The Addressee of Ovid's letter Tristia 3.4:

Barney McCULLAGH[1]

Abstract: The premise of this article is that one method for establishing the identity of the anonymous addressees of the Tristia, Ovid's first book of letters from exile, is to assume that the author alludes to their names by reference to a famous namesake. This premise is based on the fact that a letter addressed to an individual called Brutus (the overtly-declared recipient of three letters) contains a reference to the famous Marcus Brutus, one of the assassins of Julius Caesar (Ex Ponto 1.1.24). We also explore another method of accessing the identity of these correspondents, namely the possibility that their names are creatively etymologised over the course of the relevant poem. We make the assumption that the anonymous letter Tristia 3.4 is addressed to this same Brutus, on the tentative basis that the intense sympathy shown to Ovid by Brutus in Ex Ponto is reflected in the behaviour of the recipient of Tristia 3.4. It emerges that the poem contains a wealth of highly cryptic allusions to the various meanings borne by the word 'brutus' in Latin. To assist this line of enquiry, we appeal to the meanings of 'ὦμος', the Greek equivalent of 'brutus', along with the nuances borne by the adjective 'brut' in Romanian. However there is also a highly iconoclastic aspect to our approach. For reasons that will be explained, we assume the position that Ovid has inserted words intermetrically within his elegiac couplets. These words may be spelt and scanned in a manner to be expected of an auxiliary cavalryman, resident in Tomis, whose first language is Greek, and whose funerary inscription is being composed during the indeterminate period between retirement and death. This is the persona we attribute to the exiled Ovid, who declares that his Latin contains unmetrical solecisms and who also declares that his ideal reader is one who takes his words at face value ('candide lector': Tristia 4.10.132).

Keywords: Ovid, Tristia, identity, addressees, letters, code, Brutus, namesake, etymologies, metre

In the Ex Ponto poems from Tomis, Ovid declares the names of his correspondents, among hom are friends whose identity is uncertain and whose degree of influence with Augustus cannot be evaluated. Among these friends is a certain Brutus who receives three letters in total. So many lines of poetry are addressed to him that it seems highly unlikely that he is not the recipient of at least one of the letters of the Tristia, an earlier collection of exile poems which are in the main intended for specific but unnamed individuals. Ovid's Tristian strategy is summarised at Tristia 1.5.7, where he mentions that 'he has put signs in the place of correspondents' names' ('positis pro nomine signis'). In fact, as we shall see, Brutus plays an important role in the Tristia, less as a political intermediary between Ovid and August, but rather as one of the keys to deciphering the code, by which the anonymity of the Tristian correspondents is maintained. Clearly, Ovid will know that, in the case of any particular Ex Ponto , not only the addressee in question but all its readers will be curious to know the identities of the Tristia's correspondents. They will compare the Ex Ponto with the Tristia. The courtier on the Palatine, being vain, will want to find out if he is one of Ovid's two or three former allies who witnessed his fictitious funeral[2]. Thus Ovid's Expontian strategy serves to encourage the re-reading of the Tristia, in light of what can be gleaned from the Ex Ponto.

---

[1] Temporary Lector, Extramural Department, University of Cambridge, U.K.
[2] *Tristia* 1.3.16; 1.5.33; 3.5.10; 5.4.36

Brutus could be one and the same as Brutus Bruttedius, the orator and acquaintance of Seneca's, who comments: 'BRVTVS BRVTTEDIVS cotidiano uerbo significanter usus est: rivalim, inquit, occidit, amicam sauciauit' ('Brutus Bruteddius used a banal word in a meaningful sense: he said he had killed his rival, his girlfriend he had stabbed')[3]. The *everyday* verb 'stabbing' seems to have a sexual meaning here. In any event, Ovid sends Brutus the Ex Ponto letters 1.1, 3.9, and 4.6. From the last poem we discover that Brutus was indeed an orator. But what draws our attention is something that emerges from the first letter (significantly the first of the entire Ex Ponto series). The famous Caesarian conspirator Marcus Iunius Brutus is quoted as an example of those whose literary works still circulate in Rome despite the fact that the author concerned has committed crimes against the imperial family. Ovid argues that if it was not he but Brutus who had killed the deified Julius Caesar, then it is hardly right that the reading of his 'Artes Amatoriae' should be banned while Brutus's works can still be read. But the careful reader is distracted by another question: 'Why does Ovid mention the namesake of his correspondent Brutus at this point at the very beginning of Ex Ponto in a letter addressed to his own friend Brutus?' The first poem of an ancient *libellus* sets the tone for those that follow. Ovid challenges us here with a sign, or a literary omen, one that encourages us to consider the possibility that a correspondent's namesake could provide the key to discovering the identity of the Tristia's correspondents.

From Tristia 3.4 we discover the following about the addressee: the quality of his character comes to be known by Ovid only during the crisis that led to the latter's exile (3.4.1-2). We know that Brutus fits this assessment since in the Ex Ponto Ovid says he experienced Brutus' goodness particularly when the vast majority of his associates avoided him (Ex Ponto 4.6.41-42). Unfortunately, there are other correspondents who broadly match this description, including Gallio (Ex Ponto 4.11.1-4). Nevertheless, armed with the suspicion that Brutus may be Ovid's addressee, and adopting the premise that Brutus' famous namesake Lucius Iunius Brutus will provide the clues, we can try to prove that Brutus is the recipient of the letter Tr.3.4.

We begin with the first line ('O mihi quidem semper, sed tempore duro / cognite ...') which translates as follows: 'Ah, you who have indeed always been dear to me, but you who have become known to me in my difficult times'). The first two words 'o mihi' are not grammatically linked. However, if we translate them mot-à-mot into Greek we arrive at the phrase 'ὦ μοι' ('Woe!' and 'to me'). That is, we have two words that have a very close relationship either as a nexus or as a single word ('ὦ μοι' 'ὦμοι')[4]. This reconfiguration of meaning ('woe to me') finds a place within what we may call Ovid's sepulchral poetics. For there are complaints engraved on ancient tombstones that cry out from beyond the grave the word[s] 'ὦ … μοι' ('ὦμοι ἐμὴ ἄλοχος, μὴ δάκρυε': MAMA 7.586)[5]. Returning to Ovid's text, at the other end of the first line, the term 'tempore duro' can be translated into Greek as follows: 'χρονωι ὠμωι'. This funerary topos ('difficult times') also appears on tombstones (IG 3.1379)[6].The difference between the lengths of syllables 'ὦμοι' and 'ὠμωι' does not mean that they cannot be considered interconnected. The paronomasia between words of different

---

[3] Seneca *Controversiae* 7.5.9; see also 9.1.11
[4] See Etymologicum Magnum 822 for 'ὠμὸι' and Demosthenes 21.98 for 'ὠ μὸι'.
[5] 'Woe is me, my wife, do not cry'. MAMA = *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*
[6] IG = Inscriptiones Graecae

syllabic lengths is discussed in the Rhetorica ad Herennium (4.21 (29)) and in Cicero's De Oratore (2.63).

However there is a more interesting explanation for the difference between the vowel lengths of these two words. We consider that on the one hand Ovid wishes to illustrate another possible meaning of the words 'tempore duro', namely 'with a heavy syllabic length'[7]. As Ovid will tell us repeatedly, he lives in a universe (which we consider allegorical) in which his 'tempora' ('times') are uncertain (Tr.3.10.67), in which his sad poems and tribulations'are either 'of long duration' or 'without measurement in time' (Tr.5.1.35 'quis ... modus ... carminis' 1.6.32: 'longis ... malis': Tr.3.11.1-2: 'insultes ... / ... dempto fine ... '), where his [metric] foot is injured (' malum ... pedem ': Tr.2.16). All this, we suggest, reflects the metrical instability and debasement of these poems which are devoid of 'modus' (= 'metre 'and 'measure ') and in which 'time periods' or rather 'syllables' ('tempora') appear to be abnormally long or, as here, 'heavy '(Tr.3.12.1-2; Tr.5.10.11-12)[8].

In other words, unobserved in the substructure of the line, the two [practically] homonymous terms 'ὢμοι' and 'ὢμωι' act as a framework. The integral form of the second homonym encourages the former to integrate itself as one word (becoming with certainty 'woe to me'). Furthermore however, alongside the nuance 'harsh', the word 'ὢμος' also has the following meanings: 'uncooked' 'raw' 'crude' 'unprocessed' 'inexperienced' 'savage'. There is only one word in Romanian that covers all these nuances, namely 'brut', which must derive from the Latin adjective 'brutus'. Our own allegory may be of service here. It is as though the text 'o mihi … tempore duro' descends into a Greek cellar where it takes on board its Greek equivalents 'ὢ μοι' and 'ὢμωι', before returning to the Latin 'ground floor', where it now has the armour to allude to the word 'brutus', through nuances of the Romanian word 'brut'.

Unfortunately, our Latin sources ignore most of the nuances of the word 'brutus'. It is precisely because of this that we should accord great importance to the detailed correspondence between the Greek word 'ὢμος' and 'brut' in the Romanian language. Through the correspondence with 'ὢ μοι' Ovid draws our attention to 'ὢμωι ' precisely because the latter gives the poet the opportunity to tell us that he is thinking of the word 'brutus' in Latin. At this stage Ovid uses only one nuance of 'brutus' ('durus') to signal his interest in the name 'Brutus'. Other literary and colloquial nuances of the words 'brutus' and 'Brutus' remain to be exploited, in order to persuade us that the namesake of the poet's correspondent is in the poet's mind.

Linguistically speaking, Ovid is right when he says that 'Brutus' made himself known 'in [his] hard times' because Brutus' identity as the letter's addressee first becomes known through this phrase ('tempore duro') once it is re-examined in the light of Greek and once we realise 'duro' is a nuance of 'brutus'. In sum, within the poetic strategy of the Tomitan Ovid, the poem declares its interest in 'brutus' and 'Brutus'. Moreover, within this strategy, the poet shows much interest in the disjunction and reuniting of words both within a nexus ('tempore'

---

[7] The phrase 'χρονοι ὢμοι' can also mean 'harsh syllabic lengths'

[8] Note that Brutus is 'known' by the phrase 'tempore duro' also in the sense that 'duro' means 'harsh' and 'harsh' is the nuance of 'brut' in Romanian with which we are concerned. One could say that Brutus has been 'found out' [as the letter's addressee] by the word 'duro' at a suitable or opportune time' ('tempore'). Here the words 'duro' and 'tempore' no longer have any grammatical connection with each other, just as the words 'o mihi' were unconnected until we looked at them through the prism of Greek. The 'opportune time' meanwhile is here and now.

'duro') and within a single word ('ὢ ... μοι' 'ὢμωι'). In this sense, the poems in exile are preoccupied with the mobility and the metamorphosis of words.

Before discussing other passages that allude to Brutus, we should explain in more detail how Ovid's words come to be in permanent motion[9]. As we have seen, the phrase 'tempus durum' also means 'a harsh syllable length'. If for the sake of the argument we assume that all that Ovid writes constitutes allegory, then the fact that his hard times date from the moment his 'fortune fell' (Tr.3.4.2: 'res procubuere') may articulate the idea that the syllabic lengths of the Tomitan poems become discordant once Ovid 'fell' or more precisely 'once he fell after stubbing his foot' (a foot being, in this context, the basic element from which the verse is built). As a result of his fall, Ovid's *schema metricum* will have remained 'damaged' or 'foot-stubbed' always assuming Ovid remained 'fallen'. This gives the poet a wide field for literary exploitation. If his syllabic lengths do not match the *schema metricum*, then the poet has the latitude to express a sub-textual message by reconfiguring the divisions between words. Ovid's determination to associate himself with Lucius Iunius Brutus becomes clear when we remember that tripping and falling are central to Lucius' story.

Tomis the word:

We will examine Lucius' story in detail later but for now we wish to concentrate upon Ovid's strategy of word redivision which is the primary reason he has created his 'ametrical' literary environment. Fortunately, there is a passage that demonstrates his methodology with clarity. In Tristia 3.9, Ovid characterises the Greek settlements of Pontus as 'cities' ('urbes':1) or 'Greek houses' ('Graecas … domos': 4) planted in a barbarian environment. Yet, Ovid does not say that these Greek houses are among 'barbarian houses' but among 'barbarian names' ('nomina barbariae'). Now 'nomina' also means 'words' which directs us towards an interpretation of the vignette as an allegory of the character of a verse in which the 'words' for Greek cities are planted in the middle of barbarian 'words' ('nomina'). And here at Tr.3. 9.3 in the middle of the words MILETO MISSI, a city or a group of Greek dwellings with the name TOMIS (MILE-**TOMIS**-SI) seems to have been planted. The apparent problem is that the first syllable of the name 'Tŏmis' is short whilst, in the text, the same vowel ('mile - TŌM - issi') should be long in order to fit the *schema metricum*. In other words, a iambus, Tŏmīs, although forming a metric foot in other contexts, compromises the metrical integrity of this particular line. This cause-and-effect has an allegorical aspect. Namely that, if the line had been metrical before inserting (or 'discovering') the name 'Tomis', then inserting the word 'Tomis' will articulate the barbarizing of the Geti, a tribe that had previously been, in the figurative sense, 'metrical'. In the immediate vicinity of the word 'Tomis' there are now the fragments 'mile' and 'si', these being allegorised, we suggest, bythe 'Pontica verba' that surround Ovid as he himself affirms (Tr.3.14.47, 49-50). The allegorical message is precise and pungent. The nearer the Getae are to Tomis the more they are barbarised. Ovid's line has been structurally and semantically deformed by the intrusion of 'Tomis' just as Dobrogea had been dislocated by the intrusion of Greek colonies. Herodotus recognizes that among the Thracians, the Getae constituted the the most courageous and the most righteous tribe ('ἀνδρηιότατοι καὶ δικαιότατοι')[10]. In this light, Ovid's allegory is even more hard-hitting. There was no barbarity until the Greeks created it. The metrical integrity of the line before

---

[9] Metamorphoses 1.1-4 will signal the start of this mobility ('perpetuo … carmine').
[10] Herodotus Histories 4.93

inserting the word 'Tomis' reflects the ancient 'status quo' when life was 'measured', when everything was in equipoise, and when life was lived in harmony with one's neighbours[11].

An interim conclusion is called for. Ovid's poetry seems to be a prism that processes Latin words through the Greek language to articulate the poet's message. Now this strategy has a very close connection with the Tomitan context in which Ovid locates himself. First of all, Ovid is surrounded by bilingual inscriptions in Tomis. For example, an honorary decree (ISCM 48) contains the words ᾽βουλὴ δῆμος Τομειτῶν᾽ which translates the phrase 'respublica Tomitanorum'. There are also some inscriptions with transliterated texts, among which we mention IScM 45 which transliterates Latin names into Greek ('Quinto Roscio' becomes ᾽Κυεί[ντ(ου)] Ῥωσκίου᾽). However, this bilingual culture is particularly evident at the level of the retired army veterans in Tomis. When still alive, in order to emphasize their Romanitas, many 'veterans' from among the Roman army's auxiliaries, in anticipation of their deaths, will have seen to the construction of their tomb with its inscription in Latin. The inscription will have mentioned the availability of the tomb to the wife, children, freedmen and freedwomen of the proprietor. What interests us here is that these inscriptions will have been greatly influenced and even compromised by the Greek language, the common language of the provinces of the Roman Empire (from where the veterans originated) and the mother tongue of the Pontic towns where the veterans spent their last years in retirement. Ovid aligns himself with these veterans in several ways. He insists on his age of 50, the traditional age of Roman retirement (Ibis 1; Tr.4.10.95-98).The Tomitan veterans will be climbing the city's surrounding wall to repel the attacks of the barbarians, just as Ovid does (Tr.4.1.73-76; Tr.5.2.69-72). Of great interest is the existence of an honorary inscription from circa100 BC that mentions the formation of a home guard of 40 inhabitants[12]. Among their tasks is the protection of the city gates at night during a period when the city is suffering attacks from land. Thus, it is certain that the 'author' Ovid does not invent what the 'persona' Ovid suffers in Tomis. In fact, although we cannot say more than this 'persona' is similar to that of a Tomitan of a fixed age, the experience of this 'persona' in Tomis is verifiable from extant sources relating to ancient Constanta.

Meanwhile the vast majority of Tomis' army pensioners will have been cavalrymen. It seems that in the period after the pacification of the region by M. Licinius Crassus in 29-28 BC the governance of the Tomis region became the responsibility of the so-called 'praefectura orae maritimae' until the 'praefectus' of the new province, Moesia, assumed authority for the region. Under the governor's control will have been auxiliary troops. Ovid confirms the image of Dobrogea, memorably condensed by Thucydides (2.96), namely that the Scythians, the tribes of Dobrogea, and the Getan warriors from beyond the Danube, fought on horses armed

---

[11] Note that the word 'coloni' if redivided, produces the annotation 'one metrical foot' ('colon 1'). This seems to us to indicate that there is only one proper foot, a iambus, which, as 'Tomis' is constituted from the same 'coloni' ('settlers') who provide this information ('colon 1'). Moreover since the Greek word ᾽οἰκήτωρ᾽ means both 'inhabitant' and 'colonist' there must be some irony in Ovid's phrase 'Graecas … domos'. These 'homes' were rather 'colonies' which were imposed on the 'homes' of the Getae.

[12] Inscriptiones Scitiae Minoris II.2 lines11-16:

᾽ … δεδόχθαι τῆ[ι]
βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι ἑλέσθαι ἡγεμόνας ἐκ πάντων
τῶν πολειτῶν ἤδη δύο, οἵτινες καταγράψουσιν ἄνδρ[ας]
ἐπιλέκτους τεσσαράκοντα τοὺς ἐφημερεύσοντα[ς]
[ἐ]πὶ τῶν πυλῶν καὶ παρακοιτήσοντας τὰς νύκτας κ[αὶ]
ἐφοδεύσοντας τὴν πόλιν᾽

with the bow ('πάντες ἱπποτοξόται'). We do not have much information about the profile of the military cadres in Dobrogea during the first years of the Christian era, yet later many cavalrymen and archers are known to us through their funerary monuments. Andrei Aricescu[13] lists these 'alae' or cavalry units to which we should add the 'cohortes' or infantry units whose profile emphasizes archery and cavalry: 'Cohors I Cilicum Millaria Equitata Sagittariorum', 'Cohors I Tyriorum Sagittariorum', 'Cohors II Chalcidenorum Sagittariorum', 'Cohors I Claudia Sugambrorum Veterana equitata '. There is evidence for the last-named of these from the time of Tiberius. Besides these units, they were 'numeri' or irregular units with the same profile, such as 'Numerus Surorum Sagittariorum'.

We have laboured this point because Ovid can also be considered a former cavalryman of sorts. He was born into an equestrian family in Sulmo. The title of his social class, the 'equites' ('cavalrymen') will have reflected his elevated social status in the nominal sense that he could have afforded to maintain a horse provided by the state. In principle, being a writer and a 'cavalryman', provisionally deceased, Ovid will have had much in common with the retired cavalrymen of the Roman auxiliaries with their funeral monuments already inscribed on the outskirts of Tomis. Ovid, as it were, composes his own funeral inscription before death, in the expectation of being read after death. In this context, it is worth mentioning that the word 'littera' in Latin means not only 'letter' but also 'inscription'. From an allegorical perspective, the poems in exile can be considered inscriptions engraved on a figurative tombstone. Once we look at the poems from exile from this perspective, we are obliged to take into account the epigraphic context underlying the poet's sepulchral strategy[14].

The presence of the Greek language lying beneath the superficial text is a manifestation of this strategy. On a Latin inscription of the 2nd or 3rd Century CE from Histria a certain Titinius Severinus is referred to as a 'sesquipliciarius' of the 'cavalry wing II Arabacorum' ('sesquipliciarius' being a prestigious post with an increased salary). The headquarters of the unit were in Hârşova. Titinius must have later retired and settled in Istria where he and his brother set up a memorial to their father[15]. It is known that another cavalryman from the same unit, Lupus, retired to Tomis[16]. In the inscription of Titinius, the word 'ales' ('cavalry wing') draws our attention. Here the termination is Greek (the Latin version being 'alae'). Either that, or the word is transliterated from the Latin loan word 'ἀλης' in the genitive case[17]. Another burial inscription also from Lower Moesia contains the word 'arcisina[]γος' ('the leader of a synagogue': CIJ 1,681)[18]. The first syllables of this word are written in Latin, the last is in Greek.

In other words, we have every right to treat Ovid-the-Tomitan as we would Titinius, whose Latin is infiltrated by Greek, who - although he is alive when writing his text - ultimately speaks from beyond the grave, and who is a retired 'eques'. Like Titinius, Ovid is

---

[13] Andrei Aricescu Armata în Dobrogea romană Editura Militara (1977) p.65 et al.
[14] Note that in regard to ancient funeral inscriptions (a) very many suffer 'enjambement' of the words themselves, necessitating them being severed in two (b) the text may be disfigured by the throwing of stones (Ovid Nux 1-2; Tr. 3.11.26) (c) the composer regularly uses initials. In general aspects of the inscriptions' composition, physical condition and environment affect their reception. Such considerations should be fed into our understanding of Ovid's sepulchral poetics
[15] ISc M 1. 273. See also Peuce 6 (1977) p.160
[16] Aricescu op. cit p.210
[17] Liddell, Scott, Jones, MacKenzie *Greek Lexicon* (1996 ed) Supplement p.18
[18] *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaeorum*

deceased in a provisional sense. He is situated on the shore of the Styx (Ex. 4.9.74: 'Stygiis ut my navis aquis'), where the souls of the deceased gathered to await the completion of their funeral rights in the land of the living. The poet occupies a field between death and life. During this time he writes his letters or inscriptions from the same perspective as Titinius. Like Titinius, Ovid builds his monumentum in Tomis.

Earlier, we discussed the presence of the Greek word, Tomis, among the letters of Tr.3.9.3. It should be noted that another Greek word can be retrieved from the last lines of the text. It is not disputed that the word ' τεμνω ' ('I cut') is Ovid's etymology for the word Tomis, on the basis of translating the verb 'consecuisse' at Tr.3.93.44. Thus, when we encounter the sequence of letters 'temo' in the text of 3.9.32 ('trisTE / MOretur') we should consider the possibility that the letters transliterate the future tense of the same Greek verb 'to cut', namely ' τεμω' ('I will cut'). Our point is that that Titinius would have noticed this. Indeed he may well have privileged the word ' τεμω' had he read this (as it were) inscription. As a modern-day Titinius we should interpret the word 'τεμω' as a statement summarising Ovid's poetics. We are warned to expect ' cuts' in the following lines.

