridore... rudentes*) is taken from the same of *Met.* 11.495.

*Tr.* 1.4.12-5 (3) once again present the *topos* of the *rector* (“helmsman”), whose *ars* is not capable of steering the ship because natural forces and elements are attacking it too vigorously. It is possible to identify some thematic and lexical similarities with the occurrences of *Tr.* 1.2.31-6 and *Met.* 11.492-4 (see Tab. 1.4), for example, the repetition of the same words: *arte, rector, ratis/ratem*.

In 1.4.17 (4) the *emissi ... venti* (“released winds”) of *Met.* 11.433, turn into the *mutatas ... auras* (“changed blows”) released by Aelius, who is also a character in Ceyx’ episode, since he is Alcyone’s father.\(^{42}\) Finally, 1.4.24 (5) recalls the motif of *Met.* 11.529-30, where the waves “besiege” the sides (respectively, *latus/latera*) of the ship,

---

\(^{40}\) See Pasquali 1968, 275-82 (the quote occurs at p. 275).

\(^{41}\) See also *Od.* 3.290: κύματα ... ἵσσα ὀρεσίων; 11.243.

\(^{42}\) See *Met.* 11.430-2: *Neve tuum fallum animum fidicia tangat, / quod socer Hippo-
dates tibi sit, qui carcere fortès / contineat ventos et cum uelit, aequora placet.*
even though in the epic poem the metaphor is longer and more artistically elaborated.

At this point, we have seen how 1.4 also shows certain intertextual links with *Met.* 11, even though it is less refined (in a literary sense) than 1.2. Thus, we can conclude that all these three poems of *Tristia* 1 definitely show an intertextual relationship with *Met.* 11.410-748.

CONCLUSION
Through a systemic comparison between *Tr.* 1.2-4 and *Met.* 11.410-748, we have seen that the tale of Ceyx is the very textual source of *Tristia’s* first poems. In fact, the poet refers to this episode not only in terms of the sea storms of 1.2 and 1.4, but also reemploys it for certain themes and patterns within 1.3, such as the description of the farewell to his wife Fabia.43 This intertextual relationship has not been fully explored by previous scholars, but evidently it must be considered as a potential means of interpreting recurring lexical choices, themes and, more broadly, literary issues within both *Met.* 11 and *Tr.* 1.2-4.

Finally, it is worth noting once more that not only has *Met.* 11.410-748 been proved to be the principal model for *Tr.* 1.2-4, but also that these three poems are thus closely related – even though, as noted, the three do not all share the same main topic. As such, they may be considered as a sort of unitary block, at least as far as the literary core is concerned, i.e., the episode of Ceyx and Alcyone, from which they draw their principal patterns and expressions.

43 As mentioned previously, I do not intend to deny that Ovid was affected by the influence of other authors in the framing of *Tr.* 1.2-4, since Ovidian intertextuality is in fact characterized by a kind of “two-tiered” allusion (Hinds 1987, 151), which views Ovid’s own works and previous sources simultaneously. In this case, however, I would argue that the influence of Ceyx’ episode on *Met.* 11 was in fact more significant than other sources.
The rearranging of the content of previous writings is one of the many ways in which Ovidian intertextuality works, by recalling previously employed *topoi*, reworking and adapting them to a new context.
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