Structure and separation: a comparative analysis of Ovid, Amores II.11 and II.16.

By

Barbara E. Stirrup.

Portsmouth Polytechnic.

Ovid, Amores II.11 and II.16 are ostensibly poems about the distress of the lover's separation from his mistress, in which Ovid treats of two significantly different moments of separation. There are central thematic and structural features common to both poems but a comparative analysis reveals more closely the varied application of structural divisions and stylistic techniques by which Ovid communicates different areas of experience in a poetry of separation which is yet permeated by sophisticated wit and irony.

In Amores II.11 Ovid addresses Corinna at the moment she is preparing to leave him; the poem centres on his attempts to dissuade her from going and an appeal to her to return as soon as possible. Amores II.16 is written allegedly during a period of absence from his mistress who has gone away; the main concentration is on the poet's misery and his protestations of devotion, culminating in an appeal to her to return.

There are important parallels in the structure of the two poems. Each can be divided into four sections of parallel content: a statement of distress, II.11.1–10, II.16.1–14; a realistic appraisal of the situation, II.11.11–32, II.16.33–42; an excursus into fantasy, II.11.43–56, II.16.15–32; an appeal, II.11.33–42, II.16.43–52. The opening sections of both poems culminate in a statement of

distress and both focus on the appeal to return, which occupies ten lines, II.11.33–42, II.16.43–52, and which is firmly but obliquely reiterated in the final couplet, II.11.55–56, II.16.51–52. The longest section in each poem is the second, II.11.11–32 (22 lines), II.16.15–32 (18 lines). The realistic section of each poem ends with an abrupt restatement of the poet's central concern, in II.11.31–32 the assertion, as means of persuasion, that Corinna would be safer staying with him, in II.16.41–42 the reiteration of the poet's distress at separation.

The precise thematic difference between the two poems is established in the opening sections where the treatment conveys not only the basic tone of wit common to both but the separate emphases.

II.11 opens with an ironic complaint against, not Jason and the Argonauts, but against the Argo itself, the first ship:

> *Prima malas docuit mirantibus aequoris undis*
> *Peliaco pinus vertice caesa vias,*
> *quae concurrentis inter temeraria cautes*
> *conspicuam fulvo vellere vexit ovem.*
>
> Amores II.11.1–4

The tone is mock-heroic, recalling with marked brevity Catullus LXIV.1–18; the wondering waves of Ovid are derived from the sea-nymphs of Catullus:

> *quae simul ac rostro ventosum proscidit aequor*
> *tortaque remigio spumis incanuit unda,*
> *emersere feri candenti a gurgite vultus*
> *aequoreae monstrum Nereides admirantes.*
>
> Catullus LXIV.12–15

The epic allusion is expanded, stressed by the consecutive spondees of line 3 *quae concurrentis inter*, the emphatic juxtaposition of *conspicuam fulvo* 4 and the alliteration of 'v' 4, and culminates in the expostulation against sea-faring in lines 5–8, introduced by *o utinam* 5:

> *o utinam, ne quis remo freta longa moveret,*
> *Argo funestas pressa bibisset aquas*
>
> Amores II.11.5–6

Ecce fugit 7 dramatically reveals Ovid's calamity: his mistress is going to leave him:

> *ecce fugit notumque torum sociosque Penates*
> *fallacisque vias ire Corinna parat.*
>
> Amores II.11.7–8

The irony implicit in the association of the familiar couch of his mistress *notum torum* with the gods of the home *socios Penates*, supported by the pun *fallacis vias* which picks up *malas ... vias* 1–2, undercuts any seriousness.

However, there is more to it than this: in II.11 and II.16 there are echoes of Propertius I.8A and I.17. The generic parallels are close: Propertius I.8A and Ovid II.11 are *propemptica*;[1] Propertius I.17 and Ovid, Amores II.16 depict a later stage of separation, Propertius having fled from Cynthia, Ovid himself having been abandoned. There are, in addition, further cross-references.[2]

In Propertius I.8A Propertius expostulates against Cynthia who is preparing to leave him. The opening lines 1–8 are a series of passionate rhetorical questions with remonstrative repetitions *tu* 1, 5, 7, 8, *tibi* 2, 3, and echoing the lament of Gallus, Virgil, Eclogue X.46–49:[3]

> *Tune igitur demens, nec te mea cura moratur?*
> *an tibi sum gelida vilior Illyria?*
> *et tibi iam tanti, quicumque est, iste videtur,*
> *ut sine me vento quolibet ire velis?*
> *tune audire potes vesani murmura ponti*
> *fortis, et in dura nave iacere potes?*
> *tu pedibus teneris positas fulcire pruinas,*
> *tu potes insolitas, Cynthia, ferre nives?*
>
> Propertius I.8A.1–8[4]

The tone is far different from that of Ovid's opening and the wish which provides the climax of Propertius' protest points the

[1] F. CAIRNS, Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry (1971), 148, 160 ff.