One example of a plethora will suffice. At Tr.3.10.34 ('ducunt Sarmatici barbara plaustra boves') if the words 'plaustra' and 'boves' are severed, we discover the name STRABO amidst the debris ('ducunt Sarmatici Barbara plau STRA BO ves'). Strabo geographer was a contemporary of Ovid's and it is he (not Virgil) who provides the closest parallels to Ovid's description of the nomadic tribes as they cross the Danube on their way to their winter pastures. Ovid mentions 'the use of the human skull as a frightful sacrifice' (Ex P.4.9.84). Strabo adds the information that after sacrifice, the skull (having been scooped out, one assumes) is used as a drinking cup (Strabo 7.3.7: 'καταθυόντων καὶ σαρκοφαγούντων καὶ τοῖς κρανίοις ἐκπώμασι χρωμένων'). The fact that in winter the seas and rivers of Moesia can be traversed on ice is also stated more than once by Ovid (Tr.3.10.31, 39-40, Ex Ponto 4.9.85-86, 4.10.38). Strabo meanwhile (7.3.16) describes the wagons of the nomads passing over the ice-bound sea of Maiotis, as if they were following a road ('τῶν δὲ πάγων ἡ σφοδρότης μάλιστα ἐκ τῶν συμβαινόντων περὶ τὸ στόμα τῆς Μαιώτιδος δῆλός ἐστιν. ἁμαξεύεται γὰρ ὁ διάπλους ὁ εἰς Φαναγόρειαν ἐκ τοῦ Παντικαπαίου, ὥστε καὶ πλοῦν εἶναι καὶ ὁδόν'). The Tristian passage containing the reference to the name 'Strabo' at 3.10.34 describes just such a passage (this time over the Danube). Moreover, the trapping of fish by the ice, mentioned by Ovid (Tr.3.10.49), is reported more extensively in Strabo, who mentions the tool used to extract the fish so trapped ('ὀρυκτοί τέ εἰσιν ἰχθύες οἱ ἀποληφθέντες ἐν τῷ κρυστάλλῳ τῇ προσαγορευομένῃ γαγγάμῃ, καὶ μάλιστα οἱ ἀντακαῖοι, δελφῖσι πάρισοι τὸ μέγεθος': Strabo 7.3.16). Strabo even mentions that the fish most affected by the frozen sea resembles a dolphin. There may be an allusion to this in Ovid's comment that dolphins are incapable of leaping above the ice (Tr.3.10.43-44). Strabo refers to water jars that are cracked by the extreme cold, leaving the water in the shape of the pot. Ovid implies the cracking of such vessels when he states that the frozen wine retains the shape of the vessel (Strabo7.3.16: 'ῥήττονται δὲ χαλκαῖ ὑδρίαι, τὰ δ' ἐνόντα συμπήττεται'; Tr. 3.10.23-24). In another communication from the 2016 Symposium we suggested that the four nomadic tribes mentioned by Strabo at 7.3.17 are the same not only as those Danubian Sarmatians mentioned at Tr.3.10.34 but also as those tribes whose names have been gravely corrupted at Tr.2.19[19].

---

[19] Strabo 7.3.17: 'ἔπειτα οἱ Τυρεγέται, μεθ' οὓς οἱ Ἰάζυγες Σαρμάται καὶ οἱ Βασίλειοι λεγόμενοι καὶ Οὖργοι, τὸ μὲν πλέον νομάδες, ὀλίγοι δὲ καὶ γεωργίας ἐπιμελούμενοι· τούτους φασὶ καὶ παρὰ τὸν Ἴστρον οἰκεῖν'

That is, the line originally read 'Iazyges Atque Urgi, Basileia Tyrogetaeque' not 'Ciziges et Colchi Tereteaque turba Getaeque').

In many ways, the ametrical, redivisional methodology we have outlined is demonstrated most effectively by 'plauSTRA BOves' (Tr.3.10.34) since here we are dependent upon a third party (Strabo) to support out argument. However, it is possible that a third tongue has been inserted into Ovid's intermetric 'feet'.[20]

We suggest that, besides Greek words, there are also Getic words sandwiched between two metric words. In principal, this can be deduced from Ovid's own concern that there are 'Pontic and Sintian words' amidst his Latin verse (3.14.49-50). When, as here, Ovid admits to 'fearing' that Pontic diction has been intruded into his Latin writings ('timeo ne … Latinis / in … meis scriptis Pontica verba legas': Tr.3.14.40-50), this fear should be considered 'polite' ('I am afraid you are reading …') rather than 'emotional'. The former interpretation suggests Ovid's resignation in the face of a 'fait accompli'. Ovid apologises to his readers for the barbarisms they *are* encountering[21]. We have suggested that the fragments of words left in the wake of internetrical words are also Pontic words. However on one particular occasion the intermeteric word itself may be Getan.

At Tristia 3.10.21 a word has been planted within the line 'saepe sonant moti glacie pendente capilli'; 'often when blown about, [the Getae's] hair tinkles due to the ice that hangs down '). In this very well-known vignette, the wind tousles the Getae's hair, causing a metallic sound as the icicles that have formed around their locks collide with each other. The vignette is not only comic but also full of vivacity. We hear and see the Getae with their long hair transformed into a musical instrument. However, Ovid adds an extra detail that adds historical and cultural perspective to the image. From the words 'moti' and 'glacie' the word 'ţigla' can be extracted. As in the case of 'Tomis', 'Temo', and 'Strabo', this discovery leaves fragmentary words behind it, namely 'mo' and 'cie' which allegorically constitute the so-called (and incomprehensible) 'Pontica verba' (Tr.3.14.50), yet the word discovered, namely ţigla, could be a noun from the language spoken by Geti. The word ' ţigla' does not exist in Latin dictionaries but in Romanian it has two meanings, one being very little known. The basic meaning, 'tile', is reasonably supposed to derive from the Latin word 'tegula' ('tile'). But, according to the Romanian dictionary DEX, the second meaning is 'a short length of

---

[20] Apropos of (metrical) feet, note that Ovid's comparisons of himself to Thersites' ugliness (Ex Ponto 3.9.9-10; 4.13.15-16) disguise the fact that Thersites was most famous for producing a flood of haphazard and 'unmeasured' (i.e.'unmetrical') words (Iliad 2.212-214: 'Θερσίτης δ' ἔτι μοῦνος ἀμετροεπὴς ἐκολῴα, / ὃς ἔπεα φρεσὶν ᾗσιν ἄκοσμά τε πολλά τε ᾔδη / μάψ, ἀτὰρ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον'). Perhaps most significantly, Thersites' revilings were directed against the kings of the Greek army (2.214: 'ἐριζέμεναι βασιλεῦσιν'). We shall see that Ovid's unmetrical outpourings are similarly directed, but at Augustus. Meanwhile, the first god to whom Ovid appeals during the storm of Tr.1.2 is Mulciber who is not only 'the soother of storms' etymologically but also the lame god Hephaestus. Moreover at Ex Ponto 1.3.23 Ovid indicates that his 'podagra' ('gout') is incurable. By this he means that allegorically his own penchant for producing swollen metrical feet will not go away. At Tr.5.6.11, the author also praises Podalirius for his unflagging attention to the injured Greeks at Troy. The name 'Podalirius' etymologises as 'tender-footed' or 'soft-footed'. A soft foot is a malleable foot. Podalirius worked to soften feet that were calloused and in doing so allegorised the process of allowing the apparently inflexible hexameter to speak in an unmetrical register. Lastly the mentions of Philoctetes (Tr. 5.1.61), Oedipus, (Tr.1.1.114) are less to do with unceasing cries of pain (Philoctetes) and acts of unwitting parricide than with the fact they both had injured feet (Oedipus by his etymology of 'swollen feet'; Philoctetes by the bite of the snake).

[21] See also Tr.4.1.1 ('vitiosa, ut erunt …')

metal sharpened at the end on which meat is fixed; to be used to roast the meat over the coals or embers'. This is clearly a skewer.

On the one hand Ovid has inserted this reference to construct an implicit comparison between the sound of the Geti's tinkling locks of hair and the sound of metal skewers. Given however that nuances of the word 'brutus' have been preserved in Romanian by the adjective 'brut', we lean towards the notion that tigla is a Getic word that has been preserved by the absorbent Romanian tongue[22]. One coincidence of which however we are convinced is that 'tigla' ('tile') is merely a homonym of tigla ('skewer'). The first one derives from Latin, the second from Getic. We now have the task of exploring what follows from this finding. First of all, we do not claim that aeolic music is a specific Getan tradition, because in any case it is known that the Romans hung aeolic bells at their doors. But a skewer used to roast meat over the coals conjures up another image, namely that of a typical Romanian dish. 'Mititei' and 'mici' are very affectionate terms consisting of an adjective that means 'small'. In fact, the word 'mititei' is the diminutive of a diminutive. Importantly, these words have no morphological connection with the words souvlaki or kebab or shish. It seems to us that Ovid has here introduced a reference to a gastronomic tradition, originally perhaps specific to winter, which has survived to this day but which dates back to the Iron Age era and reflects the fact that folk practices are extremely persistent in Romanian culture.

If we return to Tristia 3.4.2 we find that Ovid's life has collapsed ('res procubuere'). But if we translate the verb literally ('my life has fallen on its face'), then we access a literary thread that leads us back to Brutus, Ovid's friend. For, when his namesake, Lucius Iunius Brutus, fell on his face on returning from Delphi, the incident became the most decisive moment of his life. We recount the legend from the beginning, according to the text of Livy (1.55-56). It happened that in the royal palace in Rome a serpent had been seen crawling from under a wooden column. The tyrannical king, Tarquinius, being curious to know the significance of the prodigy, sent his grandchildren accompanied by Brutus (a relative of his by marriage) to Delphi to consult the oracle. On receiving the answer, grandchildren decided to take the opportunity to put an additional question. They were keen to find out which of them would be the next king of Rome. The answer from the cave under the temple was the following: 'The first to kiss his mother will accede to the throne.' On their way home, Brutus was seen to stumble and fall. Lying (one assumes) on his face, he kissed the earth, the common mother of all people.

Returning to the allegorical discourse, Ovid's fall will be the result of his mistake for which he had been exiled from Rome. Through this experience, Ovid has learned a hard lesson, a lesson that now makes him a source of advice for his correspondent. In this sense, Ovid is not 'crude' in the sense 'unformed'. On the contrary, he is very 'educated' and 'experienced' ('usibus edocto': Tr.3.4.3). So, in general, our protagonists, Ovid and Brutus, play etymological roles. The one who is not Brutus (Ovid) is the experienced one who is 'non-brut'. Conversely, Brutus in receiving advice follows the meaning of his name in being presented as someone inexperienced or 'raw' ('brut'). Closely related to this issue is the fact that Brutus's namesake, Lucius Iunius Brutus, was destined to abolish the monarchy and become one of the first two consuls in Rome. The profile of his namesake as 'consul',

---

[22] One wonders if the Romanian words 'mic' si 'mititel' which derive from Latin serve to translate the word 'tigla' which would then logically mean 'small'. Perhaps 'mica' ('crumb') was the Latin word which may have been arrived at through the Greek 'σμικρος'

connects Brutus-the-correspondent with the functions of counsellor and petitioner, since the word 'consul' in Latin, according to Varro, derives from the verb 'consul' ('consult with') based on the circumstance that the counsellor gives advice to, or asks for advice from, the people and the senate[23]. Since there are always two consuls, the division between the one who gives and the one who receives the advice is implicit in the two etymological explanations. In fact, the whole of Tr.3.4 consists of a series of words of advice given to Brutus by his 'senior partner' Ovid. The poem stands as an allegory of the bilateral meaning of the word 'consul.' One co-magistrate ('Brutus') must be thought to have sought advice from the other in a previous letter. The other ('Ovid') now responds with the requested advice.

Brutus's presentation in the clothes, as it were, of his namesake Lucius Iunius Brutus, is highlighted in other lines of the poem. If Lucius had not intentionally fallen, he would not have realised his destiny of becoming consul in Rome. Therefore, the fall and the consulate are closely related elements. Ovid connects these two elements to one another through a figurative vignette by which he articulates good wishes for Brutus' future (T4.3.3.33-34). When he says he thinks Brutus worthy of not tripping during the race of life, he does not rule out the possibility that Brutus will fall. Brutus may well fall (like his namesake) but he does not deserve it. In fact, Ovid knows that the reader will imagine the fallen Brutus covered in the dust and sand with which in ancient times the running track was covered. A fallen runner was instantly soiled. That is why Ovid considers Brutus worthy of a fate not only "luckier" ('candidiore') but also 'whiter' meaning effectively 'cleaner' ('candidiore'). The word 'candidus' means 'white' and 'happy'. But a 'whiter' fate advances the argument in another direction. Those who ran for office at the consular elections wore a chalk-whitened toga to appear 'whiter', the idea being that the candidate ('the white one') would stand out from his entourage. Brutus being the first consul will have been imagined as the first wearer of a 'whiter toga'. Thus Ovid knits his narrative together with a thread that parallels the fate of Brutus with that of his namesake. This thread takes us from his soiling as a runner to his 'whiter than white' candidature. Meanwhile, Ovid expresses the wish that Brutus's correspondent will also become the consul (34). Thus, lines 31-34 develop the thought expressed in line 5. The irony is that Ovid would have preferred to be the consul who received advice from his colleague. His dilemma and the notion that there are two consuls, one in consultation with the other, are reflected in the dramatic 'warner having been warned' juxtaposition in line 16 ('haec ego and monitor monitus prius ipse fuissem').

Tristia1.5

However, the intimacy between Ovid and Brutus is expressed by the virtual merging of their identity (3.4.37-40), which complements their presentation as two consuls. The merging of Ovid's identity with that of a colleague is also expressed in Tr.1.5.2 ('cui praecipue sors mea visa sua est'). It is not a coincidence that that poem begins with the same two words as Tr. 3.4 ('o mihi ...'). Indeed, it follows that the recipient of the 1.5 poem will also be Brutus. In that poem the roles are reversed and it is Brutus who behaves as the consul who gives advice to the stricken Ovid (Tr.1.5.5: qui mihi consilium vivendi mite dedisti'). It is also Ovid who takes on a particular characteristic of the word 'brut' namely 'inert' or 'stupid'

---

[23] The journey undertaken by Brutus to Delphi allegorically illustrates an aspect of the title 'consul' which consists not in giving advice but in receiving it (from the oracle). In fact the story could be inspired in part by the etymology of the word 'consul'.

(DEX). This is articulated through the adjective 'attonitum' (Tr.1.5.3) which means 'lightning-struck' and therefore 'stupefied'. The [feigned] dumbness of Brutus has been transferred to Ovid.

Yet the line which contains the best evidence for identifying Brutus as the recipient of Tr.1.5 is heavily corrupt. At Tr.1.5.7 ('scis bene, quem dicam, positis pro nomine signis') doubts have been raised about the first hemistych by such as James Diggle who would substitute 'cui' for 'quem'. If we begin in the second half of the line however we note that 'pro nomine' could also be understood as 'pron[o]'omine'. This would mean 'by a favourable omen' ('prono omine'). Now in the Fasti we learn that Brutus gave kisses to his mother (Earth) 'whilst lying 'prone' (2.719: 'pronus'). This means 'stretched out on the ground' but it also means 'of good omen'. The physical meaning is supported by the figurative meaning. Brutus' 'lying prone' was well-omened. To fall flat (to kiss the earth) was (for him) the favourable interpretation of the Delphic Oracle. Yet this is also articulated by the same letters 'pronomine' which could also be divided in exactly the same way to produce the phrase 'pron[o] [h]omine'. The pronunciation of the 'h' or aspiration was being more or less affected by the cultured classes in Cicero's day. However a 'veteran' like Ovid and the generality of the population of Rome would have pronounced 'homo' as 'omo'. The phrase 'prono [h]omine'[24] now means 'with the man lying stretched out' and has clear relevance to Brutus' feigned mishap on his return from Delphi. In this context the ablative absolute 'signis … positis' now means 'omens having been inserted' [into 'pro nomirne']. These words alert the reader to the altenative 'oracular' meanings to be found in 'pro nomine'.

The textual problems afflict the first part of the line which we suggest should read:
'me me tuum indicabo, positis pro nomine signis'

It must be admitted that this version is a long way from having any resemblance to the text as we have it. We are suggesting that somehow MEMETUUMINDICABO has become SCISBENEQUENDICAM. Our defence will be entirely based on the literary advantage to be gained from these emendations.

To begin with, the scansion compels us to assume that, following elision, synizesis has taken place between 'tuum' and 'indicabo' such that 'tuum' is entirely absorbed. Thus 't(uum) indica[bo]' scans as a dactyl followed by a long syllable. Lindsay explains as follows in relation to Roman comedy: 'If we may follow the analogy of other words, we may believe the unaccented forms (mei, meo, meum, tui, tuo, tuum, sui, suo, suum, etc.) to have been monosyllables (with synizesis)'. Lindsay goes on to give examples from Plautus[25]. The uniqueness of this metrical trope in Ovid must be the reason for the copyists' confusion.. Yet the very word 'synizesis' itself means the 'melting' of two into one. It therefore allegorises Ovid's sense of becoming one with Brutus. At the same time the word means 'a collapsing' and this points to the 'fall' that both men had suffered (Brutus through association with his

---

[24] Note that St Augustine complains of 'hominem' not being pronounced with an aspiration (Confessions 1.18)

[25] W.M. Lindsay Early Latin Verse: Plautus and Menander ch. 60: Trinnummi 665-6: 'Pernovi equidem, Lesbonice, in‖genium t(uom) ingenuum ad-modum'; Miles Gloriosus Act II, 136: 'ltaque illi amanti s(uo) hospiti morem gerit'; Amphitryon 262: 'Nam ill' non potuit quin sermone ‖ s(uo) aliquem familiarium'; Poenulus 860: 'Neque erum m(eum) adeo'.

namesake). There are therefore excellent metapoetic reasons why Ovid might have inserted this metrical anomaly.

However even more convincing are the various meanings to which this reformulation gives rise. Firstly the obvious meaning is 'I shall declare that I , I am yours'. There can be no more passionate avowal of the fusing of the two characters into one. However the verb could also means 'I shall divulge the secret that I,I am yours'. Ovid here alludes to the anonymity that cloaks the addressees of the Tristia but also to his ability to devise a way of purveying information about his relationships with these individuals.

The next appraisal of the line involves a reorientation of the ablative absolute 'positis pro nomine signis'. This could means 'sign[s] having been laid aside from the pronoun *or* [from] in front of the word'. This should now be integrated into the whole sentence, as follows: 'I will indicate that I, I am yours by dropping signs (a) from a pronoun ['PRONOMINE'] or (b) 'from in front of the word 'NOMINES'[= 'PRO 'NOMINES' [S]IGNIS]. Here we have assumed that the 's' between 'nomine and 'signis' is comon to both words. Now, a sign could be a device on a shield. Certainly the Greek equivalent of 'signum' namely 'σημα' bears this meaning. If one were to 'lay aside this device' one would also be removing the word 'umbo' ('shield device'). Such a 'sign' can be removed from our sentence in two stages (a) from both the 'pronoun' 'tu**um**' and (b) from 'in front of the word 'indica**bo**' (or indeed 'from in front of both 'tuum' and 'indicabo'). This is achieved merely by subtracting the letters 'um' from 'tuum' and 'bo' from indicabo' (= the removal of 'umbo'). This entirely conforms with the methodology outlined earlier in the sense that 'um' is removed from the 'pronoun' ('tu') whilst 'bo' is removed from in front of a word meaning 'nomine[s]'. Now one meaning of 'nomines' is 'you should denounce'. This makes it a synonym of 'indica!' ('denounce!'). Thus the letters 'bo' should be removed from 'indica'.

This leaves the sentence 'me, me, tu indica!' which should logically articulate the notion that 'Ovid belongs to Brutus' (i.e.'I will declare that I, I am yours by removing the signs 'um' and 'bo'). Now 'Me, me, tu indica!' could mean 'you, give essential information about me, me!' /you make me known!'. This is an acceptable meaning as Ovid is after all anxious that he be not forgotten in Rome (Tr.3.10.1-2). The next shift of meaning comes when we make the assumption that any given vowel may be a 'littera communis' which can be shared suimultaneously by both words on either side of it. Thus we arrive at the version 'me metu uindica'('free me from fear!'). One could also claim however that the words should be construed as 'me me t[u] uindica'. This now means 'you, claim me, me as yours!' 'you, defend / protect me!' you, free me from bonds!' 'you, absolve me from blame!' 'you, avenge me!'. All these are appropriate as pleas from the banished Ovid's in Tomis. However the sense of 'championing' or acting as 'defender' or 'protector' summons up the word 'βρυτηρ'['Bruter'] in Greek, which is a variant of 'ρυτηρ' ('saviour' 'deliverer' 'defender') and which is morphologically very close to 'Brutus' in Latin. Once again the poem orients the reader to face the name of the ancient Brutus. Both Livy (1.56.8: 'liberator ille populi Romani') and Cicero (De Oratore 2.225: 'L. Bruto, qui hunc populum dominate region liberavit') focus on Brutus as the 'liberator' of Rome from tyranny. Meanwhile Ovid's text inches round like a kaleidoscope. From 'me me t'uindica' we come to 'memet uindica' which means more or less the same thing.

The same words in the line can be seen from adifferent perspective. Thus 'positis pro nomine signis' clearly also means 'by the signs [the shield device] being placed in front of the

pronoun' or 'by the signs being placed in front of the word meaning 'nomines' ('tuUM indicaBO'). This sentence now contains the imperative to construe the sentence with the parts of 'umbo' in place.[26]This produces the following text: 'me **metuum** indicabo''I will reveal that I consist in anxieties'. Despite the oddity of the expression (akin to for example 'classis centum navium'), Ovid we should recall was exposed to the risk of enemy attack at all times. All his letters in Tristia 1 were written at times of anxiety (Tr.1.11.1-2). At Tr.3.10.2 he even declares his fear intermetrically through the epistolary imperfect 'verebar' ('vi**vere bar**bariae'). To live in the barbarian world was to be afraid.

However there is one remarkable comment which emerges from the letters of this line and which proves to be thematically very important. The words may be arranged as follows:'me met [uum] in dicabo' or 'me metin dicabo'. Once again we are in the presence of Latin through which the undrerlying Greek is anxious to rise to the surface. For the word 'μητιν' ('mētin') is the word used of the 'wiliness' of Odysseus. However Ovid's sentence must mean 'I shall consecrate myself / show myself to be 'wiliness' or, more flippantly, 'to be Clever Clogs'. Now the point here is that Odysseus called himself 'Noman' ('Οὖτις', Οὖτιν'). The accusative ending of this name matches that of 'μητιν' and suggests that when 'μητιν' is used it could be confused with the putative negative imperative form of 'Οὖτιν', namely 'Μητιν'. Thus Ovid could be calling himself 'Noman'. Indeed a large portion of this poem is given over to identifying Ovid with Odysseus (lines 57-84) which suggests that he has fulfilled his cryptic promise to proclaim himself 'Μητιν'.[27]

In Tr.1.5 Ovid equates himself with Mr. Cleverness to highlight Brutus' assumed character through antithesis. Brutus is Mr Stupid (Fasti 2.717) and even his name 'Brutus' indicates boorishenss. Returning to Tristia 3.4 the fusion of identity between Ovid and Brutus allows Ovid to identify himself with Brutus' life experiences. Brutus's 'stubbed foot' mandates him to become a consul in Rome. Ovid exploits his own fall to articulate a literary programme based on the 'injured [metrical] foot'. A strict application of the allegory will suggest that Ovid, like Brutus, deliberately engineered his own fall. There may be a grain of truth in this in the sense that it may have been a series of 'compromised feet' in the Ars Amatoria that drew Augustus' wrath. In fact,at Tristia 2.16, Ovid cannot keep himself from returning to the rock where he had originally hurt his foot ('saxa malum refero rursus ad icta pedem'). Ovid may not have intended to come to grief through his 'injured feet' but, now that he has, his instinct is to continue to damage his these feet. And Ovid's foot is in any case 'malum', a word to be translated not only as 'unfortunate' but also as 'shoddy' and even as 'wicked' 'malicious'. Ovid's feet are deliberately flawed in order to revile.

In Tr.3.4 the first advice given by Ovid to Brutus is the following: 'live and beware of big names'. Although we have here a metaphor, a literal interpretation of the words will bear more fruit[28]. One of the largest names (in the sense of its length) in Rome's history is Lucius Tarquinius Superbus, the last king of Rome to be deposed by Lucius Iunius Brutus. The next line of Ovid's poem advises the recipient to live for himself and avoid what is too bright. The key terms 'praelustria' and 'vita' can be reconfigured however. First of all, 'vita' ('avoid') is a

---

[26] See above.

[27] See Appendix B

[28] In fact at the start and end of Tristia 4 we are warned by Ovid to prioritise the literal meanings of words. There Ovid addresses the 'lector candidus' who on the one hand is trusting and open but is also consequently naïve enough to translate words that are intended metaphorically in a literal way. Such a reader sees no ambiguity.

homonym of 'life', and this aspect of the word is signaled (or glossed) by 'vive' ('living') which (as in the case of ' ὦ μοι ‘ὦμωι ') is positioned at the other end of the line from where it sends an omen to its counterpart. Thus, from a linguistic point of view, 'to shy away from [what is too bright]' is equivalent to 'surviving'. Lucius Junius Brutus realized this when he pretended to be half-witted ('brutus') so he would not suffer the fate of his father and brother, both of whom were killed by Lucius Tarquinius Superbus.

However, the verbal complexity of the line continues to grow. The haughty tyrant and Brutus 'the fool' had the same praenomen, namely 'Lucius', the etymology of which derives from the word 'lucidus' which means 'brilliant'. But given that 'superbus' also means 'brilliant' (Aeneid 2.504: 'barbarico postes auro ... superbi'), we suggest that the name 'Lucius Superbus' constitutes an excess of brightness. This explains in part the reason why Ovid says that Brutus must guard against not so much 'illustria' (= 'lucida') but rather 'praelustria' (an excess of lucidity'). However, another aspect of Ovid's logic relates to the role of the prefix 'prae' (from 'praelustria') which alludes to the prefix 'prae' from 'praenomen'. In Brutus' case, he cannot avoid the praenomen Lucius, nor the 'lucidity'that 'Lucius' produces as 'prae-nomen'. There is a game of words operating here between the prefix 'prae' which means 'pre' and the prefix 'prae' which means 'prea'. That is why Ovid comments that Brutus must avoid the 'brilliance' of the rich and powerful 'quantum potes' ('to the extent of his possibilities'). Like Tarquinius Brutus cannot totally avoid what is brilliant. However, Ovid is not satisfied with this. The word 'superbus' derives from the Greek word 'ὑπερβιος' which can be deconstructed to produce the roots 'prae' and 'vita'. In other words, the etymological components of the binomination 'Lucius' / 'ὑπερ/βιος' reproduce the elements of the phrase "prae (il) lustria vita", which take up the end of line 5 (with 'vita' interpreted as a homonym of its actual meaning). Thus Ovid refers both to Lucius as a praenomen and to Lucius' etymology and to the Greek etymology of the word 'superbus' when advising Brutus to 'avoid as far as he can, what is too bright'. The narrative thread is underpinned by the analysis of names. From another perspective, the elements of the phrase 'praelustria vita' express the meaning of the word 'superbus' along with the etymological roots of the word 'ὑπερβιος' ('ὑπερ' = 'prae'; superbus' = illustris';'βιος' = 'vita').

As we have already seen, if Brutus listens to Ovid's advice he will preserve his life ('vita') just as did his famous namesake in distancing himself from the king by assuming a half-witted   character. Brutus is advised to avoid the long name of the tyrant and the etymology of this name, an etymology that makes his name even longer, namely, Lucius Superbus ὑπερβιος Tarquinius. This is signaled by the adverb 'longe'that can be understood in relation to 'magna' (= 'particularly long'). Nevertheless, our discussion must also take into account the tyrant's cognomen, namely 'Tarquinius', which one expects will also contribute to the 'special length' of the name. The etymology of 'Tarquinius' will have to be arrived at creatively as it is an Etruscan term. If we address the word as though it had Greek origins, we find that 'tarchanon' ('ταρχανον') is a synonym of 'κηδος' which means 'relationship by marriage'. This definition epitomises the relationship between Brutus and Tarquinius, for Brutus was the son of Marcus Brutus whose wife was Tarquinia, the sister of Superbus. In fact, an allusion to the relationship between Brutus and Tarquinius can be extracted from the letters of 'praelustria vita'. If we consider the letter 'a' at the end of the word 'praelustria' to be common with 'vita' we are left with the word 'avita' which, in tandem with 'praelustria' means 'highly-placed

family members'. In this context we can now deconstruct 'avita' as a combination of a Greek prefix ('a' steretikon) and a Latin suffix ('vita'). This etymological ensemble means 'no life'. In other words, the word 'avita' ('family relationships') is equivalent to 'a-vita' ('death'). Moreover, 'highly-placed family relationships' are' highly-placed relationships that kill' ('praelustria + [a]-vita = 'praelustria avita'). Lucius Iunius Brutus became all too conscious of this equation when his father and his brother were killed by Superbus.

       A short resumé is called for. According to Ovid's linguistically-driven logic, 'life' ('vita') consists of 'the avoidance' ('vita') of 'very long names' and of what is 'over-bright'. 'Lucius Tarquinius Superbus' qualifies on both these counts. On the other hand, 'death' ('a / vita') consists in 'family relationships' ('avita') that must be avoided ('vita') to ensure the opposite of death, namely 'life' ('vita'). Before continuing, we should draw attention to the fact that the Greek adjective 'λαμπροτάτης' ('brilliant') which, on official inscriptions, describes the people and the senate of Tomis, is the exact equivalent of the word 'praelustris' ('καὶ τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ δήμῳ τῆς λαμπροτάτης μητροπόλεως Τόμεως': IScM97, 105). The fact that Ovid uses the word 'praelustris' here twice in two lines must be considered against the fact that the word appears nowhere else in Latin literature. Whilst we cannot claim that Tomis and Istria are the only cities to award themselves the epithet 'λαμπροτάτης', nevertheless a double literary allusion ('praelustria' / 'praelustris') linking Rome to Tomis from where the poet purports to write, would invest the poet's advice with much force and much irony. The logic runs as follows: exiled to Tomis, Ovid speaks from an ambience that is 'praelustris'. He would wish himself to 'flee' from what is 'praelustris' ('Tomis') but can only give advice as the victim of what is 'praelustris'. Given that Augustus left Rome a city of marble, there must also be an allusion to Rome in 'praelustris'. As we shall see, the object of Ovid's attack here is Augustus himself but for that we must turn to the subtextual discourse. Meanwhile, unlike Tarqunius, Augustus did not have a long name, but he had a 'big' name in the sense that the adjective 'augustus' means 'grandiose' 'majestic' 'great'.

We have not exhausted the resources of line 5 of Tr.3.4. If we redivide the text we can extract the verb 'preluSTRIAVI ta'. This severing of the text is an imperative that Tomi's etymology imposes, deriving as it does from the word 'cut', Indeed two cuts made according to this imperative have confirmed that the poet 'will cut' his text ('tris / TEMO / retur' : Tr.3.9.32). Returning to the passage in question, 'striavi'' means 'I have made grooves'. Meanwhile the past participle 'striatus' ('incised') encourages us to suppose that the verb can be applied to the engraving of inscriptions. Moreover the application of the verb to the furrow is guaranteed. Thus in 'STRIAVI' we have two different discourses (a) 'I have engraved [my inscription]' (b) 'I have made furrows in the text'. The phrase 'I have made furrows [in text]', if metapoetically understood, constitutes an allegory of the procedure by which the author produces hidden and additional layers of text. The author has notched the text at the points where his words divide. Furthermore the meaning 'I plough' ('ara') is one of the meanings of the verb 'τεμνω' 'to cut' 'which in Tristia 3.9 constitutes the etymology of the word 'Tomis'. In sum, we have an enigma that consists of the fact that the existence of the word 'striavi' is due to the fact that we have recognized the grooves or grooves made by the author in his text. So, by its meaning, the word 'striavi' gives us the author's retrospective approval to follow the procedure we had used in tracking down 'striavi'.

This discussion of furrows however also reminds us that the earliest Greek script was termed 'boustrephedon' which in Greek means 'the turning of oxen'. That is, the engaver entered letters on the wax as though he were ploughing an arable furrow. In 'boustrephedon' the lines snaked from left to right to left in such a way that the writer did not have to lift his engraving wax tool from the wax. Seeing that the boustrephedon makes us read alternate lines back to front, there is the potential that within a poetic strategy that embraces the notion of the boustrephedon, verses will be found that are reversible.

In this context, we draw attention to 'hibernas ... procellas' (line 9) where Ovid warns Brutus that storms can be avoided by sailors as long as the sail is lowered. The metaphor is based on the circumstance that the Mediterranean winds are often cyclonic in the autumn due to the interaction of the northern winds (cold and dry) with the warmer surface of the sea[29]. This is compounded by weather depressions from Atlantica which Intersect with the Alps. In other words, the descent of the sail must anticipate the coming of the cyclonic wind, since such a wind will fill the sail from the front, causing the mast to collapse (see Met 11.551). Odysseus's boat suffers this catastrophe at Odyssey 12.405f. There the wind suddenly changes direction 180 degrees to enter the sail from the front. Hence in Tristia 3.4 the sail is immediately to be lowered lest the wind in the sail breaks the mast.

The problem with Tr.3.4 is the following: the adjective 'hibernas' ('in winter') does not express the character of a cyclonic wind that is in any case more common in the late autumn. That is, the adjective does not provide sufficient motivation for the drastic action on board. We believe that an emendation is required here. The noun 'procella' is twice qualified by the adjective 'adversa' in Ovid (Met 11.484; Tr.5.12.5).The nexus also occurs in the passage describing the storm in Aeneid 1. However, often a text is corrupted when the scribe encounters an unusual word (or nexus). The scribe will have had no reason to change the well-known nexus' adversaras ... procellas'. But the nexus 'inversas ... procellas' is quite different. This epithet precisely defines the new angle of the wind (180 degrees about). This angle guarantees that the mast will not survive the force of the wind. The angle also articulates a sense of unexpectedness (clearly present in the Odyssey vignette at 12.405f) and it is this element that complements the unexpected arrival of a lightning from a clear sky, a phenomenon that we will discuss soon in relation to line 6.

It is possible that the original word 'INVERSAS' could have been altered to 'IN VERNA [S] M'. The descent of the sail and the mobilization of the rowers could have allowed a ship to flee into the spring wind coming from the front. Rowing into the wind was clearly normal enough practice judging by Tr.5.12.5 ('nostra **per** adversas **agitur** fortuna procellas'). Yet, the Zephyrus, the typical wind of spring, was very strong (Tristia 3.12.1; Horace Odes 4.4.7: 'verni ... venti'). In any case, due to the lack of cyclonic winds in the spring, the scribes will have doubts about the validity of the phrase 'in vernam'. Moreover the word 'effugit' more naturally articulates rowing away from the direction of the wind than into it. Given the scribes' tendency to write 'B' instead of 'V', one scribe may have concluded that 'IN VERNAM was a hypercorrection for INBERNAM[30]. This scribe will have quickly moved from there by two short steps to '[H] IBERNAM' and then on to 'HIBERNAS'.

---

[29] Crivatul

[30] A vedea CIL 14.1597 (lespedea lui L.Septimius Pontianus Augustanorum libertus): D M / L SEPTIMIUS PONTIANUS / AUGG LIB SE BIVO COMPARAVIT / [SI]BI / ET PETRONIAE LUCILLAE / [CONI]UGI SUAE SANTISSIME(sic)' In loc de 'se vivo' gravatorul a scris 'se bivo'

The word 'inverto' also has other nuances, among which is 'I reverse the meaning'. If then we interpret this participle literally and allegorically, its reorientation of the wind will articulate the reversal of the letters of the line. If 'effugIT INVERsam' is written in reverse, the word 'REUNITI' appears ('masREUNITIguffe'). Although only 'unio'is evidenced in the sources it seems hard to imagine this compound failing to be in common use. It will mean '[men] reintegrated into a unit' and constitutes an annotation about the events on board the ship. During the earlier tasks on board the crew will have been divided into several teams. For instance, the captain will first order the yard to be lowered by the 2-man halyard team (see Met.11.482); then when the yard lies just above the gunwales the halyards will be tethered to their cleats; the captain will then give the order to others bind the sail tightly to the yard as it lies hanging abov the gunwales. This is the picture we receive from Metamorphoses 11. 483. An 8-man team come forward with the brailing lines in their hands. They will have been handed these lines by the helmsman who until now will have been using them to keep the sail tightly bunched against the yard as it descends. The 8-man brailing-line team will now secure the sail hard against the yard by wrapping the lines round and round the yard. This is the procedure alluded to in the Metamorphoses 11.483. The captain would not be addressing several sailors ('subnectite') if it were a case that the helmsman alone was being ordered to brail the sail. In fact with whole sail packed firmly it will be placed in a special compartment running prow to mast along the centre of the ship. There is no point securing the whole sail against the yard unless it is to be stowed.

After the stowing of the yard and sail the crew will *reunite* to propel the ship away from the point from which the wind is coming ('effugit'). This encourages us to suggest that there is a subtext operating through the order of the letters. If 'reuniti' is written in reverse, it seems likely to reflect the fact that the rowers are facing the prow to propel the ship in the direction of the wind. Normally, the oarsmen would have been facing the stern. The word 'reuniti'could also articulate the 'reverse uniting' of the words 'effugit inversas' by the word that now bridges the gap between them.

However, the word 'inversas' also describes 'procellas', a word that is liable to be reversed exactly as the winding wind reverses. Although the inverted letters of 'procellas' namely 'sallecorp' do not appear to produce meaningful results, the word 'procellas' ('cyclonic winds') when extracted from its context and interpreted as an accusative of exclamation, has a synonym 'O turbines' of which the palindrome is' 'seni Bruto' (To the famous Brutus of the past).

We turn again to the meaning of the word 'striavi' and the fact that Ovid seems to have 'scratched grooves'. On the one hand, this declares Ovid's metapoetic strategy, which through grooves, marked the divisions of words. On the other hand, a 'division of words' is also a nuance of the word 'τομη', which must be considered another candidate for the etymology of the name Tomis, given that it is cognate with 'cut', the root of the word declared by Ovid at Tr. 3.9.33. However, if we investigate the word 'stria' thoroughly, we find that it also has other nuances. According to Apuleius, a forehead can be affected with grooves in the sense that it is wrinkled on the forehead' ('adulescens ... senili tristitia strias gerens': Golden Ass10.3). In our opinion, it is not a coincidence that one of the Greek words closest to 'Brutus', namely 'βρυτις' ('Brutis') means 'wrinkle'. Meanwhile, the letters' PRAELUSTRIA ... VITA 'can be redivided to produce the text' STRIAVIT A' = 'He engraved the letter A' or 'A engraved 'wrinkles' ['rugas' or 'strias']. This subtext points to Augustus. In his old age he

began to allow the sculptors of his statues to engrave a wrinkle and a half on his forehead to reflect his ageing. The other aspects of his portrait remained unchanged, reflecting his desire to be portrayed as a young man. On the other hand, if we prioritize a nuance of the word 'stria', we find that the rebuilding of Rome in marble required an army of craftsmen specializing in cutting stone. A groove engraved along a column is little short of a symbol of the Augustan rebuilding program of Rome. However, with regard to 'STRIAVIT A', the variant 'he engraved the letter A' is the most interesting. In 'Res Gestae' (20.1), during a parenthetical commentary, Augustus mentions the 'enormous cost' ('impensa grandi') that he incurred during the restoration of the Capitol and Pompey's Theatre. Despite the cost, Augustus claims to have restrained himself. He did not engrave 'any inscription indicating his name (' sine ulla inscriptione nominis mei '). The important word is 'ulla'. No trace of the name 'Augustus' was to be engraved on the buildings. The most basic element of Augustus' name will have been the letter 'A'. In other words, we must assume that Augustus had the habit of attaching at least the letter 'A' on the buildings he had restored (or built) from his money. Furthermore, seeing that 'litera' means 'inscription' in Latin, when Augustus writes the word 'inscriptione', it can be interpreted as an allusion to a single letter (in this case 'A'). An inscription could comprise a single letter as we see in the case of slaves who were branded with a sign on their forehead ('inscriptio'). Besides this, there is another linguistic link between the word 'stria' and its meaning of 'groove' that leads us in another direction. In Greek, there is a synonym for this word 'stria', namely ' ἐντομή'. But 'ἐντομή' if cut in turn (a procedure imposed by the command inherent in the word 'stria' which, if considered to be a verb, constitutes a command and mean 'cut a groove') will necessarily pass to the ablative case, and will produce' Tomis' on the basis that in being translated into Latin 'ἐντομή' becomes 'in Tomei'. We suggest that the Greek noun 'Tomis' as conceived by Ovid, can be variously scanned. If required it could belong to the same declension as 'πολις' 'city'. This would mean that the ablative is 'Tomei'. So 'stria' evokes the name 'Brutus' through 'wrinkle' and the phrase 'in Tomis'. Once again as in the case of 'ὤμοι' and 'ὤμωι' there will be a slight jarring between τομηι and τομει all in the interests of highlighting Ovid's fluctuating vowel lengths.

The interpretation of the initial 'A' as a reference to 'Augustus' demonstrates another aspect of the epigraphic context in which Ovid situates himself, namely that initials are a basic element of all inscriptions. This leads us to the first letters of the PRAELU / STRIAVIT A sequence. There are many provincial inscriptions (eg in Pompeii) of the Republican era, which though written in Latin, fail to retain the final M on words (and not only in cases where the inscription is engraved without care). Thus, as a 'provincial veteran', the 50-year-old Ovid gives himself the latitude to assume the letters' praelu' 'represent' praelum'. The word 'praelum' means 'wine or olive press'. At first glance, the meaning of the phrase 'praelum striavit A' seems hard to establish with certainty. However, the [Augustan] version 'Augustus engraved his wine press' could express a sexual metaphor.

According to Pliny the Elder (Natural History 18.317), the Greek wine-press is designed 'mali rugis per cocleam ambulantibus' ('with the grooves of the straight pillar in the form of a spiral'). This arrangement may be illustrated by the reconstructed screw press at Yad-Ashmona in Israel (based on a mosaic). However in the context of phallus symbols it seems more likely to relate to the lever press where the thread on the upright 'mast' is a feature of only the top of the structure. Particularly on circumcised penises the striations or

concentric grooves around the glans of the penis are multiple and marked rather like Pliny's 'mast'. On the other hand since 'striatus' also articulates the grooving of pillars it is possible to interpret Ovid's vignette as an illustration of the two broad longitudinal grooves on either side of the Corpus Cavernosum Urethrae. In conclusion however we translate as follows: 'Augustus striated his penis [when he was circumcised]' ('PRAELU' STRIAVIT A'). However, a different interpretation would suggest that Ovid is making fun of Augustus. If the letter A is in the ablative case, then we may translate as follows: 'Augustus engraved his penis with the letter A ('praelu' striavit A'). Another version of the syntax produces the meaning of 'the letter A striated his penis'. In any case, this interpretation of the syntax must be a sardonic attack on the incorrigibility and even obsession of Augustus who was intent on leaving a trace of his identity on all his monuments (or, in this case, his erections). In general, this discussion tends to confirm retrospectively our interpretation of Augustus's false modesty when writing 'sine ulla inscriptione nominis mei' in the Res Gestae. His restraint on that occasion merely proves his lack of restraint on other occasions.