[2] E.g. between Propertius I.17 and Ovid, Amores II.11. See GORDON WILLIAMS, Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry (Oxford, 1968), 547.

[3] See MARGARET HUBBARD, Propertius (1974), 46.

[4] Propertius, Carmina ed. BARBER (Oxford Classical Text, 1960).

contrast: Ovid absurdly wishes that the Argo had been sunk so that no-one might sail:

> *o utinam ne quis remo freta longa moveret*
> *Argo funestas pressa bibisset aquas.*
>
> Amores II.11.5–6

Propertius is concerned with the immediate situation: his wish, 9–12, introduced by *o utinam*, is concerned with the present and is specific in content with a logical progression; he wishes that the stormy weather may be doubled in intensity, that the sailor may be landbound, that the rope may not be loosened nor the breeze carry away his entreaties:

> *o utinam hibernae duplicentur tempora brumae,*
> *et sit iners tardis navita Vergiliis,*
> *nec tibi Tyrrhena solvatur funis harena,*
> *neve inimica meas eleret aura preces*
>
> Propertius I.8A.9–12

The contrast in relevance of the two wishes is the point. But Ovid is here ironically closer to Propertius I.17.13–14 where, when Propertius has fled his mistress, he regretfully inveighs against the first sailor:

> *a pereat, quicumque rates et vela paravit*
> *primus et invito gurgite fecit iter.*

Propertius is distraught, his process of thought imprecise in the use of a factual relative clause following the irrational expostulation in the present subjunctive *a pereat*; Ovid's argument is logically precise *utinam bibisset ... ne quis remo freta longa moveret* 5.

Ovid's assertion about his mistress's forthcoming departure 7–8 is followed by an absurd question inflated by the juxtaposition of *tibi* and the exclamatory *me miserum* and embellished with word-play *gelidum ... egelidum* 10 to depict Boreas and Notus:

> *quid tibi, me miseram, Zephyros Eurosque timebo*
> *et gelidum Borean egelidumque Notum?*
>
> Amores II.11.9–10

This corresponds ironically to the indefiniteness of Propertius' address to Cynthia (cf. I.7.13–14):

et tibi iam tanti, quicumque est, iste videtur
ut sine me vento quolibet ire velis?

Propertius I.8A.3–4

The pathetic plea *me miserum*, Amores II.11.9, is a recreation, in conjunction with *tibi*, from the directness of *sine me*, Propertius I.8A.4. Four specifically defined winds are created out of *vento quolibet* Propertius I.8A.4: Propertius' indefiniteness is indicative of his jealousy, Ovid's word-play of his exuberant wit.

The opening of Ovid, Amores II.16 carries none of the literary irony of II.11.1–10. His mistress is absent: the poet longs to see her. He describes Sulmo and laments that she is not there with him. The locality is carefully emphasized with close definition of Sulmo, *pars ... Sulmo ... Paeligni tertia ruris* 1 and with the picking up of *Paeligni* 1 by *Paeligna* 5. The description embodies the contrasting components of the hot Italian summer, effectively conveyed by a concessive clause: although the sun causes fissures in the ground and the Dog-star (which brings the hottest period) 'glitters' (Lee), yet Paelignian fields are kept moist by means of water-channels. Fertility is the prevailing motif:

parva sed inriguis ora salubris aquis.
arva pererrantur Paeligna liquentibus undis
et viret in tenero fertilis herba solo.
terra ferax Cereris multoque feracior uvae;
dat quoque baciferam Pallada rarus ager.

Amores II.16.2, 5–8

The grape, central to Italian husbandry, is simply named *uvae* 7, differentiated from the corn and the olive which are described by reference to the rustic deities Ceres and Pallas and providing a link between them: the ground which is fertile in corn is much more fertile in grapes *terra ferax Cereris multoque feracior uvae* and it is this crumbly soil which is good for grapes that is the right soil also for olives.[5] The description of crops reaches its

[5] Cf. Virgil, Georgics II.227–229; 233–234:

rara sit an supra morem si densa requires
(altera frumentis quoniam favet; altera Baccho,
densa magis Cereri, rarissima quaeque Lyaeo ...)

si deerunt, rarum pecorique et vitibus almis
aptius uber erit ...

climax in line 8 with the epic elevation of *baciferam Pallada* juxtaposed with an agricultural reference to the texture of the soil *rarus ager*. The description ends with the reiteration in lines 9–10 of the beneficial effects of water described in line 2 *inriguis ora salubris aquis:*

perque resurgentes rivis labentibus herbas
gramineus madidam caespes obumbrat humum.

Where the grasses are growing up again *resurgentes herbas* owing to the irrigation channels, the turf shades the ground (and prevents its being dried up and cracked by the sun).