Of course there will be many who will be very skeptical that (so many) ametrical and scatological interpretations of this text are intentional. However, there are many links between the different subtextual aspects of these lines. The most interesting link in the context of the present discussion exists between 'Brutus' and 'praelum' ('wine press'). It has been established that the word 'ὦμος '(=' brut 'in Romanian) also means 'an object used in the production of wine or oil'. According to LSJM, it seems to be a part of the press or a carrying pole ... '.[31]. This seems to be too coincidental. A compromise position would suggest that it is the same upright member that we attributed to the Lever Press. In any event, it is one thing to say that there is no incontrovertible proof that 'ὦμος ' means 'praelum'. It is another thing to say the same thing when both words emerge from the highly cryptic subtext of the same passage. It is yet another thing to say the same thing when these words appear twice in six lines ('mihi ... tempore duro' = 'ὦμοι ... [ὦμωι];' praelustria vita / ... praelustri fulmen ... '.

Tristia 3.3 .6is considered corrupt, but Ovid's poetic strategy can help us rebuild the text. There are two main versions of the text (a) 'saevum praelustri fulmen ab arce venit'; 'The savage lightning comes from the bright-shining fortress' (b) 'saevum praelustri fulmen ab igne venit'; 'The savage lightning comes from the bright-shining fire'. These versions are inspired by comparisons with (a) Tr.1.1.72: ' venit in hoc illa fulmen **ab arce** caput'; 'The lightning came from that citadel onto this head' and (b) Fasti 1.574: 'et rapidum Aetnaeo, fulgur ab igne venit'; 'And from the fire of Etna comes the scorching light'. Unfortunately, neither of these versions succeed in expressing Ovid's idea. The way forward is to put the emphasis on 'saevum'[32]. In essence no lightning strike is desirable. It is 'cruel' whatever the circumstances. Thus the adjective 'saevum' risks being supernumerary unless it adds something specific to the meaning of the passage. We suggest that lightning is particularly 'cruel' when the blow is not deserved or expected. And it is not expected when it comes from a clear sky. Such a phenomenon happens quite often in the southern Mediterranean. In fact, lightning can travel up to 25 kilometres from the source of a storm, leaving the impression that it comes from the clear sky. In the imagination of the ancients, most lightning strikes came from Zeus and Zeus inhabited the ether. The role of the clouds in producing lightning was understood, but in

---

[31] LSJM (1996) Supplement p.319 s.v. 'ὦμος'
[32] Note that 'saevus' is also a nuance of the word 'ὦμος' which translates the word 'brutus' as we have already seen. This constitutes another indication of the identity of the addressee.

general a lightning strike was thought to be a deliberate punishment from Zeus. Thus 'saevum' would well describe the cruelty of a Zeus who was intent on taking his victim by surprise when the ether was 'praelustris' ('very diaphanous').

In Aristophanes' Thesmophoriazusae (272), Euripides declares' I swear on the ether, the house of Zeus'. It is not surprising that in Troades Euripides himself defines the ether as Zeus' heavenly headquarters[33]. So a savage lightning will come from the clear ether where Zeus lives. The ether is elsewhere regularly described as 'white' ('πολιος' 'λευκος') and the adjective 'praelustris' will articulate both the shock that overcomes the victim when lightning strikes 'out of the blue'and the cruelty of the enemy that unleashes the lightning. That is, if the ether is completely clear one has no expectation of a lightning strike. Thus if lightning is forthcoming, it will be judged an act of cruelty in the eyes of the stricken victim.

If we replace 'ab arce' or 'ab igne' with 'ab aethere', we are left with a line in which the logic is much tighter and in which the finger of blame points more clearly to Augustus living in his metaphorical ether on the Palatine Hill in Rome. However, there remains the task of finding a verb that fits the spondaic sixth foot. Almost the only candidate is 'abit' which triggers the elision of the last syllable of 'aether[a] ('aether' abit'). So the new meaning of the line is as follows: 'Cruel is the lightning that sets off from the ether at its brightest'.

Now we may further examine the text to see what possibilities it offers. If we remove the last three syllables from their context, we are left with the verb 'erabit' ('ABAETH**ER'ABIT'**). The word 'errabit', with a double consonant means 'he [Augustus] will miss'. But we can also embrace the 'erabit' version as a species of provincial verb, for, as the grammarians never tire of saying, the people of old (Ovid being 'old') did not double their consonants[34]. This argument is supported by the fact that in the provinces of the Roman Empire epigraphical conventions remained old-fashioned viz-a-viz Rome. For example, at Callatis, a soldier from Crete who retired to Callatis, calls the citizens 'Καλατιανῶν'instead of 'Καλλατιανῶν'[35]. We claim that Ovid is not only a retired person of over 50 years, and a veteran in his own field of literature, but also a provincial because of his exile from Rome. Ovid embraces all these aspects of his life to give himself the latitude to write subtextual literature that is ametrical and ill-spelt. In other words, the intermetric word 'erabit' is to be taken all the more seriously *because* it exemplifies the degraded form of Latin written and spoken by Ovid. We now need to find a candidate for the subject of this verb. Again, the emperor Augustus presents himself. In his role as Jupiter, one can only suppose he had struck his enemy Ovid with a lightning-bolt when there was no cloud in the sky. This precipitated Ovid's fall. Ovid frequently mentions his astonishment and disbelief when the blow fell (Tr.2.99-100; Tr.1.3.7-8)[36].

In the immediate context, however, the verb 'erabit' will ironically comment on Augustus's actions. Ovid insists Brutus does not have to worry because Augustus will not be able to hit him with lightning. 'Erabit' means 'he will not hit the target'. Confirmation that this analysis has merit comes from Pliny the Elder. In a passage (2.43 (113)) that discusses a type of lightning that is triggered independent of the intervention of the celestial bodies, the

---

[33] Euripides *Troades* 1077-1079: '[to Zeus] 'ἄναξ, / οὐράνιον ἕδρανον ἐπιβεβὼς /αἰθέρα …'
[34] E.g. Paulus Festus (Mueller 6): 'anus dicta est ab annorum multitudine, quoniam antiqui non geminabant consonantes'
[35] IScM III 115
[36] See also Tr.1.5.2; 5.12,67-68. Ovid knows what he is talking about in terms of 'bolts from the blue'

historian notes that 'posse et conflictu nubium elidi, ut duorum lapidum, hinc bruta fulmina et vana, ut quae nullam habeant rationem naturae. His percuti montes, his maria, omnesque alios inritos iactus' ('through the collision of two clouds, as if two gravel stones are rubbed together, a lightning strike may be triggered; they are called 'crude and vain' lightning strikes'. They have no causative factor. They come down on mountains and in the sea, and all their other strikes are futile'). The unusual and highly specific nuance of 'bruta' here as an adjective to define random, untargeted, fruitless lightning strikes cannot be a coincidence. Such a reference to Brutus guarantees that Brutus is the person addressed in the poem. It also suggests that the cryptic messages of the subtext are the ones we should prioritize if we wish to reach the truth about Ovid's exile. Meanwhile, it is to be noted that Pliny would have considered a lightning bolt sent by Zeus (or from any star) as having a specific aim in view, such as would persuade the onlooker to characterize such a lightning as triggered by rational causes. That is, for the ancients, a rational origin involved a certain intention on the part of the gods.

This logic leads us to the conclusion that Ovid is poking further fun at Augustus. According to Pliny, a wayward lightning-bolt will not have come from Mount Olympus, because if it had, it would not have missed its target. Ovid develops this argument further. He does not deny that August corresponds largely to Zeus. The problem is that Augustus fails to convince in the most important aspect of Zeus' brief as king of the gods, namely in sending lightning. For when Augustus misses, the ordinary man assumes that that bolt was a haphazard event ('fulmen brutum'). The crowning insult will be that if none of Augustus' lightning bolts strike their target he will be characterized in the eyes of Ovid as (i) being of ill-intent but also (i) being utterly incompetent. The result of this will be that Augustus will become of no consequence to the ordinary man. No one will pay any attention to his evil intentions because they know he will fail to put them into practice.

We come now to our final paragraphs where we tie together some loose ends. The connection between 'Brutus' and 'stria' ('wrinkle') via 'βρυτις' encourages to suppose that other words morphologically similar to 'Brutus' will be found scattered across the text. Ovid seems to embroider the poem with quasi-etymological verbal sequins in order to keep Brutus before the reader's mind's eye. We start with the little-known verb 'βρυζω' which, in the passive voice ('ἐβρυσθης' = 'ebrust[h]es') means 'he fell'. Obviously, Brutus's fall (in deliberately throwing himself face downwards) prefigures the transformation of the fall suffered by Ovid ('procubuere') into his permanently 'injured metrical foot'. It is likely that the active voice of the same verb 'βρυζω' would also mean 'he fell'. The main problem, however, is that the morphology of the word 'ἐβρυσθης' is not so similar to 'Brutus' as to convince us that an etymological relationship between Brutus and 'ἐβρυσθης' can be sustained. Archilochus uses the form 'ἐβρυζε' which does not bring us closer to the solution. However, some verbs that have a root ending in zeta, for example κτιζω' or 'σωζω' produce derivatives which end in both -στ- and -τ- ('σωστεον' > 'σωτεον'= 'to be saved; 'κτιστης' 'κτιτης' = 'ctitor; 'founder).'In conclusion, especially in the case of lesser known verbs, both forms of this termination may produce derivatives. In other words, the nouns βρυτης' or/and 'βρυστης' ('cel care cade') could have existed. Indeed, so close to the name 'Brutus' is 'βρυτης ' that this etymology   ('fall')   could   have   inspired   the   entire   legend. In Ovid's poem there are many references to Brutus 'fall'. Firstly, when Ovid says that a person who falls when he walks on a flat terrain can get up easily, he not only refers to the

unusual circumstances of Brutus' fall, but also insinuates that the rarity of the event indicates that the fall is intentional (Tr.3.3.17). At Fasti 2,719-720 ('Ille iacens pronus matri dédit oscula Terra / Creditus offenso procubuisse pede') Ovid allows for the possibility that Brutus did fall, but no more. Livy adopts the same view of Brutus's intention to fall (1.56: 'velut and prolapsus cecidisset'). Meanwhile, in Tristia 3.18, the phrase 'tacta ... humo' rather than being translated 'after touching the earth' may mean that [Brutus] 'kissed the earth'. Livy uses a similar collocation to express the same incident ('terram osculo contigit'; 'he touched the earth with a kiss'). In fact, a more nuanced translation of Tr.3.4.19 guarantees that only Brutus may be the subject of the sentence. For if we consider the word 'ut' to mean 'in order to' instead of 'so,' then we are left with the following sentiment: 'the one who falls on flat ground falls in this way <u>in order that</u> he may rise once he kisses the earth'. Brutus had intentionally chosen a place where his fall would not prevent him from rising.

The interest of Ovid's passage Tr.3.4.17 is greatly increased by ringing the changes on a particular word before observing the effect this has on the rest of the sentence. Thus 'in plano' also means 'in a humble situation'. Any plebeian, that is, whose fortunes come to grief (and this rarely happens because the poor man has little to lose) so falls (that is, not very far) that he can repair his fortunes. Alternatively 'in plano' also means 'according to the literal form of the word' and this metapoetically reminds the reader to approach Ovid's work without necessarily reading figures of speech into the words. The ideal reader, that is, should translate literally & with credulous eyes ('candide lector': 4.10.120). The meaning 'according to the literal form of the word' therefore locates the physical act of 'falling' at the literary and narratological heart of this line.

The line Tristia 3.3.10 ('lataque plus parvis vela timoris habent') seems to be essentially gnomic: [when the wind blows from the opposite direction] a wide sail inspires more fear than small ones'. However, the word 'lata' also means the 'broad purple stripe' which was the symbol of a member of the Senate in Rome. If we treat this word as the nominative noun (meaning effectively 'senatorial status'), we will need to look for another nominative because the verb is in the plural ('habent'). The required subject is provided by the word 'parvis' once it is redivided into a nominative with an adjective ('par / vis'). This means 'corresponding force'. To take its place in the line it needs to be forced to depend on a further redivision namely 'velati moris' (replacing 'vela timoris'). The new collocation 'par vis velati moris' means 'the corresponding force of his hidden personality'. Brutus's relevance to this description is very clear (Fasti 2.717 'stulti sapiens imitator'). Iunius Brutus pretended to be half-witted for years to escape the fate suffered by his relatives as explained above. When Lucretia, his sister-in-law, committed suicide following her rape by a member of Tarquinius Superbus' family, Brutus revealed his true personality (courageous and of firm convictions). It is obvious that Ovid considers Brutus' personality to be as important as his status as the consul 'lata' [clavus][37].

Two aspects of the line require further comment: (a) how the syntax finds place for the word 'plus' (Tr.3.3.11). 'Plus' sometimes means no more than 'as well' or 'and'. It therefore

---

[37] We suggest that a reference to Lucretia once appeared in our text. Line 12 of Tr.3.4 relates to fishing nets floating on the sea's surface thanks to their cork attachments. The word 'simul' could have been used to replace the word 'illuc' at one stage (owng to illuc's apparent use here as a relative pronoun, in the sense of 'tied 'to it'). Illuc appears regularly in this sedes in Ovid however and were we to suppose it was part of the original text we would find the text had secreted the word 'Lucretia' amongst its letters ('illLUCRETIAmergat').

binds together 'lata' and 'vis' as the two nominatives; (b) the meaning of the verb 'habent'. It seems to be only one nuance that suits the new configuration of the line namely 'to be master' (in an absolute sense). That is, the line now means that Brutus's position and personality prevail.

Twofurther lines deserve comment. The 'joining of equal friendships' (Tr.3.4.44) appears to be another prompt from Ovid in the direction of Brutus becoming consul. The two consuls were on the same footing as each other and in that sense their 'amicitia'will be thought to be lacking any imbalance. However this friendship will be less personal and more political. 'Amicitia' was a politicised term that defined public relationships between those of the Senatorial class. Cicero expatiates on the concept in Ad Familares 5.8 ('has litteras velim existimes foederis habituras esse vim, non epistulae, meque ea, quae tibi promitto ac recipio, sanctissime esse observaturum diligentissimeque esse facturum'). The sense of a compact between two people is strong, as is the sense of reciprocity and the solemn nature of the accord which has to be seen to be fulfilled by continuous acts of 'friendship'. Underlying Ovid's wish is a bitter if implicit regret that his own amicitia with Augustus was not based on a level playing-field. In such circumstances the cards will have bee stacked on the emperor's side.

Lastly, the mention of Elpenor (Tr.3.4.19-20) is on the one hand a further example of those whose fate has been marked by a 'fall', a fall being central to the life story and even the etymology of 'Brutus'. However it is significant that the reason for Elpenor's fall relates to the consumption of alcohol. In Odyssey 10 the young oarsman sleeps on the roof of Circe's palace 'heavy [it appears] with wine' ('οἰνοβαρείων':10.555). On awaking he forgets where he is and topples from the roof breaking his neck. Now in Herodotus (2.77) we learn that the Egyptians have no vines but drink an alcohol made from barley ('οἴνῳ δὲ ἐκ κριθέων πεποιημένῳ διαχρέωνται: οὐ γάρ σφι εἰσὶ ἐν τῇ χώρῃ ἄμπελοι'). Of interest is the fact that the word for this non-vinous drink is the word that is always assumed to mean 'wine', namely 'οἴνος'. This in turn leaves us the option of assuming that Elpenor may have been heavy with a form of 'beer made from barley'. This brings us back to Brutus once more. For according to Hesychius, the word for a drink made from barley ('πομα ἐκ κριθης') is'βρυττιον' (**Bruttion**'). This very accurately etymologises the cognomen of Brutus **Bruttedius** whom we suspect to be Ovid's correspondent. Moreover there is another more common word for such a concoction, namely βρυτον or βρυτος (**Bruton**, **Brutos**). These terms cannot but allude to the addressee of Tristia3.4 namely Brutus.

Appendix A:
Tristia 3.4.46 and Augustus' indulgence in Scythian Incense:

The poemTr.3.4 contains an even more damning verdict upon Augustus' daily life than anything we have so far witnessed. At Tristia 3.4.46 Ovid seems to be routinely bringing the poem to an end. He is repeating his well-worn sentiment that Rome harbours his name ('reputation') but that Pontus contains all else that is his. The text seems uncontroversial: 'Scythicus cetera Pontus habet'.

However we may redivide the words, in the light of Greek, to produce a lacerating aside on the decadence of the Augustan regime:
'Scythic[um] usce 'τεραπων' tus habet'.

Here we have taken the liberty of assuming an internal elision ('Scythic[um]) which we now restore to the text. This allows 'Scythicum' to agree with 'tus' producing the meaning 'Scythian incense'. Meanwhile the nominative of the sentence will be the transliterated Greek word 'τεραπων' which will be the equivalent of 'θεραπων'. The particular circumstance that allows us to treat these two words as one and the same, relates to Latin spoken by a Scythian. As we know Ovid lived in the general area of Scythia (Ex Ponto 3.7.29-30: 'cur ego concepi Scythicis me posse carere / finibus …') and was surrounded by the sounds of the Scythian tongue (Tr.3.14.57: 'Scythicoque fero circumsonor ore'). This had brought him to a point where his Latin had become rusty (Tr.5.7.58: 'vix subeunt ipsi verba Latina mihi') and he was forced to speak to a very large extent 'in the Sarmatian fashion' (Tr.5.7.56: 'Sarmatico cogor plurima loqui more'). This, he claims, has also had an effect on his literary output which he fears may contain 'barbarisms' (Tr.5.7.59-60: 'pauca barbara').

Now it is arguable that 'pauca … barbara' and 'Sarmatico … more' relate not merely to the use of foreign words and foreign languages but also Ovid's use of barbarised Latin and Greek words, which will be ill-pronounced or ill-spelt. Certainly Ovid is likely to have picked up the Scythian mode of pronouncing Greek (Tr.5.751-52: 'Graecae vestigia linguae … Getico barbara facta sono'). This gives the reader the rhetorical room to presume Ovid's writings contain Greek and Latin words that are spelt and pronounced in the manner made famous by Scythian archers in Aristophanes' plays. Of all their idiosyncracies of pronunciation the one that is most characteristic is that of treating aspirated plosives as non-aspirated. Thus at Thesmophoriazusae 1086 we find the barbarism 'πωτε το πωνη' which should have been written 'ποθεν ἡ φωνη' had the character speaking been Athenian. Here there are two examples of de-aspiration ($\theta > \tau$ and $\varphi > \pi$) alongside the lengthening of a vowel ($o > \omega$) and the ignorance of the gender of the definite article ($\dot{\eta} > \tau o$). We may take this further and assume that all aspirations including the Latin 'qu' will have been expunged from the 'original' by the Scythianised Ovid, leaving the textual '-us ce-' ('usce') to represent an abbreviation of 'usque'. Certainly 'usce' is attested in Pompeiian graffiti in scurrilous and non-scurrilous contexts[38] thereby confirming its place in common speech.

In general, we must assume that the text as it stands represents a Scythianised version of a flawless literary text. This latter version is the text the reader is charged with recovering. Given our provincial context, the reader naturalistically begins with a Greek lexical item. The deaspirated 'τεραπων' accurately represents the word 'θεραπων' in a Scythianised-Greek context. And as we have intimated in a rhetorical sense (and metrical concerns notwithstanding) the preponderantly Greek milieu in which Ovid found himself, renders the word 'τεραπων' more immediately accessible to the Tomitan mind than 'ce/tera Pon/tus'. As we have seen, Ovid will have been surrounded by a debased Greek which will have affected his Latin. The only Latin speakers in Tomis are likely to have been those of official status sent by Augustus from Rome. Indeed Ovid admits (in rather ungainly Latin) that there is no one amongst the people of Tomis who can utter even basic Latin words ('unus in hoc nemo est populo qui forte Latine /quamlibet e medio reddere verba queat': Tr.5.7.53-54).

---

[38] For 'usce' see CIL 4.10195: 'Si qui(s) mi(hi) dicat surge fututum / si causa est{e} surga si mi[nu]s / us<q=C>(u)e <v=B>i<v=B>a(s) / puella mea emisti tib<i=E> (phallum)'; CIL 4.2437: C(aius) Alleius Astraga[l]us / curator / fuit IV Non(as) Dec(embres) us<q=C>(u)e ad / VI Eid(us) Dec(embres) M(arco) Agrip(pa) T(ito) Stat(ilio) co(n)s(ulibus) / Ce[3]ria C(ai) Iuli Heleni turma / C(ai) Iuli Hilari

In the meantime, in transliterating from Latin into Greek, the long syllable 'o' in 'Pontus', allows us to posit an omega within the word for 'worshipper' ('τεραπων'). Even were this vowel not long, Aristophanes' Scythian would have been all too ready to lengthen it. Another aspect of this Scythian's Greek is his marked predilection for elision[39]. Indeed the Scythian habit of eliding a final ν and ς before a consonant reflects the determinedly eliding nature of the Scythian's oral delivery. This latter point has a bearing on our presumed elision of 'Scythic[um] usque'. For, a Scythian presented with the text as it stands ('Scythicus ce-') would have felt moved to pronounce the words 'Scythicu' ce'. One result of this perspective, is the assumption that a Scythian will have meant something else by 'Scythicus ce-'. Thus, from our rhetorical perspective, we can be sure that linguistics is on our side in treating the existing text as a barbarised version of an authentic, classical text. The best way to Scythianise the text is to posit 'Scythic[um] usce' which both supports the eliding character of Scythian speech and also contains the typically Scythian deaspiration of 'usque' to 'usce'. Thus to the mind of a Tomitan Scythianised reader, the reading 'Scythic[um]usce τεραπων' is the only reading possible, with the exception of the aspirated theta in the word 'Scythic[um]. In this latter case, we suggest Ovid is able to have his cake and eat it. The proper noun 'Scythian' may be thought immune to the deaspirating tendency of the Scythians (who would in most circumstances use their own word for 'Scythian'). When obliged to utter the Greek word 'Scythian' the Scythians may have resisted the temptation to change the substantive that represents their national identity[40].Nevertheless, we will return to the possibility that 'Scyt' [h]ic' disguises another internal elision.

Whilst noting the deaspirated, 'Scythianised' version of 'tus' '(incense') viz-a-viz the Grecising 'thus', we can clarify the new text as follows:
'Scythicum usque θεραπων tus habet'.

This should mean 'the Worshipper uses Scythian incense continually' or 'the Worshipper has Scythian incense in his possession continually'. Now Scythian incense was a very particular form of incense, the latter being the well-known staple of Roman religious practise. We know from Herodotus (4.73 f) that the Scythians marked the death of a relative by *inter alia* constructing a tepee within the grave site with the intention of performing a rite. The celebrants, effectively sealed within their tent, would throw hemp seed upon white-hot stones which had been transported in copper vessels and placed in a hole in the middle of the floor. This procedure produced a concentrated narcotic haze which transported the celebrants into a collective state of semi-consciousness during which one supposes they communed with the deceased. However the use of this hemp was not restricted to religious contexts. Herodotus mentions the Scythians 'in wonderment howling' following absorption of the smoke. The wonderment suggests a stupor (the state known as 'stoned' today), while the howling may be a form of keening or an involuntary discharge of grief. Nevertheless the state of howling with 'the giggles' is also a well-known effect of the consumption of cannabis in modern times. For whatever reason Herodotus' Scythians were howling, they were letting off a form of primeval steam and it must have been the case that such a release will have appealed to individuals with no interest in the mourning process. This may also be demonstrated archaeologically by the ancient plundering of tombs, tombs from which the

---

[39] E.g elision and prodelision at Thesmophoriazusae 1187: 'κλαῦσί γ' ἂν μὴ 'νδον μένῃς'
[40] In Ceausescu's Romania, the word Romania and its cognate words were spelt with an 'a' (with a grave-acute diacritic) in the fourth letter. Elsewhere this letter was universally written as an 'i' (with the same diacritic)

ritual hardware such as mats that covered the tepee and the copper cauldrons are now missing. The robbers were perhaps hoping to use the materials for their own drug-fuelled soirees. On the other hand at least one example of all elements of the material culture relating to this ritual, as described by Herodotus (teepee supports, leather bottles for the seed, copper vessels complete with birch coverings for the handles) have been discovered in the Parzyryk Kurgan tomb complex[41].

Hesychius defines 'cannabis' as 'Scythian incense' and goes on to explain the cognate verb as signifying the use of cannabis in vapour-baths and sweat-cures. He also mentions the heating of the seeds as the source of the vapour. The Irish of more recent times (in a similarly harsh environment) used stone sweat-houses as a way of treating rheumatism brought on by the relentless damp of the bogs. A surviving example can be seen at Rousky in County Tyrone. In the matter of the use of ancient incense in general, the subsidiary literary sources and the archaeological findings fully support the account given in the *locus classicus* for Scythian incense, namely Herodotus 4.73 & 74, a passage employed passim in our earlier reconstruction of the procedure.

Returning to Ovid's subtext[42] (if its validity is assumed for a moment) the obvious points to emerge are that (a) 'the worshipper' must be Augustus and (b) given he was not a Scythian, any use on his part of Scythian Incense must relate to its medicinal properties or to its pleasure-inducing effects. One may assume that both reasons will have been in Augustus' mind, in view of his infirmities chief of which was the weakness in his left leg (Suetonius 80). However the adverb 'continually' also implies that the consumption of cannabis vapour had become an addiction, a condition which the word 'habet' ('uses' and 'has on his person') adequately complements. Meanwhile the word 'worshipper' carries a strong flavour of sarcasm and belittlement. It characterises Augustus as the pompous practitioner of religious ritual. However in this specific context it also satirises his religious posturing as being hypocritical lip service. Behind the veil of his public face, the 'Pontifex Maximus' and adherent of Apollo was indulging in the consumption of incense within a practice (or 'drug habit') that devalued both his own and the herb's role in the public and private rituals by which he affected to put such store.

As mentioned above we are also bound to consider the interpretation of 'Scythic[us]' as 'Scyt' [h]ic'. In considering this new text we recall that the Scythians in Aristophanes do not aspirate the first vowel of their Greek words. Similarly the rustic and plebeian Romans, and perhaps many others, were by the Late Republic ignoring the imperative in such words as '[h]ic' to pronounce the 'h'[43]. However the initial letter 'h' was always written and in the first instance that is what matters. Faced by our text, the Roman reader of Ovid, as one who is also conscious of the unaspirated plosives of the Scythians, will have had a natural tendency to attach the 'h' to 'ic'. The aspiration, that is, is detached from the plosive and added to the demonstrative, thereby disappearing as a sound in the mouths of many. In any event, the word

---

[41] The archaeologist concerned was the Russian S.I .Rudenko who subsequently wrote *The Frozen Tombs of Siberia* (1970). A useful summary of his findings appears in Christian Rätsch *The Encyclopedia of Psychoactive Plants: Ethnopharmacology and Its Applications. See also* Karl Jettmar *Skythen und Haschisch* (1981) in G. Volker *Rausch und Realitat* p.311.

[42] Scythicum usque θεραπων tus habet'.

[43] However, Cicero mentions the growing literary awareness of Greek aspirated plosives in the same period and their effect upon Latin (Brutus 160). See also Catullus 84 for late Republican self-consciousness about aspirations and their perceived value as an indicator of social status.

'hic' in our new text will agree with 'the Worshipper'. Meanwhile 'scyt' ('scut') itself could represent the elision of the Latin word 'scutum' (shield'). More probably, we are in the presence of the word 'scut[a]' meaning 'a flat pan'. This (in the diminutive) seems to have been used for heating wine whilst flavouring it with quinces and scented rushes (Plautus Persa 1.3.8). That Augustus ('this Worshipper') should have 'held incense in a pan used for heating wine' requires some explanation. In the hands of a 'worshipper' incense was burnt on an altar as a cheap offering to the gods, just as Ovid's birthday poem demonstrates in Tristia 5.5. This is the point at which the demonstrative in Tr. 3.4 gains force. '*This* particular' worshipper, it appears, does not burn incense in the ritual manner. Instead he uses it to flavour his mulled wine. In principle, that a member of the upper orders in Rome should add myrrh to inject fragrance into his wine will come as no surprise. Indeed, in bygone days, says Pliny, myrrh was the favourite source of flavouring for the best wines (14.92). Thus on the one hand our new text produces a verifiable observation on the treatment of wines in the highest social circles. This is important in bolstering the case for our subterranean text to be considered an intentional construct of the author's. An uncontroversial truism arising from a radical rehandling of the text is just the sort of combination that should inspire credence in alternative interpretations of the text as the sources of, for instance, the author's opinions. In this case Ovid's opinions are conveyed through the ironic labelling of Augustus as 'this worshipper'. Incense and Augustus had always been spoken of in the same religious breath. To have them juxtaposed within a different context is both disconcerting but also no more than is to be expected.

In sum, there were two ways in which incense was used by Romans of the imperial age. As a symbol of piety it was the humblest and therefore most common offering to the gods. It was virtually a symbol of Augustus' ritual-based reorganisation of Roman society. As 'the worshipper' himself *sans-pareil* Augustus' will be expected to have prioritised this religious use of incense. Instead 'this worshipper' uses it for his dinner parties where it flavoured the wine that was consumed with portions of cannabis-seed cake, as we shall see below.

The recreational use of cannabis was known in the ancient world though its medicinal properties were of more interest to the scientific writers. Many texts speak of its medicinal use against ear-worms and in cases of the nocturnal emissions of teenage boys. That is, cannabis was thought to 'dry up' the production of semen. Nevertheless its intoxicating effects are mentioned in several places. Galen in 'On the Properties of Foods' mentions the use of cannabis in snacks to accompany the liquid refreshment at drinking parties. The warming effect of the seed intoxicates quickly he says producing vapour in the head (unlike 'agnus castus'). Aetius seems to confirm the intoxicant nature of the seeds when heated (*Iatrica* 1.198: 'εἰ δε και φρρυχθειη …' = 'and if it has furthermore been roasted … [it warms the head and thereby intoxicates, sending up pharmacological vapours]'). Lastly fragment 13 of the comic poet Ephippus constitutes a list of snacks to be consumed at a symposium. These include 'cannibides' which on the model of 'sesamis' and 'sesamos' could refer to 'cannabis cakes' prepared with honey.

Galen exhibits concern with cannabis' side effects when used medicinally. The writer may be implying that the quantities required to stave off nocturnal emissions from adolescent boys were so great that they were always likely to intoxicate the immature body. In any case, the dangers of slipping from a medicinal dose of e.g. alcohol to an intoxicating dose were well

known in antiquity as the following anecdote in Pliny reveals. A certain judge Gaius Domitius fined a 'matrona' the sum of her dowry for exceeding the medicinal dose of wine without her husband's knowledge (14.90).

It is clear that addiction and the resulting dependence on drugs and alcohol was a concern to the ancients. We suggest that that concern is expressed in Ovid's subversive text 'Scythicum usce θεραπων tus habet'. We also suggest that the same text satirises the incense-touting worshipper-in-chief as rather a symposiast who used both incense and Scythian incense for private pleasure. In Ovid's subterranean narrative, Augustus is high on cannabis and steeped in alcohol more or less every day[44].

Appendix B:
Polyphemos the Grammarian: Odyssey 9

In Odyssey 9, Odysseus was not lying when he told the Cyclops his name was 'No-one'. We think that a form of Cockney Rhyming Slang was current amongst the Greeks such that someone who had the reputation for being 'Mr Clever Clogs' ('Μητις') was referred to laterally as Ὀὐτις' with the homonymic 'Μη τις' acting as the vital intermediary (= both 'Clevernesss' and 'No Man'). The rank-and-file would not have been allowed to address Odysseus as such but they must have known it was his nickname (Od. 9.367 refers to those allowed to address him as such as being *other than his crew*). It is entirely naturalistic to suppose that Odysseus' mother father and peer comrades called him, as it were, 'Clever Clogs'. In sum then, they will have have used the word 'Οὖτις' on the basis that it constituted an allusion to Odysseus' salient characteristic ('cleverness') through its synonym 'Μῆτις' (> 'no one').

In Cockney Rhyming Slang a nexus is formed of two words one of which rhymes closely with the target word. It is then the non-rhyming word that is used as the codified equivalent of the target word. Thus the word for 'wife' is 'trouble' on the basis that 'trouble and strife' rhymes with 'wife'. Of course the implication that marriage is a relationship that has its difficulties is also purveyed by the nexus. Odysseus is, we suggest, giving the Cyclops his true nickname which is 'Noman' but which everyone in his inner circle realises is the equivalent of 'μῆτις'. Odysseus describes it as 'a famous name' ('ὄνομα κλυτόν') and whilst this may be a wry comment on its wide currency, the scholiast at this point defines 'κλυτόν' ('famous') as '[the name] one is called' (i.e from κλυω''I call by a name'). Meanwhile Odysseus in saying that his mother, father, and 'all other comrades' call him 'Noman' convinces Polyphemus that the whole world knows him by this name.

However this is only a foretaste of the lengths to which Odysseus' exploits the slipperiness of words and of 'μῆτις' in particular. Once Polyphemus, the Cyclops, learns Odysseus' 'nickname' the guileless monster becomes enmeshed in a web-like matrix consisting of the words 'Μῆτις', 'Μῆ τις' 'μῆτις' and 'Οὖτις', words which lend themselves to unintended puns and alternative meanings.

---

[44] This daily cocktail is familiar enough in our own day. Those who have acquired power and status through unorthodox means will take drugs in the company of those with whom they enjoy a murky professional interdependency. The consumption of expensive drugs is an expression both of their material success and of their acute need to bond with those who could bring their world to its knees with one phone-call. One imagines Augustus inhaling in the presence of a trusted inner circle.

Our first example reveals how Homer's text is capable of a adapting itself to a fresh nuance of a word with the consequence that the text bifurcates into quite different strands. First of all, in line Odyssey 9.369 we momentarily read 'Οὗ τιν[α] εγω' or 'Οὗτιν[α] εγω' instead of 'Οὗτιν εγω'. Here we have made an assumption, namely that the last alpha of 'Οὗ τιν[α]' has been elided. This feeds into Homer's oral poetics. Taking his cue, as it were, from bards such as Demodocus viz-a-viz his audience, Homer addresses us in an oral key. His words however, in practice, are read. This allows us the best of both worlds. We have time to re-hear the 'oral' language as we re-read, and to re-situate ourselves in the narrative contexts of places such as the hall of the Phaeacians, as imagined by us. This regime allows us to accommodate ourselves to the oral imperative of the texts but at an analytical pace. From a practical perspective, as modern readers, we are using our eyes to re-hear. This is what Homer would have wished. He was a writer after all, not a bard.

In practical terms these poetics allow the reader to posit a range of elisions that could be thought to have been made by the notional reciter, sitting as it were on the reader's shoulder. On this basis then, the words 'Οὗ τιν[α] ἐγὼ πύματον ἔδομαι μετὰ οἷς ἑτάροισιν' could mean 'I will not devour anyone for the last time from amongst those companions' or (with 'Οὗτιν[α]') 'I will eat nobody from amongst those companions for the last time'. In saying these words, the Cyclops accidentally utters the riddling truth. It is in fact impossible to eat someone for the last time since that would imply that the person has already been eaten at least once before. Alternatively eating nobody 'for the last time' will be impossible since the first time one consumes anybody will inevitably constitute the single and unrepeatable occasion on which the person is consumed. Another way of interpreting the words is to suppose that 'Οὗ τιν[α] πύματον' means 'not … anyone … last'. It is however impossible not to eat anyone last in the sense that even if one only eats one person that person will be the last to be eaten assuming no more are eaten. And of course if one eats the sixth of six persons that person will be also be the last to be eaten. This where our understanding of the oral culture needs to be bookish. Just like Odysseus who will hear and accept these alternative texts as 'omens' guiding his path, so we are required to accept such reformulations as signs guiding our interpretation of the text. The signs suggest that Polyphemus has dined his last on human flesh. The reader, like Odysseus, has been warned.

However the name 'Οὗτιν' ('Noman'), if it is allowed to remain the object of the verb, can itself inspire further retranslations. Firstly, 'μετὰ οἷς ἑτάροισιν' could mean 'between the [two] companions'. On this reading Polyphemus' 'unintended meaning' fails yet again to make sense. If Polyphemus devours Odysseus (Nobody) 'between his companions' then Odysseus cannot be the last to be devoured. The meat of a sandwich is never the last thing to be devoured.Thus yet again we should understand Odysseus as taking heart from an oracular reception of Polyphemus' words.

Meanwhile Polyphemus' words can also be turned against him in order to characterise him as a sadist. The Cyclops always eats two men at a time (e.g. 9.289 & 311). If there were 12 men in the cave with Odysseus there will eventually be two left besides Odysseus. On the last night, promises Polyphemus, Odysseus will become the sandwich-filler by being consumed not so much 'after' as 'between his comrades'[45]. Here the word 'between' is interpreted spatially. Meanwhile in the following line the phrase 'τοὺς δ' ἄλλους πρόσθεν'

---

[45] It seems reasonable on the basis of this passage to advance the theory that the sandwich was known to the ancient Greeks.

could also be interpreted spatially rather than temporally. Polyphemus declares he will eat the rest of the men not just 'ahead of' but also 'in front of' Odysseus. Odysseus will be forced to watch his comrades' die in agony. He will endure such torture in reality during the passage of Scylla and Charybdis.

There is another, more metapoetic, reason for the subtextual understanding of the elided alpha on 'Οὖ τιν[α]'. Polyphemus is, etymologically speaking, 'the one who says a lot'. We might suppose then that his words are more expressive than they appear. Line 9.369 may be recast as follows: 'I shall not devour the end of [the word]'τιν[α]' *[where it occurs]* alongside *[the phrase]* 'his companions'' ('Οὖ τιν[α] ἐγὼ πύματον ἔδομαι μετὰ οἷς ἑτάροισιν'). This now constitutes Polyphemus' self-reflective comment on his use of words. Firstly, he implicitly admits to having swallowed ('elided') the end of 'τιν[α]'. This is an encouraging metapoetic communication from the author. It confirms we were correct to posit that an alpha on 'τιν[α]' *could have* once existed. Polyphemus' point however is that he will not repeat his swallowing of the letter 'alpha' *when it appears* 'alongside of / in company with [Odysseus'] companions', that is next to the letters of 'οἷς ἑτάροισιν'. Now any student of Greek will know that Polyphemus ought to swallow ('elide') the alpha on the end of 'μετὰ' since it is followed by a vowel[46]. Polyphemus also ought to change the tau to a theta on the end of μετ[ὰ] to take account of the ensuing aspiration. Homer does this in other contexts involving 'μετὰ' (e.g Odyssey 8.53: 'μεθ' αἷμά'). However *causa metri* Polyphemus has assumed a hiatus at 9.369. In prose or in a different part of the line Polyphemus would have said 'μεθ'οἷς' thereby eliminating the alpha. Here he is constrained by the metre. He therefore takes the opportunity to warn us that he will not swallow the alpha 'alongside of' the words 'οἷς ἑτάροισιν' in order that that we should not concern ourselves about the hiatus when we meet it. He is anxious that we should not try to emend the line on the assumption that the hiatus is a scibal error.

There is another very similar grammatical observation to be unearthed from these lines. To access this discourse we will be obliged to make a different assumption which contradicts our previous one. Despite this anomaly, we will proceed on the basis that one discourse will not be contaminated with another. Our new assumption is that the integrated word 'Οὖτιν' ('Noman') does not after all possess an elided alpha. Indeed the termination 'ν' had been confirmed as the accusative of 'Οὖτις' by Odysseus at 9.366. Thus Polyphemus could (indeed should) be referring to the letter 'ν' when he mentions 'swallowing the end of 'Οὖτιν'. Thus Polyphemus' fresh meaning is 'I will elide the letter 'ν' ('Οὖτιν... πύματον' = 'the end of [the word] Οὖτιν' = 'ν'). In this instance the negative 'οὖ' has disappeared having been absorbed by the name 'Οὖτιν'. Thus, on this reading, we cannot divide Οὖτιν ('Noman') into Οὖ τιν (no-one) since in that case 'τιν' would have to be understood as 'τιν[α]'. This would return us to the previous discourse. Now in some modern editions, but not others, the letter **'ν'** is appended to the end of the following words, namely 'μετὰ οἷς ἑτάροισιν'. If now the preposition 'μετὰ' is permitted to modulate into the meaning of 'after', then the following grammarian's observation can be extracted from within the text: 'I will swallow/elide the end of the word 'Οὖτιν', namely the letter 'ν', after (= 'at the end of') 'οἷς ἑτάροισι[ν]'. We should be grateful to Polyphemus for confirming the correct reading of the text since he would have been justified in including that 'ν'. The letter is regularly added to the final

---

[46] The word 'μετα' in compounds can mean 'at the back of' ('μεταυχενιος' 'μεταφρνενον'). In the context of numbers it means 'asides'.

syllable of a hexametric line when the following line starts with a vowel (e.g. Od.9.361-362: 'ἀφραδίῃσιν / αὐτὰρ'). The last syllable in the first of such a pair of lines would usually constitute a third declension dative plural ending, or an aorist third person singular, both of which would naturally end in an iota, thereby causing the rhapsode the (quite frequent) inconvenience of an interlinear hiatus[47]. However a nu is also added to the final syllable when the following line starts with the unvoiced dental tau (9.406-407; 9.427-428). The rhapsode clearly appreciated the ease with which 'ν' enjambs with 'τ'. However there are also occasions when 'ν' is not added before a following 'τ' (9.10-11& 9.440). Thus Polyphemus feels it is appropriate to warn the reader that on this occasion he will 'swallow' the letter 'ν'.

Appendix C:
The Conversation between Polyphemus and the other Cyclopes: Odyssey 9:
        The text of Odyssey 9 betrays further interest in the narratological possibilities opened up by the interplay of Μῆτις', 'Μῆ τις' and 'Οὖτις'. In lines 399f the other Cyclopes gather round Polyphemus' cave as the monster bellows in pain. His single eye has been extinguished by Odysseus. The last two questions put to Polyphemus contain our nexus 'μη τις' within what in Latin would be termed 'num' clauses ('τίπτε τόσον, Πολύφημ', ἀρημένος ὧδ' ἐβόησας / νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίην καὶ ἄυπνους ἄμμε τίθησθα; / ἦ μή τίς σευ μῆλα βροτῶν ἀέκοντος ἐλαύνει; / ἦ μή τίς σ' αὐτὸν κτείνει δόλῳ ἠὲ βίηφιν;': 9.403-406). The meanings of lines 405-406 are (a) '*Surely* it is *not* the case that *someone* amongst mortal men is driving off your flocks against your will' (b) 'or that someone is murdering you yourself by guile or by violence'. The order of the questions indicates that the other Cyclopes are confident that their questions will be met with the answer 'no'. They rank the possibility of Polyphemus being burgled above that of him being murdered. This immediately characterises them as sceptical of any threat to Polyphemus' life (but rather more concerned about pirates). However, given that they are standing around the cave they must be aware that the stone door is in place. The chances of successfully stealing Polyphemus' sheep with impunity are currently nil. The second question put by the Cyclopes should therefore be considered in the same vein. They cannot seriously believe Polyphemos is being murdered. They are merely bellowing out questions to encourage Polyphemos to engage with them. Their addition of rhetorical flourishes such as 'the ambrosial night' also serves to lighten the tone. However it is our contention that the distracted Polyphemus hears both these questions as though they begin with 'ἦ μῆτις' which, in Polyphemus' mind means 'Μῆτις' ('No-one'). That is, he assumes that 'Μῆτις' in the mouths of the other Cyclopes is the equivalent of 'Οὖτις' ('Noman') which he believes is the name of his assailant, Odysseus. Polyphemus' understandable fixation with 'Noman' brings him to a particular understanding of the questions put by the Cyclopes outside. These Cyclopes, he feels, are insinuating into their questions a tone mildly intended to avert a positive reply. Thus he takes the meaning of their words to be (a) 'It wouldn't be that either Noman among mortals is driving off your flocks against your will?' (b) 'Or that Noman is murdering you either by guile or by force?'
        This now makes Polyphemus' reply entirely naturalistic. The monster assumes in his distracted state that his 'friends' must be aware of Odysseus' visit to the cave. Their casual use of the phrase 'among mortals' in reference to Odysseus is taken by Polyphemus as

---

[47] See Od.9.461-462: 'θύραζε / ἐλθόντες'; 465-466: ἐπὶ νῆα / ἱκόμεθ'.

confirmation that they are familiar with the identity of 'Noman' as a mortal. He assumes they are using the form 'Μῆτις' instead of 'Οὖτις' in order to prompt from him a negative answer. In his terror he mostly ignores the first possibility suggested by the other Cyclopes, namely that Odysseus wishes to drive off his sheep. Yet sheep-rustling proves to be the means by which Odysseus' escapes and Polyphemus would have been well advised to consider its implications more deeply. To his undoing, the only word to which he ascribes any importance in line 403 is 'βροτων' ('mortals'), a detail which had been added by the others as mere verbal ornament.