So far the opening of II.16 is very different from that of II.11 but the assertion of the poet's plight in II.16.11–14 corresponds in wit to II.11.7–10. The sensuous description of rural Italy gives way to ironic rhetoric, heightening it by contrast:

at meus ignis abest. verbo peccavimus uno –
quae movet ardores est procul, ardor adest.

Amores II.16.11–12

The two lines pivot on the qualification *verbo peccavimus uno* 11 immediately following *at meus ignis* and prompted by the ambiguity in *ignis*:[6] it is correct that *ignis*, the beloved girl who stirs up the fire of passion, is absent, but it is incorrect that *ignis*, the heat of passion, is absent, for *ardor adest* 12. It follows therefore that if one equates *ignis* 'the heat of passion' and *ardor* 'the heat' the incorrect word is *abest* and the wit is sharpened by the fact that only one letter is wrong. This paronomasia leads to the hyperbole that not even if he were placed between Castor and Pollux who

[6] For *ignis* = the beloved cf. Virgil, Eclogue III.66, Horace, Epode XIV.13, Ovid, Amores III.9.56.
= the passion of love cf. Catullus XLV.16, Virgil, Aeneid IV.2.

were exalted by catasterism after they had lost the girls they loved[7] would this be any compensation for Ovid if he were without his mistress:

> *non ego, si medius Polluce et Castore ponar,*
> *in caeli sine te parte fuisse velim.*
>
> Amores II.16.13–14

The thematic and stylistic differences in the opening lines II.11.1–6, II.16.1–10, point the way to the different structural developments in the long second sections: II.11.11–32 consists of a series of arguments designed to deter Corinna from leaving and culminating in recalling to her the pleasures of love; II.16.15–32 progresses through mounting fantasies illustrative of the poet's devotion.

Ovid's first argument, II.11.11–14, is that at sea Corinna will miss the advantages of land, cities and woods. The cities and woods she will not be able to wonder at are dismissed in two half-line cola; their variety points the monotony of the sea:

> *non illic urbes, non tu mirabere silvas:*
> *una est iniusti caerula forma maris;*
>
> Amores II.11.11–12

The witty incongruity of *iniusti maris*[8] where *iniusti* is used here only in Ovid of nature, is developed. The middle of the sea yields no lover's gifts:

> *nec medius tenuis conchas*[9] *pictosque lapillos*[10]
> *pontus habet ...*
>
> Amores II.11.13–14

[7] Ovid, Fasti V.641–666.

[8] *iniusti*, generally used in a human context, often carries an erotic connotation: *iniustus durum erga amantes et saevum imperium puellarum denotat:* PICHON, Index Verborum Amatoriorum (Georg Olms Hildesheim, 1966), 170.

[9] *conchas* as lover's gifts: Tibullus II.4.30, Propertius III.13.6, Ovid, *Metamorphoses* X.260.

[10] *lapillos* as lover's gifts: Ovid, Metamorphoses X.260, Ars Amatoria III.129.

The logic of the joke is sustained:

> *litora marmoreis pedibus signate, puellae*
> *(hactenus est tutum, cetera caeca via est)*
>
> Amores II.11.15–16

Shells and stones are to be found on the beach and there, but no further, should girls make the imprint of their feet, delicately white *marmoreis* 15 in contrast to the 'coloured pebbles' (Lee) *pictos lapillos* 13. *Caeca via*[11] 16 picks up *iniusti maris* 12. He continues his argument: girls should let others tell them about hazards at sea:

> *et vobis alii ventorum proelia narrent,*
> *quas Scylla infestet quasve Charybdis aquas,*
> *et quibus emineant violenta Ceraunia saxis,*
> *quo lateant Syrtes magna minorque sinu.*
>
> Amores II.11.17–20

The epic heightening of the allusions to Scylla, Charybdis and the Syrtes is discreetly offset by reference to the *Ceraunia* echoing, in the context of the *propempticon*, Propertius I.8A.19. The argument is extended. *Haec alii referant* 21 picks up *et vobis alii ... narrent* 17 only to yield to a pun on *credenti* which is stressed by the juxtaposition and polyptoton *credite, credenti* 22:

> *haec alii referant. at vos quod quisque loquetur*
> *credite, credenti nulla procella nocet.*
>
> Amores II.11.21–22

Sero introduces by asyndeton the next argument, 23–30: it is too late to look back when the rope has been loosened. *Iniquos ventos*[12] 25 recalls *iniusti* 12 and heralds the return to direct address to Corinna as the climax of this argument:

> *tum generosa voces fecundae sidera Ledae*
> *et 'felix' dicas 'quam sua terra tenet'*
> *tutius est fovisse torum, legisse libellos ...*
>
> Amores II.11.29–31

[11] *via* used metaphorically of love: Ovid, Ars Amatoria I.52, 585–6.

[12] *iniquos:* of nature cf. Ovid, Metamorphoses X.172. of love cf. Propertius II.14.13, Ovid, Amores II.18.17.