Instead Polyphemus concentrates on the suggestion that 'Noman' is killing him. Yet Odysseus cannot kill Polyphemus without condemning himself to death. He would be a fool to murder him with the only access to the outside world (the cave entrance) now blocked. This should have told Polyphemus that his life was not in danger. However, thanks to the physical assault he has suffered Cyclopes is induced to focus his response around this question. Indeed he is heartened that the others seem to grasp his predicament namely that mortals are the issue. Nevertheless, in focusing on the second question, Polyphemus accords it prime importance. That is, he assumes the others have very good reasons for wanting to know whether he is being murdered by guile or by violence. Polyphemus thinks the question revolves around Odysseus' choice of 'modus operandi'.

In fact the other Cyclops have merely tacked on the two possible methods by which anyone could be killed in order to trick out their already somewhat rhetorical question, namely whether or not Polyphemus *is* being killed (which they find hard to believe). The tendency of the Cyclopes to add redundant detail should have been clear to Polyphemus from phrases like 'through the ambrosial night' and 'anyone/Noman *amongst men*'. Unfortunately his colleagues' otiose diction is fatally misinterpreted as germane to their meaning by Polyphemus. Thus Polyphemus now responds to the second question in the same merely factual key in which he thinks it has been framed. In doing so he correctly reconstitutes Odysseus' name as 'Οὖτις'.

He states that 'Noman is killing [him] by guile and not by violence'. To Polyphemus' mind his reply is perfectly tailored to the question. Unfortunately for him, the word 'οὐδε' although intended by Polyphemus to link the two parts of an antithesis ('by one thing *but not* by another') is received by the other Cyclopes as closely related syntactically to the prefix of 'Οὖτις' which they receive as 'οὖ τις' ('no one'). Thus the other Cyclopes assume Polyphemus means '*neither* by guile *nor* by violence [is anyone killing him] ('οὖ … οὖ[δε]'). This inadvertently renders Polyphemus' reply highly rhetorical in appearing to portentously omit the real reason for his distress. He seems to his colleagues to bawl out 'Friends! No one is killing me either by guile or by force'. To the ears of the others the usually courteous word 'friends' sounds condescending in the context of what ensues. For Polyphemus seems to implicitly accuse them of foolishness in asking the wrong question. The impression they are left with is that Polyphemus is bitterly and sarcastically repeating back the unnecessary detail they had appended ('neither by guile nor by force')[48]. His tone will sound rasping because of the pain, but it is received as being rasping from extreme irritation. These other Cyclopes are inadvertently made to feel it that they should already know the reasons for Polyphemus' distress. This deters them from further interrogation. Had there been some way in which their

---

[48] Compare the Romanian outburst 'Go to Hell both today and tomorrow' ('duceţi-vă la dracu' şi astăzi şi mâine').

physical intervention could have resolved Polyphemus' distress they would have felt themselves to be on firmer ground. They will assume that Polyphemus' ailment involves some form of psychological disturbance that he finds it impossible to explain (but which he may assume is known to the others in general terms). It is not unusual even today for people to be unable to describe or express the pain they feel as a result of mental illness. A sheepish silence will have followed Polyphemus' words during which each Cyclops will have mentally filled the gaps with their own imaginings.

Owing to their choice of a conditional clause, the reply of the other Cyclopes begins with the same fateful words 'μῆ τις'. Their meaning is the following: 'if on the one hand it is really the case that no one is inflicting violence upon you and there is no one there with you, then certainly it is not thus [by bawling] that one accords proper awe to a disease that comes from mighty Zeus. Instead you should pray to your father Lord Poseidon'.

First of all we propose an emendation in line 411 where we would replace 'οὔ πως' with 'οὐδ᾽ως' ('nor is it thus'). This now plays an important role in connecting line 411 with the words spoken at line 403 where the Cyclopes wanted to know why 'it was thus' ('ὧδ᾽ ἐβόησας') that Polyphemus was bawling. The second 'ως' at 411 now re-evokes the same bawling. Even without this alteration our translation will be seen to be radically different to the received interpretation of the text. To take the issues as they arise, the phrase 'οἷον ἐόντα' is intended to reassure the questioners themselves that they have understood the gist of Polyphemus' words which is that he is not being attacked by anyone in any way and that in fact he is alone. The speaker then suggests that since Polyphemus is safe and in no danger of suffering imminent harm, he should not be raising the roof about an illness he will have to come to terms with alone. We know that the Cyclopes lived with their wives and children in caves (Od.9.114-115). Polyphemus the bachelor was an exception and will have been thought to be somewhat odd even by Cyclopean standards (9.187-189). According to the others he is creating unnecessary alarm whilst at the same time 'failing to show due awe'[49] to a 'Holy Disease' which they suggest should be combatted by prayer. The basis of this disease they will imagine to be psychological and probably related to isolation. However they are unsympathetic to Polyphemus' exaggerated reaction.

---

[49] In the Odyssey the verb 'ἀλέασθαι' is paired with the verb 'δειδίμεν' ('to fear') in the mouth of Polyphemus himself ('ὅς με θεοὺς κέλεαι ἢ δειδίμεν ἢ ἀλέασθαι': 9.274). We should also note Polyphemus' use of the same verb as a participle at 9.277 (οὐδ᾽ ἂν ἐγὼ Διὸς ἔχθος ἀλευάμενος πεφιδοίμην';'nor would I spare you, *through being deterred by* the animus of Zeus'). The first context makes the case for the verb to be interpreted as 'I show awe towards'. It is true however that the received translation of 'ἀλέασθαι' at 9.411 ('to shun') also makes some sense in that context. The main objection to it however relates to its use at 9.274 where it would be illogical for the Cyclops to suggest that Odysseus had ordered him to 'shun' the gods. Odysseus was bidding Polyphemus to do the opposite, namely to respect and reverence Zeus Xenios who takes vengeance on those who maltreat strangers. If Odysseus has been 'ordering' the Cyclops to do anything, it was to 'show due awe'. Meanwhile the phrase 'δηΐων ἀνδρῶν ἀλεωρήν' (Iliad 12.57) contains the word ἀλεωρήν which is cognate with ἀλέασθαι. This noun 'ἀλεωρή' is paired with 'φοβος' at Iliad 24.216, creating a nexus one would have expected given the verbal equivalent 'δειδίμεν ἢ ἀλέασθαι' at Od. 9.274. The phrase 'δηΐων ἀνδρῶν ἀλεωρήν' stands in apposition to the stakes planted <u>in the bottom of the ditch</u> along the Greek wall at Troy. The words are usually rendered as 'a refuge against foemen'. However neither the bottom of the ditch nor, for that matter, the lips of the ditch are places where a Greek would have sought sanctuary from the hooves of Trojan horses. In any case the stakes in the ditch were as much a death-trap for Greek chariots returning from the plain as they were for their Trojan assailants. Thus 'ἀλεωρήν' is better interpreted in the Iliad passage as 'a deterrent *or* an object of awe [to warlike heroes]'. In general both meanings of 'to exhibit awe towards' an 'to feel deterred by' should be considered part of the heritage of the verb 'ἀλέασθαι'

The other Cyclopes would have sprung into action if Polyphemus had required their intervention to deal with and to dispense with puny mortals. However they realise there is nothing they can do for Polyphemus except take him to task for his unconscionable reaction to his psychological distress. His only recourse, they suggest, is to enlist the help of his father Poseidon against Zeus, the sender of the affliction. Later we learn that Poseidon is the only god from whom the Cyclops can expect help (9.520-521). Meanwhile we note that the practice of praying to one god to fend off the unwelcome attentions of another is the policy adopted by Ovid at Tristia 1.2.1ff. In sum, given the slippage in meaning between words being uttered and received (through a cave wall, amid groaning and weeping, in deep voices), the other Cyclopes cannot be expected to do more than offer reasonable advice. They think the monster is safe but deeply troubled.

Of course Polyphemus is confused and nonplussed by this response. This is because he hears the following message: 'Whether or not it is by guile that he [*Noman*] is wreaking violence upon you, with you being the sort you are, this at any rate is not the way of Mighty Zeus to escape a scurvy knave. Instead you should pray to your father Lord Poseidon'.

Polyphemus has tried to make sense of their words based on his understanding of the exchange so far. The phrase 'εἰ μὲν δὴ' he interprets as dismissive. In Xenophon's Anabasis (1.3.5) we find the general pondering the wisdom of a decision: 'εἰ μὲν δὴ δίκαια ποιήσω, οὐκ οἶδα· αἱρήσομαι δ' οὖν ὑμᾶς' ('whether I shall do what is correct (or not), I do not know; be that as it may, I will choose you'). The protasis in the Anabasis passage introduces a question the answer to which is of no little indifference to the speaker through the tone of 'εἰ μὲν δὴ' ('whether or not'). Unfortunately for Polyphemus he never thinks to question the uncaring tone he reads into his friends' reply as a result of his understanding of 'εἰ μὲν δὴ'. Furthermore, he is convinced he has interpreted 'μή τίς σε' correctly whereas in fact he is grossly mistaken.

Firstly, he naturally assumes those outside the cave will refer to his previous answer in their reply. He has made it clear that Odysseus is killing him *by guile*. Thus the words 'μή τίς σε' are received by him as 'μήτί[ς] σε'. He assumes his friends will not repeat 'Noman's' name having said it twice already in their opening barrage of questions. Instead (thinks Polyphemus) they rely on the implicit pronoun 'he' in the verb in order to allude to Noman. This leaves Polyphemus free to focus upon (and privilege) the phrase 'by guile' which can be recovered from the letters of 'μήτί[ς] σε' *assuming the two sigmas are heard as one*.

Homer's overriding theme in this passage is an age-old one. During human communication, especially when conditions are not optimum, we hear what we want to hear or what we expect to hear or what we have been primed to hear. Polyphemus is particularly concerned with Odysseus' guile and is therefore not in the least surprised to hear his 'friends' alluding to it early in their reply by way of a synonym in the same ablative case. However the phrase 'εἰ μὲν δὴ' has already suggested to him that the others are sceptical about the relevance of his reply. The combination of 'εἰ μὲν δὴ' and 'μήτι' convinces him of their indifference because he takes it to mean 'It does not matter whether it is by guile …'. He 'realises' they are irritated by what they perceive to be a pointless distinction between the two ways of being killed. He had made that reply in good faith but it has been interpreted (so he thinks) as though he were an Aristophanic hero who unfailingly addresses the least important part of a question when replying.

When he hears the following word 'βιάζεται' he is already resigned to his friends' irritability. Now he finds that the Cyclopes have downgraded their own definition of Odysseus' actions (which Polyphemus had upheld).Rather than Noman 'killing' Polyphemus, the other Cyclopes have (it seems to Polyphemus) decided that Noman is now merely 'perpetrating violence upon' him (if that). However until he had heard the word βιάζεται he had still been nonplussed by the fact that the other Cyclopes seemed to want to know the manner in which he was being killed only to treat the information when received as of little importance ('whether or not by guile …'). It 'dawns' on Polyphemus now that his protestations of murder in general are being sidelined by the others who use the word βιάζεται to further point up the fact that 'violence' is required to inflict violence. That is Polyphemus' rejection of *violence* as a reason for his *murder*, is now being doubly undermined by βιάζεται which both re-characterises Polyphemus's plight as 'less than critical' and insinuates that guile will not be enough on its own to do violence. Effectively, Polyphemus understands his fellow Cyclopes to be saying the following: 'leaving to one side the issue of violence being visited on someone by guile (i.e 'without violence') …'.[50]

Polyphemus, having 'heard' the first four feet of line 410 ('εἰ μὲν δὴ μήτί[ς] σε βιάζεται …') is however at least 'sure' that the others are aware that there is someone doing him violence. The emphatic position of 'μήτί[ς]' in their reply 'makes it clear'to him that their issue is not with the use of violence *per se* but with how that violence is being wrought. He is therefore wholly resistant to interpreting the words 'οἶον ἐόντα' (410) as 'with you being on your own'. The only sense he could possibly make of such a reading would be to suppose that the others think Odysseus is killing him telepathically. However such a concept will not form part of Polyphemus' simplistic understanding of human psychology. Instead Polyphemus assumes 'οἶον' is the homonym 'such as you are'. He now suspects the others are not just incredulous but poking fun. He thinks they are saying 'Whether or not it is by guile that someone is attacking you, with you being the sort you are,…'. In his mind they are putting him to shame in juxtaposing the use of violence through guile with his character. This insinuates that the reason one *would* visit violence on Polyphemus by guile is that he is a man of brute strength but guileless naivety.

This brings us to another possible construction Polyphemus could have put on the word 'οἶον'. This is one that crystallises the sort of character traits he thinks that the others have invested in him through their vague reference to himself as being 'such as he is'. For the word 'οἶος' also means 'sheepish'. This will have meant two things to the ancients: (a) 'dull-witted, docile, easily-led' (b) 'determined, blindly bullish in a duel'. This could be summarised as 'would be dangerous if they had a brain'. This character resumè provides a very close fit with the sort of creature that one might attack through guile. Polyphemus will 'realise' that he has been succinctly damned as the perfect victim of one who prefers subterfuge to a face-to-face encounter.In order to encapsulate Polyphemus' take on the last words of the other Cyclopes, a paraphrase will be found useful: 'Whether or not it is by guile

---

[50] The original reason Polyphemus had seized upon the word 'kills' (originally used by the other Cyclopes) is because he had considered himself to be in the process of being killed in stages through the workings of 'guilefulness'. He assumes he has been blinded in preparation for a second and final assault. Moreover, while he would not himself have drawn a hard distinction between death by violence and death by guile, he was simply answering the question put.

that he is attacking you - and given the sort of sheep-like person you are [who could blame him?],…

The other Cylcopes now proceed (thinks Polyphemus) to counterpoint him and Odysseus with Mighty Zeus and a knave ('νοῦσον … Διὸς μεγάλου'). In his sardonic reading of the text, Polyphemus construes the syntax in such a way that he finds the following jibe being levelled at him: 'not thus is it a mark of Mighty Jove to be awed by a knave'. Here they seem to Polyphemus to be teasing him by depicting the assailant as a knave threatening Zeus, the most powerful god in the pantheon. The implication is that Polyphemus as a type of Zeus should dispense with a troublesome ne'er-do-well in a manner fitting for the king of the gods. They seem to be suggesting that a fit of bawling will be both self-demeaning and of no avail to the Mighty Polyphemus faced with a scurvy plague of a fellow. Here the verb 'ἀλέασθαι' continues to bear the meaning of 'be awed by' (the very notion of which should cause Polyphemus acute embarrassment). The word 'νοῦσον' meanwhile followed by an objective genitive is used figuratively by Plato of a person ('νοῦσον πολεως' = 'the Bane of the City'). In sum, this line is designed (thinks Polyphemus) to make him feel sheepish about having caused a pandemonium over something that is in fact 'clearly not' an insurmountable obstacle.

At this point we would draw attention to another way Polyphemus may have construed the words he hears. He may have interpreted the participial phrase 'οἷον ἐόντα' as constituting his friends' reason for him not behaving as outlined in the following line. In other words 'οἷον ἐόντα' may be detached from 'εἰ μὲν δὴ μή τίς σε βιάζεται' and instead taken closely with 'νοῦσον γ' οὔ πως ἔστι Διὸς μεγάλου ἀλέασθαι' giving the following sense: 'whether or not it is by guile that he is attacking you [is of little consequence, but] - given the sort of fellow you are, it is not in the character of Mighty Zeus to show awe before / be deterred by a rascal'. In other words the construction of 'ἐστι + genitive' meaning 'it is [not] of the character of …' is intended to pick up 'οἷον ἐόντα' ('being the sort of character you are'). There is an implicit paralleling of the Mighty Zeus with the Mighty Cyclops and with their respective opponents as so many flies to be swotted. In Polyphemus' mind the final piece of advice dispensed by the other Cyclopes (that he should pray to his father Lord Poseidon) is of a piece with the previous line. It is an attempt, he thinks, to jolt him into realising the size of the mountain he is making from the smallest of molehills. To pray to his father to deliver him from such a minor inconvenience will constitute a major embarrassment. In Polyphemus' mind the others are appealing to his amour-propre to shame him into taking charge of the situation.

This explains Polyphemus' utter anguish. He will be too embarrassed now to show himself to the others. He will also be too embarrassed (and in fact too preoccupied with his immediate fate) to pray to Poseidon. He thereby gives everybody (inadvertently) a quiet night, for he knows that only by praying to Poseidon *can* he be healed (9.520-521). Ironically to pray to Poseidon was the advice the other Cyclopes had given him, but he had interpreted it as a way of shaming him into silence. Furthermore, the other Cyclopes (he thinks) have twitted him about the dimensions of the foe he is facing. He cannot now reveal how a puny mortal has brought him low. Instead, stung by comparisons to sheep, he tries to demonstrate he can meet 'μῆτις' with 'μῆτις'. However his own form of 'μῆτις' or 'cunning' is comically ineffectual. He sits in the doorway with the stone removed and feels for escapees 'among the

sheep'. Nevertheless, had he been more thorough such a plan would have served him well the next day.

In Line 414 Odysseus summarises the communicational debacle created by the word 'μῆτίς'. Firstly 'μῆτίς' as meaning Odysseus''guile' is active here in tandem with 'ἀμύμων' its adjective which will mean 'excellent'. However this 'excellence' lies in Odysseus' implicit linking of his name 'Οὖτις' to 'μῆτίς'. 'I laughed' he says, 'that *the name* I am called, 'Οὖτις' ('my nickname') along with *the innocent word* 'μῆτίς' (but also μητίς) had *deceived* him [Polyphemus]'. It is noteworthy here that the verb 'ἐξαπάτησεν' ('completely deceived') is in the singular third person. For only the word 'Οὖτις' plays a role in confounding the Cyclopes. The word 'μῆτίς' can be described as 'blameless' [of the deception] in never crossing Odysseus' lips. Neither is it ever mentioned by any of the Cyclopes. It is in being confused with other words that it is dragged into the plot. This 'innocence' however inevitably attaches itself to Odysseus' 'guile' 'μῆτίς'. Odysseus can claim to have never used his 'guile' to influence the conversation between the Cyclopes discussed above. For, as we have seen, we think that 'Οὖτις' was Odysseus' real nickname. Any role played by Odysseus''μῆτίς' or the word 'μητις' has to be laid at the door of the foolishness of others.

Further occurrences of 'μή τίς':

There is another occurrence of 'μῆτιν' at 9.422 where Odysseus is said to 'weave' his cunning. We suggest that we are to take 'weaving' here in a metapoetic sense namely as a sign that the letters of the word 'μῆτιν' should be 'woven'. That is, an anagram of 'μῆτιν' would appropriately represent the product of Odysseus' literary weaving. The most obvious term that constitutes such an anagram is 'τιμην' ('retribution, penalty, punishment'). Given the proven mobility of the letters of 'μῆτιν' we suggest it is reasonable to imagine Odysseus weaving his revenge on Polyphemus from the raw material of his cunning[51].

Meanwhile at 9.376-377 the nexus 'μή τίς' recurs. Here it should mean '*lest anyone* take fright and retire ['I encouraged them] ('ἔπεσσι δὲ πάντας ἑταίρους / θάρσυνον, μή τίς μοι ὑποδείσας ἀναδύη'). However if we create the word μῆτίς and assume the elision of the letter 'α' at the end of 'ὑποδείσας' then the following meaning emerges: 'should my guilefulness take fright and shrink back, I encouraged all my companions with words'. Here we access the vulnerable Odysseus whose fragile inner confidence is papered over by an outward display of captaincy. He cries out words of encouragement to his men but they are also there to deafen any silent inner void that might appear during the protracted preparation of the stake that will blind the Cyclops. Odysseus shows his hidden human side appropriately through a hidden seam of the text. Yet it also worth considering 'μῆτίς' here as 'Noman' or Odysseus' *alter ego*. After all, that is his name as far as the sleeping Cyclops is concerned. With the polymorphic text ringing the changes, Noman emerges as the embodiment of Odysseus' unseen, vulnerable side. As 'Noman', he technically does not exist and is an aspect of self which Odysseus deliberately keeps invisible to the crew (who, as we have seen, are not amongst those colleagues who use this nickname of him). However between Odysseus and

---

[51] One wonders if the two words 'καὶ μῆτιν' are not intended to be woven into a word such as 'ἱμαντικη' which might well have meant 'the art of weaving' on the model of 'πλαστικη' ('the plastic arts') or 'μαντικη' ('the art of divination'). This would be an appropriate way of confirming that the search for anagrams was not misguided. In fact a poetics of 'torn and scattered members' will only reach its fullest expression through anagrams

the reader, the shadowy literary form of 'Noman' acts as a mediator of the invisible aspects of character.

Lastly, the nexus 'μή τίς' bookends Odyssey 9 making the phrase the touchstone of Homer's literary poetics. The two passages are 9.41-42 ('… καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ λαβόντες / δασσάμεθ', ὡς μή τίς μοι ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσης') and 9.548-549 ('μῆλα δὲ Κύκλωπος γλαφυρῆς ἐκ νηὸς ἑλόντες / δασσάμεθ', ὡς μή τίς μοι ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσης'). In many ways this is the perfect illustration of the problem with Homeric studies. The cosy habit of glossing over rather than reading apparently formulaic poetry has lulled readers into assuming that any two lines that seem identical are identical. A consequence of this attitude to the text is that it colours our reception of the author himself. Thus we imagine that while he may be in the vanguard of a new generation of literate bards he is nevertheless rooted in a tradition which both maintains literary momentum and supplements creativity by the repetition of largely generic passages[52]. Our view is that Homer has hoodwinked everyone. His bardic pose is a posture. The old-world aroma that hangs over him is of his creation. However as willing adorants of his 'primal authenticity' we have built an impenetrable shrine around his 'bible'. From a literary standpoint we are his least ideal readers for we steadfastly refuse to 'read' him.