Generosa fecundae 29 are a nicely provocative reminder of the circumstances of the births of Castor and Pollux, of the nobility of descent from Zeus and fecundity of twin conception twice over on the same night.[13] This provides a natural and tempting transition to the reminder of the pleasures of love, with *tutius* 31 recalling *tutum* 16, *fovisse torum* 31 recalling by constrast *fugit notumque torum* 7 and the perfect infinitive eloquently linking past and present. This is his final attempt at persuasion.

II.16.15 *solliciti iaceant* begins with a transition by asyndeton from the previous two lines; this leads into the fantasy of the section 15–32. In II.16.13–14 Ovid states that he would not wish to be installed in the sky between Castor and Pollux if he were not with his mistress. This hypothetical consideration of the reward of immortality in the sky prompts antithetically the transition to human burial in the earth and to the desire for punishment by burial of those roadbuilders who are responsible for the means of distant travel by land and the consequent separation of lovers. Ovid inveighs with repetition and polyptoton *secuere ... secanda* against their operations:

> *solliciti iaceant terraque premantur iniqua*
> *in longas orbem qui secuere vias.*
> *aut iuvenum comites iussissent ire puellas*
> *si fuit in longas terra secanda vias.*
>
> Amores II.16.15–18

He suggests that if they must construct their roads they should have ordered lovers to travel together: the absurdity of the proposal[14] is expanded in the fantasies of the following lines. He begins with an extravagant claim: if, shivering, he were treading the windy Alps *premerem ventosas horridus Alpes* 19, provided he were with his mistress, the journey would have been gentle:

> *tum mihi, si premerem ventosas horridus Alpes,*
> *dummodo cum domina, molle fuisset iter;*
>
> Amores II.16.19–20

[13] Apollodorus III.10.5–7.

[14] Jokes about aspects of Roman life occur throughout Ovid e.g. Amores I.2, I.7, II.12, II.17, III.15.

The entirely literal sense of *premerem*,[15] accentuated by the literal *premantur* 15, points by constrast to the erotic significance of *iter molle*.[16] The ironic incongruity makes fun of both the sentimental absurdity of Gallus, Virgil *Eclogue* X.49 *a tibi ne teneras glacies secet aspera plantas* and Propertius' adaptation I.8A.7–8 *tu pedibus teneris positas fulcire pruinas ... potes*?

Ovid moves now from hypothetical impossibility to potential lovers' journeys he would willingly endure with his mistress *cum domina* 21: he makes use of the conventional destinations fraught with danger invoked by lovers[17] but he destroys any seriousness. The section opens with the claim that he would dare to force his way through the Libyan Syrtes at the worst time of the year:

> *cum domina Libycas ausim perrumpere Syrtes*
> *et dare non aequis vela ferenda Notis.*
>
> Amores II.16.21–22

The forcefulness of *perrumpere*, used on only one occasion elsewhere by Ovid[18] and found nowhere else in conjunction with the Syrtes in the love-poets and Virgil, is entirely appropriate. Ovid would be prepared to venture through the Syrtes when the weather is at its worst and the sandbanks have shifted:[19] he would voyage in winter when the Notus, which could be favourable, would instead, unfavourably *non aequis* 22, be bringing rain.[20]

He adds fantasy to fantasy: he would fear neither Scylla, Malea nor Charybdis:

> *non quae virgineo portenta sub inguine latrant*
> *nec timeam vestros, curva Malea, sinus*
> *nec quae submersis ratibus saturata Charybdis*
> *fundit et effusas ore receptat aquas.*
>
> Amores II.16.23–26

[15] *premere* occurs often in an erotic context e.g. Propertius II.29.35, Ovid, Amores I.4.15, Metamorphoses X.411, Fasti II.795.

[16] *mollis* with an erotic connotation: Pichon 204–6.

[17] Cf. Catullus XI.2, Horace, Odes I.22, Virgil, Eclogue X.46.

[18] Ovid, Metamorphoses XII.370, *hastam/quae laterum cratem perrupit* ...

[19] Virgil, Aeneid I.81 ff., describes a storm and the subsequent opening up of a way through the Syrtes, *vastas aperit Syrtes* 146.

[20] For *Notus* as favourable wind see Horace, Odes I.7.15–16, Ovid, Amores I.4.12; as unfavourable wind see Herodotus II.25, Horace, Odes I.28.22, IV.5.9.