The first line at Odyssey 9.42 is translated much as we would expect. The booty from the sack of the Cicones is divided up 'so that no one might go defrauded of his equal share'. However when the moment comes to divide spoil after the blinding of Polyphemus, although the same text resurfaces, its words have moved on. First of all we should examine the background to the sheep-sharing at the end of Book 9. There are 19 sheep to be divided since, besides Odysseus' single ram, there had been three sheep supporting each of the survivors of Polyphemus' cave. There were 6 of these survivors since of the 12 men who had accompanied Odysseus to the Cyclopes' cave, 6 had been eaten by Polyphemus. Thus, an equal division of the 18 sheep amongst the 12 ships will mean 1.5 sheep per ship. One half and one whole sheep per ship. Odysseus' division of the sheep at the close of Book 9 is in fact a physical one. The flock is dismembered in order that 1.5 sheep can be distributed to each contingent of men. The word for such a number in Greek is 'ἡμιολιος'. However 'ἡμιολια' is also the term for a pirate-ship with 1.5 banks of oars on each side. There is a possible connection between 'banks of oars' and 'sheep'. The rank-and-file rowers of a hemiola must have comprised three teams, two banks forward and one aft. Such teams may have been referred to colloquially as 'flocks' [of sheep]. Given that rustling sheep will have been a major part of the crew's daily work, it seems quite likely that these rowers will have been identified with the creatures that lay beneath their feet. Significantly, the word for 'flock' [of sheep], namely 'ποιμνη', is used uniquely by Homer in the context of the lack of such flocks on the island opposite that of the Cyclopes' (Od.9.122). Meanwhile in Aeschylus the same word 'ποιμνη' is used disparagingly of the Furies (Eumenides 197) and self-disparagingly of the 'wretched Suppliant chorus' (Suppliants 642). On the other hand it is also used of the followers of Christ in the New Testament.

Thus at the end of Book 9, the one and a half sheep per ship evoke, we suggest, the one and a half banks of rowers of a hemiola. There are further such verbal connections that bind the narrative of the Cyclopes together. The word 'κελλας' means 'one-eyed' while

---

[52] Alternatively the image we have of Homer influences our reading habits when we come across 'formulaic lines'

'κελες' refers to another fast pirate-craft and 'κελω' is the verb 'I drive a ship onto shore, beach' Such beaching is a feature of Book 9 from beginning to end (9.130-131; 546). Meanwhile monocularity and piracy are also pervasive motifs. The piratical instinct of Odysseus' crew is clear at 9.224f. When they do not find Polyphemus at home, they try to convince Odysseus to seize the moment and drive the flocks back to the ship. When later Polyphemus sees the men in the cave one of his first instincts is to wonder if they are pirates (9.252f). And, as we have seen, Polyphemus' screams of distress are initially presumed by his friends to be provoked by an act of piracy perpetrated on his flocks (9.404f).

Thus Homer's tableau on the beach at the end of Book 9 is sequined with references to (often invisible) key words of very similar morphologies. These provide the narrative with a quasi-etymological thread by which to find its way. These sequins also highlight the underlying themes of the passage. Whether or not Odysseus had a ship similar to a 'hemiolia' or 'keles' is less important than the role of these ships as allusive thematic markers in the text. For, at the close of Odyssey 9 Odysseus reverts to being the pirate master *extraordinaire*, just as he was at the beginning during the raid on the Cicones.

We turn now to the examination of line 9.549 quoted above. Odysseus' insistence that all the ships get the same amount of ovine flesh is his way of inculcating a democratic and cohesive spirit amongst the crew, only some of whom have merited special treatment. Further details regarding the reasons for his decision emerge from a lateral interpretation of the text. The word 'ἀτεμβόμενος' could mean 'carping at' or 'dissatisfied at' even 'vexed at' (+ dative). Thus the sentence could suggest that Odysseus has shared out the sheep equally 'in order that no one might leave [the island] disgruntled with [him] over their share'. Or the same words could suggest that the division of sheep was arranged so that 'no one might leave disgruntled / perplexed over *my* share'. Here the dative is possessive. Odysseus gets the ram but only after it is assigned to him by the crews as a special gift outside of the democratic process[53]. The sharing is transparent, as is Odysseus' receipt of the extra gift. There is no room for 'fault-finding' or 'perplexity' ('ἀτεμβόμενος'). Thus the translation 'that no one may leave the island with an axe to grind' also has some relevance. Lastly the dative of 'me' could be considered to be of the agent rather than dependent upon the participle. This would give a meaning of 'that no one should leave [the island] being cheated by me of their share'. An important aspect of these renderings is the local application of the verb. We assume that the fleet is about to *leave the island* and that it is their collective morale upon departure that is at stake here. Odysseus is a forward-thinking leader.

Another approach to the line is to view the process of 'sharing' or 'division' as applicable to the words of the text. That is the phrase δασσάμεθ', ὡς μή τίς could mean 'we cut apart 'μήτίς' thus' [i.e. μή τίς]. That is, we 'divided up the word 'plan' or (allegorically) 'we devised a plan that involved cutting in pieces'. In sum, if for a moment we consider line 549 to contain the word 'μήτίς' ('plan'), then that plan ('μήτίς') must consist in the process of 'sharing', that is, in 'division' ('μή τίς'), for μήτίς as an integral feminine noun cannot in any

---

[53] Note that this most nondescript of names is described as 'κλυτον' 'glorious' by Odysseus at 9.364. This is echoed by 'ἀμυμων' (9.414) in its nuance of 'excellent'. However 'κλυτον' in deriving from the verb 'κλυω' has an etymological sense of 'heard' or 'called' and it will be the inadvertent and misleading 'hearing' of the 'called' words 'μήτίς' 'μή τίς' 'Μήτίς' that will confound the Cyclops. When Odysseus is described as 'πολυμήτίς' ('of many wiles') in the first line of the Book we are not yet aware that this word has a very literal application. The word 'μήτίς' has 'many' forms and each of them is exploited by Odysseus who can therefore be defined as being 'of many wiles' in a literal sense and also, as a direct consequence, in a more general sense.

case enter the line grammatically. This 'division', which we 'have executed' ('δασσάμεθ'), produces satisfaction for the whole fleet because the sentence now reads 'that no one should go cheated of their share'[54]. A 'plan'('μῆτίς') consisting in 'dividing up' ('μή τίς') produces something for everyone. The fissiveness of words is here used as an allegory to express the workings of a fair society. To cut is to share.

Appendix D:
Ovid's Poetics of Exile:

Introduction: Tuticanus (Ex Ponto 4.12)
A signal difference between Ovid's two collections of exile letters, the Tristia and Ex Ponto, lies in the fact that the addressees of the Tristia are not overtly named. The Ex Ponto by contrast contains letters addressed to some of the most famous men of the late Augustan Age. Despite this, there are some individuals in the ExPonto about whom nothing is known except their names and whatever details Ovid himself chooses to reveal about them. In such circumstances the names themselves must take on a particular importance. In this article we propose to consider one such addressee, Tuticanus, to whom poem 4.12 is dedicated. It is hoped to show that the text alludes to, and interacts with, his name in various ways, ways which, in their turn, may assist in the formation of a methodology to isolate and detect the hitherto anonymous addressees of the relevant letters of the Tristia. For at least one of the addressees of the Tristia is made aware that they are the object of Ovid's attention. Ovid has alluded to the individual, not by name but by highly diagnostic 'signs', ('positis pro nomine signis': Tristia 1.5.7).

The Issue:
Tuticanus has a unique claim to fame. Ovid apologises to him for having excluded him from his exilic poetry until the twelfth letter of his last book (Ex Ponto 4.12). The reason for the omission is that the name 'Tuticanus' cannot be inserted into the metre of Ovid's elegiac couplet due to the order in which the long and short syllables of his name occur. In brief, a short syllable sandwiched by two long syllables instantly disqualifies Tūtĭcānus from a place in the elegiac couplet. Ovid could have circumvented the problem, he says, by ending one line with 'Tūtĭ' and beginning the next with 'cānus'. However he claims that, as a poet, he risked ridicule in severing a name in this way. Such a procedure, he says, would create 'vitia' ('shortcomings' 'infelicities')[55].

Ovid's text as self-confessedly containing flaws and barbarisms:
However the word 'vitium' and its cognate 'vitiosum' are used throughout the exilic corpus in contexts that suggest not merely the possibility of finding 'defects' ('si sint vitiosa … carmina' Ex P. 4.13.17), but even the certainty of finding them ('siqua meis fuerint, *ut erunt*, vitiosa libellis': Tr.4.1.1)[56]. These indisputable shortcomings are to be forgiven, says

---

[54] Given the past tense of 'δασσάμεθ' the 'cutting' of the word 'μῆτίς' is a given. We will search in vain for 'Noman'. He plays no part in a plan that is fundamentally and necessarily about 'division'.

[55] 4.12.15-16. Note that the word 'corrumpere' suggests etymologically the 'breaking up' of the name Tuticanus. It also suggests the improper etymological handling of a name. See OLD s.v. 'corruptus'.

[56] Compare Ex Ponto 3.9.5: 'o, quam de multis vitium reprehenditur unum'

Ovid, by reason of 'their time' 'excusata suo tempore, lector, habe'). This 'temporal' excuse had been established as early as Tristia 1.1 where the quality of the libellus was to be assessed in the light of its 'time' (Tristia 1.1.37-38: 'quaesito tempore tutus eris'). But 'time' means more than merely 'the current circumstances under which one lives'. Ovid signals his interest in other nuances of 'tempus ' by alluding to its meaning of 'weather' in metaphors that evoke his 'beclouded' state (Tristia 1.1.39-43; 1.9.6). If we investigate the meanings of 'tempus' even further we find it also means 'length of syllabic sound'. This encourages us to speculate that the solecisms that will occur in these poems will be, amongst others, metrical ones.

Apropos of metre, when we reinterpret the poet as not 'seeming' but 'being deemed' to be able to write in Getic metres ('*videor* Geticis scribere posse modis': Tr.3.14.48), we have abandoned the poet's subjective impression ('I seem to be able'), in favour of an objective assessment of an acquired talent. Furthermore, when Ovid admits to 'fearing' that Pontic diction has been intruded into his Latin writings ('timeo ne … Latinis / in … meis scriptis Pontica verba legas': Tr.3.14.40-50), this fear should be considered 'polite' ('I am afraid you are reading …') rather than 'emotional'. The former interpretation suggests Ovid's resignation in the face of a 'fait accompli'. Ovid apologises to his readers for the barbarisms they are encountering. Eventually at Ex Ponto 4.13.17-20 the poet admits to having written a poem in Latin metres which contains nothing but barbarian words. His protestations of embarrassment must be formulaic, since the use of Getic diction here is a conscious choice ('a! pudet, / structa … sunt nostris barbara verba modis'; 'Ah I to my shame barbarian words have been built into our metres': Ex P. 4.13.20). In conclusion, the rattling of Getic quivers in appreciation of Ovid's Getic poem about Augustus may be considered an allegorical vignette intended as a 'reductio ad absurdum' of Ovid's predicament. Ovid's 'vitia' are now so pervasive that no Latin words remain in his poetry.

There is evidence therefore that Ovid knew he had included Getic words and committed metrical solecisms in his writings from Tomis. In the first Tuticanus poem however, his strategy seems to be to avoid any (further) loss of face by taking the reader through the mistakes he vows not to commit. It is as if the author, embattled by his own declining powers, wishes us to see with our own eyes that he is still capable of raising his metapoetical drawbridge.

The word 'modo':
Ovid alludes discreetly to this deterioration in his metre in line 4 of our poem. On the face of it this line is simply a sardonic, self-mocking swipe at Ovid's own poetry and the dubious distinction it confers ('est aliquis nostrum si modo carmen honor': 'if in some way our poetry does constitute an honour of sorts'). However Ovid has deliberately provoked interest in this poem's metre. The reader is thus suborned into taking a closer look at the word 'modo' ('in some way'). Under pressure from 'modos' ('metres') in line 6, the reader is tempted to see the ablative of 'modus', in 'modo', which would produce the meaning of 'in [its] metre'. Clearly 'modo' if it *were* intended to mean 'in the metre' would scan differently ('mŏdō not mŏdŏ'). But the reader is momentarily wrong-footed, especially because mŏdŏ had been scanned as mŏdō by earlier poets[57]. Furthermore the word quōmŏdō had been used 'in tmesi' by elegiac poets in order to allow them the latitude to read the second member

---

[57] Catullus 10.7

('mŏdŏ') as 'mŏdō'. The poem under discussion, in self-consciously foregrounding the issue of scansion, beguiles the reader into rereading the line to make sure 'mŏdŏ' is not 'mŏdō'.

The re-reading of this line is also part of the agenda of poem 4.14.1-2 which is also addressed to Tuticanus. There the word 'mŏdŏ' reappears in a reference to 4.12's 'recently made' ('modo') complaint that Tuticanus' name is unconducive to Ovid's metre. In 4.14 the juxtaposition of 'modo' with 'carmine' ('metrical song') forcibly thrusts the issue of the scansion of the [word] 'metre' ('modo') upon the reader who may even begin to wonder how conducive to the metre Ovid's words in general are *intended* to be. The reason why Ovid creates metrical discomfort for himself in the intrusion of the name 'Tuticanus' is to create corresponding metrical doubt in the reader. This is crystallised - even allegorised - in the reader's doubt over the word 'metre'.

The lines Ex Ponto 4.14-1-2 are also open to reinterpretation in general. Ovid's use of the negative is notoriously problematical. He frequently seems to attach 'non' or 'nec' to one particular word in a clause, though the reader's uncertainty over which word to negativise is quite possibly an intentional result of Ovid's strategy. Thus at Ars Amatoria 3.665 we cannot besure whether 'nec nimium vobis formosa ancilla ministret' means (a) 'do not let the all-too-beautiful maid minister to you' or (b) 'do not let the beautiful maid minister to you overmuch'. At Ex Ponto 4.14.1-2 nothing prevents 'non' attaching itself to the verb. One could then reconstrue the sentence as follows: 'these words are sent to you, whom I did not complain had a name suited by metre to my metrical lengths'. Ovid might complain that the nameTuticanus cannot be inserted into an elegiac couplet but that is a different issue. Ovid, that is, is content with the scansion of Tuticanus' name because his own *schema metricum* also falls short of that expected of the standard elegiac couplet. In other words, Ovid's defective metres (illustrated by 'modo') can easily accommodate the word 'Tuticanus'.

Alternatively if in the couplet under discussion 'aptum' agrees with 'quem', the following wry comment can be recovered: '… [you Tuticanus] whom in a poem I did not complain of as being fitted *by metre* to derive your etymology by reference to my metrical lengths'[58]. Here Ovid's true purpose in 4.12 is revealed. In Ovid, the phrase 'nomen habere' regularly used in the sense 'to derive [one's] etymology' (*Amores* 1.8.3 [on the bibulous Dipsas]: 'ex re nomen habet'; *Ars Amatoria* 3.177 [on 'Helle' deriving from 'Hellespont']: 'habet quoque nomen ab undis'). Ovid's meaning is that the word 'Tuticanus' by being as untrammelled by the elegiac *schema metricum* as Ovid's own verse will be able to access etymological roots that are expressed in the poem through words, the scansion of which will not match the syllabic quantities normally borne by 'Tuticanus'. Ovid superficially may have complained that the name Tuticanus was not suited to the elegiac metre. But he did not complain (= 'he is now quite content') that 'Tuticanus' negotiable metrical quantities (as revealed by Ex Ponto 4.12.10-11) should render it capable of being etymologised by reference to Ovid's own flexible metrical units (exemplified by the interpretation of 'modo' at Ex Ponto 4.14.1). Heretical as it may sound, Ovid's metrical lengths are not monolithic quantities designed exclusively to fit the straitjacket of the elegiac couplet. Instead they are flexible entities that modulate as suits the author's purpose, just as the scansion of 'Tuticanus' fluctuates 'within the poem' ('carmine'). In sum, Tuticanus can expect to find himself etymologised using roots the syllabic lengths of which may not match the canonical scansion

---

[58] 'Haec tibi mittuntur, quem sum modo carmine questus / non aptum numeris nomen habere meis'

of the syllables of 'Tuticanus'. This approach will be adopted in our own analysis of the etymologies of Tuticanus later in this work.

Returning to 'modo' in poem 4.12, an unorthodox interpretation of the word (which the reader ought to reject on metrical grounds) presents itself: 'if our [current] poem in its metre[59] [and 'in its word 'metre''] constitutes any honour …' ('est aliquis nostrum si mŏdō carmen honor'). Thus interpreted, the line both exemplifies Ovid's declining grasp of metre (ironically exemplified in the word 'metre' itself, namely 'mŏdō') and conveys by its meaning the naturalistic embarrassment that such a development occasions Ovid. The unmetricality of the line provides support for the sentiment expressed, whilst the sentiment expressed points to the existence of the metrical anomalies which are a *sine qua non* of the unearthing of the sentiment. The mutually-reinforcing meaning and metre oblige the reader to embrace the metrical solecism. On the one hand this emergence of 'mŏdō' looks back to the poetics of decline articulated by the self-critical passages we have observed above. On the other hand, along with those other passages, line 6 of Ex Ponto 4.12 now also issues a challenge to the reader to find other metrical anomalies within the exilic corpus. Two such anomalies occur in Tristia 3.9.

Pontic words amidst Latin writings and a metrical anomaly: Tristia 3.9.3

In a poem concerning the etymology of the word 'Tomis' Ovid tells an apparently routine story or aition explaining the events which led to the the name Tomis being derived from the Greek verb 'τεμνω' ('I cut'). He begins in a deceptively conversational key. 'Even here there are Greek cities … amidst the names of wild barbaricum'. One assumes 'here' means 'the Western Black Sea coast around Tomis'. Meanwhile Ovid's deft use of 'quoque' ('even') continues the didactic tone which is reinforced by 'quis crederet' ('Who would credit it? Even here …'). Ovid purports to be opening the reader's eyes to an extraordinary phenomenon. However the existence of Greek cities along the western seaboard of the Black Sea will have been anything but a revelation to Ovid's readership. Five centuries earlier, a Milesian colony, Histria had been mentioned by Herodotus as the point where the Danube entered the Black Sea (2.33). The same author notes that Scyles, the King of Scythia, had been taught Greek by his Histrian mother. The thoroughly Hellenised king later spends a month at a time behaving and dressing as a Greek within a different Black Sea coastal colony, that of Borysthenes (4.78). Thus, to the Romans back in Rome, Ovid's 'exposé' will merely furnish further evidence of his declining powers. Any Roman reader of Herodotus will have known there was a string of Greek cities on the western seaboard of the Euxine that were models of Hellenism. Ovid seems to be presenting old news as new.

However this prompts the thought that a different version of these words might present a more favourable view of Ovid the didactic poet. It is curious that Ovid's Greek cities are planted not among Getic villages or 'oppida' but rather among barbarian 'terms' or 'words'. It is as if he is here referring to the textual words rather than the settlements themselves. Thus the word 'here' could just as well refer to 'this poem'. On this reading 'hic quoque' would mean 'even in this poem', thereby producing the meaning that [the words for] Greek cities are planted amongst barbarian 'terms' ('nomina'), 'even' on Ovid's page. Alternatively 'quoque' could be interpreted as 'too' thereby conveying the notion that the

---

[59] Note the juxtaposition in the same *sedes* of 'modo carmen' at 4.12.4 and of 'modo carmine' at 4.14.1. 'Carmen' in these contexts refers to the specific poem itself.

phenomenon of Greek elements existing within a barbarian milieu obtains both in reality and in literature. The word 'nomina' ('words') and the abstract sense of 'barbariae' ('barbarian speech') conspire to support the literary-allegorical interpretation. Thus an unorthodox reading of the line produces the following sense: '[not just on the coast of Romania] but also/even here [in this poem] there are [the names of] Greek cities amongst words of the uncivilised barbarian tongue'. The aside 'quis crederet' which has hitherto reinforced the didactic tone ('Who would believe there were Greek cities here?) now acts as a challenge to the reader ('who' asks Ovid 'would give credence [to such a reading]?'). The question is anything but rhetorical. Ovid is demanding a response from the individual reader who is pressed into engaging with the author in the search for the names of Greek cities amongst unintelligible barbarisms.

The anaphora of 'hic quoque … / huc quoque' (3.9.3) reinforces the didactic tone of astonishment. We learn that 'even to here [Tomis] came Miletan colonists who founded Greek homes amongst the Getae'. However the facts do not bear out the implied remoteness of the Getan coast. Miletus founded over 60 colonies in the Black Sea many of them (e.g. Panticipaeum, Olbia) much further afield than Tomis. Once again Ovid seems to betray naivety in his understanding of history and demography. However the word 'domos' now attracts the attention of the reader who is reluctant to assume Ovid is as naïve as his words suggest. On the face of it, 'domos' articulates the elements ('homes') that constitute a city, as well as the sense of collective 'homes' constituting a 'city'. However a synonym of 'domos', namely '*sedes*', is used by Horace (*Ars Poetica* 257) to express each of the 6 'feet' of a iambic trimeter. Thus the word 'domos', as well as referring to a Greek city amongst the Getae, could be construed as an indirect, allegorical reference to the metrical divisions of a line of poetry, to either side of which lie 'Getic' elements.

The first four lines of Tristia 3.9 are therefore conducive to a bilateral interpretation which in turn suggests that an allegorical schema may be operative. Line 3 produces the first justification for such a reading. The words 'Mīlētō mīssī' contain the unmetrical word **tŏmis** at their heart: 'Mile / **Tŏmīs** / si'. Many centuries earlier, a Greek town called Tomis had appeared amongst the Getae on the Black Sea coast. Miletan Greeks had established their homes amongst the Getae. This process now becomes the allegorical basis of a development which many will find extraordinary ('quis crederet?') What beggars belief is not the process of colonisation *per se* but the fact that the name of that Greek town ('Tomis') forms a iambus, namely a Greek metrical 'sedes' ('Graias … domos'). The disruption this causes to the words on either side of 'Tomis' produces unintelligible, verbal fragments which are represented in the allegory as 'Getic terms' ('inter inhumanae nomina barbariae'). Ovid's lines allegorise the way he would wish his verse to be read. Amid the words of barbarian speech there are Greek cities. However in constituting a Greek metrical 'home', the word Tomis identities itself as a iambus foot (**Tŏmīs)** which should have no place in the hexametrical *schema metricum*.