There is a progression in the treatment. Scylla is not mentioned by name but the barking of the hounds recalls the opening of Homer's description.[21] Homer describes a monster. In Virgil Aeneid III. 426–427 she has acquired the appearance not only of a human being as far as the private parts but of a sexually attractive maiden:

> *prima hominis facies et pulchro pectore virgo*
> *pube tenus ...*

The hounds are not located and are mentioned only cursorily *caeruleis canibus resonantia saxa* 432. Ovid, however, derives his description not only from the epic portrayal but, more particularly, from Virgil *Eclogue* VI.74–76, where there is a fusion of the myths of the daughters of Phorcys and Nisus:

> *quid loquar aut Scyllam Nisi, quam fama secuta est*
> *candida succinctam latrantibus inguina monstris*
> *Dulichias vexasse rates ...*

Scylla, daughter of Nisus, fell in love with Minos when he was besieging her father's city and, betraying her father and pursuing Minos, was changed into a seabird;[22] it is related in an alternative version that she bred dogs in her womb.[23] Scylla, daughter of Phorcys, was changed into a monster by Circe out of jealousy of Glaucus' love for her which she rejected[24] and harassed the ships of Odysseus.

Virgil's Scylla, daughter of Nisus, is pregnant with hounds but erroneously harasses the ships of Odysseus. Ovid, describing Scylla, deliberately follows Virgil, Eclogue VI. His language is close: *succinctam ... inguina: sub inguine; latrantibus: latrant:*

> *non quae virgineo portenta sub inguine latrant*
> *nec timeam ...*
>
> Amores II.16.23–24

But *virgineo* recalls *virgo* Virgil Aeneid III.426, and provides the

[21] Homer Odyssey XII.85 ἔνθ, δ'ἐνὶ Σκύλλη ναίει δεινὸν λελακυῖα.
[22] Ovid, Metamorphoses VIII.6–151, Apollodorus III.15.8.
[23] Cf. Ovid, Ars Amatoria I.331–332.
[24] Ovid, Metamorphoses XIII.900–XIV.67.

clue to Ovid's intent: by fusing the myths he is suggesting that both Scyllas are virgins, both pregnant with hounds, yet he would not fear them. The fantastic absurdity confirms the exaggeration of his claim to bravery.

He moves to his next Homeric reference, Cape Malea, on the south-east promontory of Laconia. Homer stresses the dangers of Cape Malea[25] as do Propertius[26] and Virgil[27] but the movement from *virgineo* 23 to *sinus* 24, pointed by apostrophe, undercuts any epic grandeur.

The climax of fantasy is reached in the description of Charybdis: Ovid switches from the sexual to the absurd. The Charybdis of Homer swallows the dark water and pours it forth three times a day.[28] Virgil dramatizes Homer: his emphasis rests on the depths of the abyss from which the huge waves are sucked and the height to which they are thrown:

> *imo barathri ter gurgite vastos*
> *sorbet in abruptum fluctus rursusque sub auras*
> *erigit alternas, et sidera verberat unda.*
>
> Virgil, Aeneid III.421–423

Ovid converts this to the absurd: he alone makes reference to the ships that are sunk and this is central to his main assertion. His Charybdis, it is true, conforms to the descriptions of Homer and Virgil in that its main function is the swallowing and emitting of water but it is rendered absurd by the emphasis on the fact that it is the same water each time and the point is made by polyptoton *fundit effusas*, by the suggestion conveyed by *saturata*[29] that Charybdis is vomiting as the result of a surfeit of ships and by the inescapable significance of *receptat* that she is reingesting her own vomit:

[25] Homer, Odyssey IX.80, III.287, XIX.187.
[26] Propertius III.19.8.
[27] Virgil, Aeneid V.193.
[28] Homer, *Odyssey* XII.104–106.
[29] *Saturare* used of excess Cicero, In Verrem II.3.42, De Domo Sua 17.44. Philippics II.24.59.

nec quae submersis ratibus saturata Charybdis
fundit et effusas ore receptat aquas.

Amores II.16.25–26

At this point the fantasy becomes visual and concrete: Ovid claims that if he were shipwrecked with his mistress he would himself carry her to safety; he addresses her directly:

quod si Neptuni ventosa potentia vincat
et subventuros auferat unda deos
tu nostris niveos umeris impone lacertos
corpore nos facili dulce feremus onus.

Amores II.16.27–30

The endearments *niveos lacertos*, *dulce onus*, are nicely incongruous at a moment of desperate injunction stressed by antithesis, *tu nostris ... umeris impone lacertos* and the wit is heightened by *facili*[30] and the word-play *facili dulce*.

But there are also literary echoes of Virgil[31] and Propertius. Ovid ironically echoes Propertius I.8A.13–16 where, entreating Cynthia not to leave him, Propertius suddenly bitterly changes his tone and exclaims:

atque ego non videam tales subsidere ventos,
cum tibi provectas auferet unda rates,
ut me defixum vacua patiatur in ora
crudelem infesta saepe vocare manu.

The bitterness of Propertius' plea points to the extravagant hypothesis expounded by Ovid. Both poets envisage a storm at sea. Propertius rails against the moment of departure and calls upon the winds as an ally of his frustrated passion; Ovid echoes this, imagining shipwreck but seeing the winds as an ally of his devotion which he may prove by saving his mistress:

quod si Neptuni ventosa potentia vincat
et subventuros auferat unda deos ...

Amores II.16.27–28

[30] *Facilis* is used frequently of sexual compliance: Ovid, Fasti VI.509, Amores II.3.5, II.19.57, Ars Amatoria I.358, III.475.

[31] *Neptuni ventosa potentia* cf. Aeneid I.81 ff. for an incongruous analogy with the lovers' hypothetical shipwreck.

The protestation of Propertius on the empty shore *defixum vacua ... in ora* is in contrast to the imagined heroic scene of rescue.

It is perhaps this picture of the poet on the shore which prompts Ovid's conclusive analogy of an inverted situation: Hero too waited on the shore but for a lover who came to her, not one who fled. The analogy is Ovid's final plea for compassion: Leander had swum the Hellespont nightly guided by Hero's light; it was only when he could no longer see her that he drowned:

tum quoque transnasset, sed via caeca fuit.

Amores II.16.32

The pluperfect subjunctive *transnasset* underlines the import of *via caeca fuit*. Ovid too could have dared as much had he been with his mistress. The analogy is implicit: without her, he too drowns. *Via caeca fuit*, recalling by contrast *cum domina* 21 at the beginning of the section provides together with *at sine te* 33 a close transition to the next section.

The second section is the key to the development of both poems. What is significant is the different ordering of the structural divisions which derives from the use of realistic argument in II.11.11–32 and fantasy in II.16.15–32 as the most effective means of persuasion within the situation. In II.11 the realistic arguments 11–32 lead into a direct appeal to Corinna to return as soon as possible, 33–40, and this is supported by the fantasy of the final section 43–52, culminating in an oblique reiterated appeal. The fantasy of II.16.15–32 yields to a realistic re-assertion 33–42 of the poet's gloom within his rural setting and as in II.11 the realistic section prompts the direct appeal 43–52 which ends, as does II.11.55–56 with an oblique entreaty 51–52.

With an ironic twist introduced by *at si* II.11.33 Ovid, having conjured up the delights of love as final bait II.11.31–32, switches to acceptance that Corinna will go, wishes her a safe voyage and implores her to return as soon as possible. The ironic tone of mock-resignation is suggested by the emphatic positioning of *rana procellae* 33 and the alliteration of 'r' but is more

firmly established by the echo of Propertius I.8A.18 where Propertius revokes his vengeful wish that if Cynthia leaves him (I.8A.13–16) the storms should not subside:

sed quocumque modo de me, periura, mereris.
sit Galatea tuae non aliena viae.

Propertius I.8A.17–18

Ovid too invokes the aid of Galatea. But Ovid enlarges on Propertius: not only does he invoke the support of Galatea, *aequa tamen puppi sit Galatea tuae Amores* II.11.34 but also the protective hierarchy of Nereus himself and the Nereids:

vestrum crimen erit talis iactura puellae.
Nereidesque deae Nereidumque pater.

Amores II.11.35–36

He urges her to return, strengthening his plea by the personification of Nereus supported by the anaphora of *huc* and the personification *venti spectent, agat aestus aquas* 40 and culminating in direct address to her *ipsa roges* 41 which picks up the hypothetical cry of 30:

et 'felix' dicas 'quem sua terra tenet'.

As in lines 27–30 the direct address 41–42 prepares for the transition and the last section is a fantasy of her imagined return intended to act as the finally effective means of persuasion.

The transition is asyndetic, dramatic and a corollary of lines 1–2:

primus ego aspiciam notam de litore puppim
et dicam 'nostros advehit illa deos'.

Amores II.11.43–44

prima malas docuit ...
Peliaco pinus vertice caesa vias.

Amores II.11.1–2

Aspiciam notam ... puppim ironically recalls *ecce fugit notumque torum* 7 and his assertion 44 picks up her hypothetical exclamation 30:

et 'felix' dicas 'quem sua terra tenet'.

The final section, like the first, relies for its effect mainly on literary irony. Propertius I.17.1–4, after fleeing from Cynthia, laments his desolation on the seashore:

omniaque ingrato litore vota cadunt.

Propertius I.17.4

Ovid, imagining Corinna's return, ironically echoes him:

pro reditu victima vota cadet.

Amores II.11.46

He recalls Propertius by language that is syntactically modified: *vota* (noun, Propertius) becomes *vota* (participle, Ovid); the metaphorical *cadunt* (Propertius) becomes the literal *cadet* (Ovid). The syntactical play strengthens the pun on *victima* which further picks up ironically the religious connotation of *nostros advehit illa deos* 44.

The mock-heroic tone is resumed: lines 47–52 recall Virgil Aeneid I: the shipwrecked Trojans settle down on the shore, Aeneid I.171–173, then prepare a meal of meat and wine after which they talk of their experiences 213–217. The linguistic link is *mensae* 48. Ovid is making fun again: the 'tables' which are removed in Aeneid I.216 *postquam ... mensaeque remotae*[32] are particularly described in Amores II.11.47–48 together with the addition of a couch of soft sand:

inque tori formam molles sternentur harenae
et cumulus mensae quilibet esse potest.

Amores II.11.47–48

The significance of *tori* in conjunction with *oscula* 46, *molles* 47,[33] and recalling the transitions at lines 7 *ecce fugit notumque torum* and 31 *tutius est forisse torum* is only emphasized by the epic allusion. Wine precipitates conversation, in both cases reminiscent: the Trojans are anxious about their companions:

[32] Cf. Virgil, Aeneid VII.116.
[33] Cf. Note 16.

implentur veteris Bacchi ...
amissos longo socios sermone requirunt.
Virgil, Aeneid I.215, 217

Ovid imagines Corinna's version of her courage on his account in the face of the dangers at sea:

illic adposito narrabis multa Lyaeo
paene sit ut mediis obruta navis aquis.
Amores II.11.49–50

The Trojans were shipwrecked; Corinna just escaped. Her imagined words reach hyperbole in lines 51–52 with a pun on *iniquae*; Notus is now the unfavourable wind *non aequis* of Amores II.16.22, not the ambivalent wind of II.11.10:

dumque ad me properas neque iniquae tempora noctis
nec te praecipites extimuisse Notos.

There the literary echo ends. The next couplet is pure Ovid with its absurd extravagance, its ambivalence and the deflation[34] of the juxtaposed *votis blandiar* and *ipse meis*:

omnia pro veris credam, sint ficta licebit
cur ego non votis blandiar ipse meis?
Amores II.11.53–54

The poem ends with an oblique appeal to Lucifer to bring the day of return as soon as possible.

In II.16 the fantasy of protestation of devotion as a means of persuasion leads to a restatement, 33–42, of the poet's desolation which is described in the opening section. The transition from the second to the third section in II.11 is effected by *at si* 33 which conveys the abrupt switch in argument; similarly, the transition at II.16.33 *at sine te* denotes an equally abrupt change and, moving from fantasy to realism, picks up *at meus ignis abest* 11.

The section which follows *at sine te* 33 recalls the first section explicitly: although Ovid is in Sulmo, without his mistress he is

[34] Cf. for deflationary endings, Amores I.7, I.9.

desolate. We are prepared linguistically for the parallel by the introductory *at* together with the anaphora of *non ego* 37, 38, picking up *non ego* 13; *quamvis agri me teneant* 33–34 recalls *me Sulmo tenet* 1. The stress on the locality is reaffirmed: *Paeligni* 1, *Paeligna* 5 are picked up by *Paelignos* 37 which is defined more closely as *natalem, rura paterna, locum* 38. Again, fertility is emphasized: this is a hot country, carefully irrigated:

quamvis amnibus arva natent
et vocet in rivos currentem rusticus undam
Amores II.16.34–35

Vitibus 33 picks up *uvae* 7, *salubres* 37 *salubris* 2. The contrast between the heat and the coolness is again pointed:

frigidaque arboreas mulceat aura comas,
Amores II.16.36

The section ends with antithetical hyperbole: the poet seems to inhabit not his native land but Scythia and to live not amongst the countryfolk *rusticus* 35 but among barbarous peoples *Cilicasque feros viridesque Britannos* 39. The climax of the hyperbole is reached in the reference to the Caucasus where Prometheus was bound in punishment by Zeus. Ovid focusses on the colour of the rocks *saxa cruore rubent* 40, stressing his point by the juxtaposition *cruore rubent* and the contrast with *virides* 39; he suggests a movement of blood through the parallel cola, *saxa cruore rubent* 40, positioned in the final couplet of the section and *amnibus arva natent* 34 in the first couplet. His reference is to the colour and movement of fire,[35] the bringing of which to mortals was the cause of Prometheus' punishment by Zeus. The point is obliquely made: Ovid is concerned not with the punishment of Prometheus but with that of mankind, the creation of woman by Zeus to be a source of trouble to men.[36]

[35] Cf. *at dare ferrumf igne rubens plerumque solet*, Ovid, Metamorphoses XII.277.

[36] Hesiod, Works and Days 94–95, Theogony 590–593. Ovid's emphasis on the colour of fire (Prometheus' gift) and blood (his punishment) suggests that he is here concerned primarily with the punishment for his sin; this is appropriate to the context.

The hyperbole is dropped; the section ends in absurd rhetoric drawing from rural life:

ulmus amat vitem, vitis non deserit ulmum —
separor a domina cur ego saepe mea?

Amores II.16.41–42

The final section, introduced by *at mihi te* 43, reconstructs the hypotheses of the second section in terms of an appeal: in the second section, he would have found it easy going to cross the Alps if he had his mistress with him, in the final section he urges her to cross the mountains swiftly to him; in the second section, he claims that he would venture through all the dangers of the sea even to the extent of saving her from shipwreck, in the final section he asserts that the faithfulness of a girl is lost in the sea. The references back reinforce the vigour of his persuasiveness by their hyperbolic claims to devotion.

The relationship of the two sections is made clear by the verbal echoes: Ovid reminds his mistress that she had sworn that she would always be his companion *mihi te comitem* 43; in line 17 he stated that roadbuilders should have decreed that girls should travel together with young men *iuvenum comites*. She had sworn to him by her eyes, which were his stars, *nostra sidera* 44, and the guide for his voyage in love; this gains significance from its ironic reference back to the light which guided Leander—and which failed, *via caeca fuit* 32. The extreme of reproach lies in the meaninglessness of a girl's words, carried away by wind and wave:

verba puellarum, foliis leviora caducis,
inrita qua visum est ventus et unda ferunt.

Amores II.16.45–46

He, on the other hand, would utilize wind and wave, eager only to save his mistress:

quod si Neptuni ventosa potentia vincat
et subventuros auferat unda deos
... dulce feremus onus.

Amores II.16.27–28, 30

But he is ironically echoing not only his own words but the plea of Propertius[37] and more closely the reproaches of Ariadne, Catullus LXIV.141–142:

sed conubia laeta, sed optatos hymenaeos
quae cuncta aerii discerpunt irrita venti ...

He continues his literary irony, picking up Catullus' protestations of *pietas* in LXXVI.1–2.:

siqua recordanti benefacta priora voluptas
est homini, cum se cogitet esse pium ...

Catullus LXXVI.1–2

Ovid is close:

si qua mei tamen est in te pia cura relicti ...

Amores II.16.47

He urges her to come as quickly as possible and the emotional appeal turns to absurdity with the transition to the last couplet. *At* 51 is used for the first time not to make an appeal to his mistress but in extravagant apostrophe to the mountains and roads! The effect is achieved by antithesis, *tumidi subsidite montes, tumidi montes: curvis vallibus* and by the ambivalence of *faciles*.[38] The poem ends on a note of comic deflation.

Amores II.11 and II.16 are thus differentiated by the varied application of similar structural divisions in order to lend psychological conviction. In II.11 the poet still has enough optimism to hope that, even if Corinna insists on leaving him, she can be persuaded to return: it is appropriate that the realistic second section is based on practical arguments which lead to the appeal which is finally supported by the fantasy of return. The key to II.16 is the despair of the abandoned lover and it is therefore here appropriate that the second section should be one of unrealistic fantasy. Realism is confined to his state of desolation and the final appeal at the end of the poem is a cry of despair.

But these poems are not cris de coeur: Ovid has here taken

[37] Propertius I.8A.12.

[38] Cf. Note 30.

significant moments in the separation of lovers and out of these situations he has created a poetry in which he uses structural and stylistic techniques to point the ostensible differences of mood while yet maintaining a tone of sophisticated wit and irony. This is most apparent in the arrangement and the treatment of the sections on fantasy. In II.11 the literary irony of the fantasy 43–51 which supports the poet's appeal is reinforced by the mock-heroic tone of the opening lines 1–6 in a vein of optimism; in II.16 literary irony is predominantly applied to the section on fantasy 15–32 which is a protestation of despairing devotion. Where the emotion is most overt, there the irony is most concentrated. It is by the application of ironic stylistic techniques to a particular structure that Ovid achieves his ultimate poetic effect in these poems.

Petronius' Tryphaeana.

By

Barry Baldwin.

University of Calgary, Canada.

An interesting name, that of Tryphaena. It tends to be seen as indicative of the lady's suspect character. "Dérivé de τρύφη: mollesse, sensualité." Thus ERNOUT in his Budé edition (p. 210). The revised Loeb (p. 237, n. 1) concurs: "The name Tryphaena implies sexiness and good living."

This may very well be in order, albeit to some tastes constituting no insult to a lady. But those commentators who dub her a *meretrix* exceed due bounds. True, she is described (Sat. 101) as *omnium feminarum formosissima quae voluptatis causa huc atque illuc vectatur*. But that in itself hardly makes her a woman of ill-fame. And the passage is at serious odds with the previous one, in which Tryphaena is introduced as one carried *exulem Tarentum* in Lichas' boat.

Such an immediate discrepancy might be a reproach to the artistry of Petronius; one would prefer to blame the state of our manuscripts. We cannot tell what role (if any) Tryphaena played in the lost books. Let it be emphasised here that the seaboard frolics involving Tryphaena, Encolpius, Giton, and company do not remotely approach the carnalities of Quartilla and her party earlier in the *Satyricon*.

Those who wish to follow ERNOUT and company ought perhaps to stress that Tryphaena is a name borne by at least one of the later Cleopatras.[1] That would afford a suitable link between

[1] See PW XI, cols. 787–8, s.v. Kleopatra 25; G. MACURDY, Hellenistic Queens (Baltimore, 1932), 99.