If one engages with this allegorical reading of the text then one may speculate as to how far this allegorical schema may be pressed, and whether the allegorising may flow backwards in the opposite direction. That is, Ovid may be encouraging us to consider the intrusion of Greeks into the Getic homelands as having the effect of characterising (indeed rendering) all around as 'measureless barbaricum with its incomprehensible languages'. That is, before we, the readers, intruded 'Tomis' into the text, the line reflected a sense of orderliness and linguistic comprehensibility. The pre-colonial Getic civilisation will have

corresponded to the civilised quality of the metrically sound 'huc quoque Mileto missi uenere coloni'. However, the introduction of a Greek colony into the line (Tŏmīs) along with its ill-fitting Greek metre, allegorically imposes a Greek perspective upon the Getic culture which is now rendered 'peripheral' and (in becoming 'unmetrical') 'uncivilised'. On this reading 'barbaricum' becomes a transforming side-effect of the intruding of Greek colonies into indigenous civilisations.

From another perspective, with the word **Tŏmīs** now intruded into the line, Ovid's hexameter also exemplifies the metrical deficiencies to which the poet alludes *passim* in the exilic poems. 'Tomis' also serves as an omen of the ametrical readings of the word 'Tuticanus'. However there is another, etymological aspect attaching to the emergence of 'Tomis' here. The shunting together of 'to' and 'mis' emblematises the way the roots of a word were thought to become fused together in the process of a word's formation. Cicero calls the reverse process (that of extracting etymologies) 'enodatio' or 'unknotting'. The knotting process generally involved the shedding of letters at the junction of the melded roots (e.g. **ornatus** quasi ab **or[e] natus':** Varro DLL 5.129)[60]. In Tristia 3.9.3 however the reverse is true,[61] for the letters are shed from the outer perimeters of the words. Overall, the process produces a derivation of 'Tomis' ('those sent from Miletus'; 'Mile**to mis**si') that is highly accurate and constitutes a common form of etymology which ancient grammarians would have termed 'vis est ab re' ('the derivation derives from reality')[62].

The theme of the poem (the etymology of Tomis) guarantees that the emergence of Tomis here as an etymology is not wishful thinking. Moreover, the overt etymology of 'Tomis', which is offered at line 34 (> 'τεμνω' ['temno'] 'I sever'), is highly relevant to the methodology by which Tomis is unearthed from 'Mileto missi'. For the words 'Mileto' and 'missi' have to be 'severed' in order that the word Tomis may be formed from the 'membra' of the line. This leads us to the figure of Absyrtus whose body is dismembered by his sister Medea in the *aition* that explains the etymology of 'cutting'.

Tristia 3.9 and the Etymology of Tomis: the Poetics of the Exchange of Letters:

Tristia 3.9 contains more than one redivision. And indeed another 'unknotted' etymology emerges from a dismemberment of the phrase 'aliq**ua fra**ude' (line 20). Medea is seeking to flee the pursuit of her father Aeetes whom she needs to delay 'by', as she says, 'some trick'. But the (appropriately) feminine adjective '**uafra**' ('clever in strategy') emerges from within the midst of this collocation once the words are severed and reassembled ('aliq / **vafra** /** ude'). Ovid is suggesting that the Latin word 'uafra' (which describes Medea, the female protagonist as 'cunning') derives etymologically 'from some stratagem or other'. Once again the etymology is commensurate with the real meaning of the word. And once again the severing of textual 'membra' has thrown up a word that vitiates the *schema metricum,* whilst leaving snatches of Pontic words ('aliq' and 'ude') on either side[63]. We should also note here

---

[60] See also orbita > 'orb[is sem]ita' (Maltby p.433 s.v. orbita')

[61] One might compare Isidore *Origines* 10.187: '**neuter** … quasi **ne uter**que'.

[62] Compare Livy 37.31: 'Naustathmon ab re appellant, quia ingentem uim nauium capit': '[the one harbour] they call Naustathmon from the situation obtaining, since it can contain a large number of ships'; and Lucretius 6.740-741: 'quod Averna vocantur nomine, id ab re inpositumst / quia sunt avibus contraria cunctis': '[a place] they call Avernus by name; that name was assigned from the situation obtaining, since it is inimical to all birds'.

[63] Note that the adjective 'vafer' is appended to the 'Getan' slave at Ars Amatoria 3.332: Cuive pater vafri luditur arte Getae'.

that the word 'vafer' evokes the conventionally cunning Getan slave. It is Ovid himself who appends this adjective to the Getan (Ars 3.332: 'Geta vafer') to epitomise the slave's portrayal in New Comedy. Thus the presence of the Getae is felt not only in the wings of the narrative (they surround the Greek cities) but also in the wings of the subtextual discourse (through 'vafra' and indeed through the remnants of Getic speech on either side).

A further redivision occurs early in the poem. In line 2, the words 'nomina barbariae' may be redivided to produce 'no / MINABAR / bariae'. Here we are privy to a comment from the author himself. As the epistolary present tense of 'minor' ('I threaten'), the word avails of more than one nuance. One that is apposite is that of Horace Satires 2.3.9 where the author uses the term in the sense of 'giving indications of future action'. This would constitute a statement of strategic intent in Ovid's mouth. He is giving advance notice, we suggest, of the proliferation of 'nomina barbariae' ('terms of barbarian speech') which are soon to accompany the Latin words created by the process of redivision. In this instance those terms are 'nom' and 'bariae'. However there are 'barbarian words' and there are '(perfectly good) Greek words that describe barbarian culture'. The word 'baria' ('βαρια') belongs to the second category and means 'herds' or 'sheep' One wonders indeed if the word developed out of the word 'barbarian' which itself may have been onomatopoeic of the sound of a sheep braying rather than a Getan speaking[64]. In any event, the words '[no] minabar βαρια[e]' mean 'I am urging on sheep' (in the sense of hurling vocalic, monosyllabic orders). Ovid has become a provincial farm worker and it may be that the peripheral sounds 'NO' and 'E' are intended to represent his shouts.

By simultaneously declaring his intentions towards, and giving an example of ('-mina bar-'), the redivisional strategy he is going to employ, Ovid alerts us to the torrent of such barbarian terms that await us in the next poem 3.10. Meanwhile this particular redivision ('minabar') when 'collected' and 'read' ('legit') also happens to *mean* that Ovid 'is foreshadowing (with intent)' a particular course of action. Lastly the 'names of barbaricum' could be taken literally. In the following poem barbaric names such as Bessi, Getae, Sauromatae, Sarmatici, proliferate[65]. Of these Ovid may be thought to have given advance warning, particularly in regard to their sheep. When the barbarian names arrive, we are primed to read 'baria' as 'sheep'. ('me sciat in media vivere barbariae': 3.10.4). This enbales us to isolate 'verebar' and 'in media vi' and to punctuate with a semi-colon after 'sciat'. The couplet 3.10.3-4 now means 'let them know I have been set beneath the stars that never touch the sea' or (not with some point) 'let them know that the sea has been placed beneath the stars that never touch me'. There then follows the redivided phrase 'I am fearful in the midst of violence'. This is now separated by another colon from the following line which means 'the Sauromatae , Bessi, and Getae [as a single Nomadic tribe working in concert] surround [not 'Ovid' but]the wild sheep which they [collectively] drive' ('in media vi verebar; βαρια Sauromatae cingunt, fer[a] agens, [instead of 'fera gens'][66]Bessusque Get'aeque[67]). This

---

[64] The word 'προβατον' originally evoked, through its etymology, the primitive nomadic herds in which the small animals 'went in front' of the larger ones.

[65] Give the uncertainty over the relationahip between the verbs 'mino' and'minor' it is possible to read 'minabar' as 'I am being threatened' (the effect on Ovid of the Getans speaking 'barbarian words').

[66] 'Fer[a]' now agrees with 'βαρια'

[67] Note the adverb 'aeque' on Geta which like Bessus becomes a colletive plural. ('and the Bessi

vignette paraphrases very succinctly the behaviour of the Nomads who supervise their vast flocks by patrolling the outer margins[68].

Absyrtus' fate meanwhile may itself be read as an allegory of the way in which Ovid's dismembered text should be reassembled. Indeed it will be instructive to treat the relevant parts of Tristia 3.9 as an extended allegory in which the actions of the characters illuminate the relationship between the reader, Ovid, and his text. In line 9 ('fugiens Medea parentem'), Medea is pursued by her father Aeetes whom she had abandoned. She had earlier helped the Greek hero Jason to steal the Golden Fleece from the city of Colchis. Both Jason and Medea and were now heading back to Greece in the Argo. Under Medea's instructions the ship had rowed into a shallow harbour near the mouths of the Danube. Allegorically, the fleeing Medea represents Ovid himself. In his ship of poetry he is pursued by the reader in the guise of Aeetes who is anxious to follow the textual narrative. Ovid as the author (etymologically 'the increaser' of meaning) however wishes to prevent the reader from having the satisfaction of 'finishing' his book.

Now a look-out from a grave mound in Tomis spies Aeetes approaching. The ship is hastily prepared for departure. Medea however realises that they will be intercepted. She therefore requires a stratagem. Her eyes light upon her brother Absyrtes who had escaped with her from Colchis. She summarily runs him through with a sword and proceeds to dismember him before scattering his sundered limbs across the landscape 'to be discovered in many places'. Her object is to delay her father whose sense of pious duty towards his son's remains will distract him from the pursuit of Medea.

This allegorises Ovid's strategy of severing his text into a multitude of 'disiecta membra'. The word 'artus' ('limbs') is a synonym of 'membra' which is the equivalent of the Greek 'κωλα' meaning 'metrical units'. Meanwhile the 'corpus' of Absyrtus (his 'body') is an image of a 'body of writings' (Cicero Ad Atticum 2.1.4) or a 'compendium of writings'. Ovid himself describes the twelve books of Virgil's Aeneid as a 'corpus' (Tristia 2.535 [of the Dido and Aeneas episode]: 'nec legitur ulla pars magis de toto corpore'). Thus, allegorically, Ovid's text (Absyrtus' 'corpus') should consist of scattered fragments of words ('membra'). On an interpretative level meanwhile, the allegory instructs the Aeetan reader to give up his or her quest to reach the end of Ovid's writings. It has become that reader's *solemn duty* (as though the text were the remains of a child) to 'gather together' the various 'membra' of the text. The verb 'legit' carries the meaning of 'collecting the bones of the deceased' and is central to the allegory (Tibullus 1.3.6). The bones will be gathered together by the grieving relative. Of course the verb 'legit' also means 'to read'. Thus the act of 'gathering up' the fragments of text will equate to the act of reading. One will read these textual fragments in the true etymological sense of the word 'read' that is, one will reassemble the text. This suggests that merely following the narrative does not constitute the act of 'reading'. 'Reading' is the act of 'collecting' fragments of text[69]. Collecting bones from a pyre meanwhile is a piecemeal affair. The bones will be pieced together but not necessarily in the precise order they enjoyed when the 'corpus' was alive.

---

[68] Strabo 7.3.5: 'they [the Nomads] follow the grazing herds, from time to time moving to other places that have grass'

[69] Note also that 'membra' are the shattered fragments of Ovid's shipwreck. These also allegorise the sundered nature of his poetic 'craft'. See Tristia 1.2.2, Ibis 278 (of Ceyx as a literary forerunner of the shipwrecked Ovid), and Ibis 17-18 where 'tabulas' is also used in this allegorical sense of 'severed fragments of words'.

Thus, in 'gathering' the broken pieces of 'mile / to /mis /si', the reader will join 'to' and 'mis' to form (and read) 'Tomis'. It is noteworthy that the limbs of Absyrtus are scattered across 'fields'[70]. This makes Aeetes' mission a particularly literary one since 'fields' were a favourite Augustan image for poetic endeavour[71]. The Aeetan reader will scour the textual landscape for broken pieces of words. Thus at a time when the reader thought he or she was on the point of capturing Ovid's meaning, Ovid's text disintegrates into a wealth of potential new meanings all of which need to be recovered and re-assembled[72].

Aeetes' new journey is a 'sad' one involving 'fresh grief' ('luctu … novo')[73]. The 'sad journey' allegorises the process of reading the literally 'sad' 'Tristia'. The phrase 'luctu ... novo' however points in yet another direction. A strong interpretation of the fissiveness of Ovid's text would suggest the existence of anagrams. The adjective 'novus' ('strange, fresh') could constitute a pointer to an anagram, which, in this case, would consist in 'cultu' (> 'luctu'). This word bears the meaning 'devotion' 'loyalty' 'respect' and is even used (as here) of familial devotion towards one's children (Sallust *Bellum Jugurthinum* 5.7). The gathering of the limbs of one's dead son is clearly an 'unforeseen' ('novus') form of 'devotion' ('cultus'). The word 'cultus' however also means 'pursuit' 'cultivation' (Livy 1.39.4) and in this sense it conveys the literary pursuit of reassembling textual 'membra', a pursuit which delays the diligent reader of Ovid's corpus. In other words an anagram of 'luctus' ('cultus') finds a place in the metapoetical articulation of the allegory whilst also constituting an example of the allegory in practice.

Metapoetic Allegories:

This brings us to an important metapoetic aspect of Ovid's exilic corpus. Tampering with Ovid's text in the search for anagrams can be shown to be an imperative of Ovid's poetics if we take on board an allegorical aspect of the exile poetry. For if we suppose that (a) an 'exchange of (epistolary) letters' must be a premise of any reading of the 'Tristia' and (b) that the 'Tristia' are an allegory of the methodology required to understand Ovid's poetry, then it follows that (c) 'a swopping about of (alphabetical) letters' is rather how we should interpret the notion of 'exchanging letters' when we look at Ovid's texts through metapoetic eyes. In fact when Ovid presses his correspondents to fulfill their duty to keep up the 'exchange of letters', he can be read as inviting them to collaborate and collude with him in a game of 'letter rearrangement', involving anagrams and palindromes.

---

[70] Note that in other versions of the story such Apollodorus' (*Library* 1.9.24) Absyrtus'parts are cast into the sea. This makes the change to 'fields' significant.

[71] See Tristia 2.327-328 ('…tenuis mihi campus aratur / illud erat magnae fertilitatis erat') and 5.12.33-34

[72] Note that Ibis seeks to possess Ovid's 'membra' in the sense of his 'poetic ship's sundered planks'. Ibis represents the 'least ideal' readers who elsewhere tear at Ovid's 'corpora' in an effort to access the meaning of the severed words. Ovid meanwhile protests that he would wish to be 'integer' (Tr.3.3.35) and 'salvus' (Ex Ponto 2.1.67). These are the technical words for a citizen who is in full possession of his citizen rights. However they also mean 'unsevered' 'whole' and as such allude to the non-fissiveness of Ovid's text. A never-to-be-resolved allegorical tension is set up in the exile poems. If Ovid is ever restored to his former self his verse will no longer be fissive. In the final analysis 'he doth protest too much'. Ibis is in fact Ovid's *alter ego*. He represents the dark side of the Ovidian split-persona. 'Ibis' spelt backwards produces 'Sibi'. The Ibis is dedicated to the Ovidian Mr Hyde, the subversive scarifier of the text of the Ovidian Dr Jekyll, the writer of flawless Augustan verse.

[73] His earlier grief will have been the theft of the Golden Fleece and the treachery and flight of his daughter, Medea.

In fact one could interpret all the conventional vocabulary of Roman correspondence as having an allegorical application to Ovid's poetics. Thus the terms 'littera missa''littera allata/accepta' and especially 'litteris (com-)(in-)mutatis' referring to the sending, receiving, and exchange of epistolary letters are equally at home in the discourse of etymologists and grammarians when these attempt to explain the origins of words that have suffered the loss, accrual, or interchange of alphabetical letters as they change their 'forma' (their morphology) over time, and, in so doing, move away from their original appearance which it is the work of etymologists to recapture and define as the roots of the new words that have evolved. The notion of 'commutata littera' ('a letter having been changed') is particularly common in etymological discourse[74]. However in terms of Ovid's epistolary allegory this 'change of letters' becomes rather an 'exchange of letters'. Thus there is a sense in which the Absyrtan allegory of textual dismemberment complements the allegory of epistolary communication since an exchange of letters between words will necessarily involve the redivision of the text.

In sum, the sending and receiving of letters allegorises the migration of letters to an adjoining word or the accrual of letters from the adjoining word. Meanwhile, whilst the receipt of an epistle allegorises the fundamental idea of the accrual of a letter by a word, the 'sending of a letter' performs a double task. Not only does it articulate the migration of a letter to another word, it also allegorises the loss of a letter. This is because mitto means 'send' but also 'lose' (Varro DLL 6.2). The sending of letters is an uncontroversial aspect of the exile poems. However in many places Ovid hints at the loss of an epistle. He packages this by assuming that the relevant correspondent is not forgetful of Ovid but rather the letter has failed to arrive (Tr.4.7.9-10: 'di faciant ut saepe tua sit epistula dextra / scripta, sed ex multis reddita nulla mihi'; Tr.5.13.15-16: 'pluribus accusem, fieri nisi possit, ut ad me littera non veniat, missa sit illa tamen'). In practical terms this allows Ovid much room to manoeuvre. Not only can he allude to a word one letter longer than the one he writes, he can also assume the elision of a letter where no elision could reasonably be expected. This will be the case in for instance in the word 'capillos' which according to Frederick Ahl disguises the nexus 'cap[e] illos' ('cap'illos').

In the same vein, the apparently conventional 'adynata' which Ovid uses to characterise his feelings towards both friends and foe could be read as allegorical pointers towards the existence of palindromes in Ovid's text. Thus at Tr.1.8.1/2 ('In caput alta suum labentur ab aequore retro / flumina, conversis Solque recurret equis') Ovid is prepared to believe in the complete reversal of the laws of nature now that a formerly steadfast friend has been proved false. The normal 'flow' of words from left to right across the page is itself one of the literary laws of nature and it is not unlikely therefore that within Ovid's works we will find words written in reverse order[75] to produce subtextual messages.

Finally, to summarise the main thrust of this digression, an examination of the lexical depths of the word 'permutatio' (which yet does not appear as a lexical item in the exile poetry) may be found instructive. As well as articulating the 'swopping' [of anything including letters] it also translates the Greek word 'αλληγορια' or 'allegory'. More than this, the verb 'permuto' is used by Lucretius at DRN 1.827 to refer explicitly to the transposition of the same letters to produce different words. This 'exchange of letters' clearly constitutes

---

[74] See Varro in Augustine Civitas Dei 18.5 p.262,7 D: 'Sorapis...una littera commutata Serapis dictus est'. Varro DLL 6.2; '... ut verba litteras alia assumant, alia mittant, alia commutent'.

[75] See below on Suilllius.

anagrams. And one manifestation of anagrams is the simple reversal of letters in a word which we noted as a possibility above. Such reversals of order are also covered by the verb 'permuto'. 'Permuto' is also used of 'changing' one's abode, specifically by going overseas according to Seneca at Nat.3.17.1 ('si nos maria transimus, permutabimus sedes'). In other words, in 'going abroad' to Tomis, and by 'swopping' epistolary letters, Ovid is indulging in activities that can be articulated by the verb 'permuto'. Ovid's own constant request to move to a different country can be read as an allegorical imperative that insists upon the continued tendency of the text and its hero towards 'permutatio'. Indeed if we are permitted to sidestep to a different meaning of 'permuto' ('I allegorise') we can appreciate that any activity covered by 'permuto' effectively constitutes 'allegory' 'per se'. What Ovid is specifically allegorising by his 'exchange of epistolary letters' is the 'exchange' or 'changing around' of letters within words or between words, a process that can be defined as anagramatisation or word-redivision, but a process that can also be defined by the Latin word which (also) means 'allegory'[76]. The fundamental and irrevocable change ('permutatio') in Ovid's literary life reflected in the move from the Fasti to the Tristia constitutes the allegorical fountainhead of all the allegorical meanings of 'permutatio' that follow.

In the final analysis this is a riddle. Ovid allegorises the meaning of 'allegory' by swopping his letters around so that his words, no longer being in their original order, 'say something different'. In doing this he is creating changes in the text in two senses (new letter order = new versions of the text's meaning). Indeed the flexibility of words when treated as material for anagrams itself allegorises the fertility of meanings which are thrown up by the interpretations of the reordered latters. Within this strategy Ovid himself allegorises allegory by 'talking deliriously' at Tr.3.3.19 ('aliena locutum'). The phrase 'aliena loctum' constitutes both the etymology of the word 'allegory' (Isidore) and, in its contextualised meaning, serves to allegorise the word. Indeed the fact that 'someone else told' Ovid that he was delusional in his speech is a conceit based on 'allegory' in the sense that rather than 'words being spoken about other things' here 'other *things* are speaking the words'. This trope is confirmed by the fact the writer of the letter Tr.3.3 is not Ovid but a secretary (3.3.1-2). 'Someone else is conveying' ('alienus loquitur' as it were) Ovid's words.

This leads to yet another aspect of Ovid's poetics. It will have been noticed that several letters begin by addressing an individual before turning their attention to a different addressee or a plurality of addressees. Thus the Suillius letter (Ex Ponto 4.8) hails 'Suilli' at line 1 followed by 'Germanice' at line 31and 65. The poem finishes by engaging anew with Suillius. Other letters move from a single addressee to a group of which the original addressee is a (loose) member (Tr.1.5: 'O … carissime … amice': 1-3; 'o pauci, rebus succurite laesis':35: Ex Ponto 1.5.2: '….Maxime…'; 57: 'gloria vos acuat, vos…'; 85: 'vosque, quibus perii…'). Tr. 5.1 is a dramatised debate with friends who speak with a common voice in the singular (50 :'at poteras', inquis 'melius mala ferre silendo') but are addressed in the plural (79 :'cur mittam, quaeritis, isto'). Meanwhile Ex Ponto 4.14 is sent to Tuticanus but soon addresses the citizens of Tomis. Many letters, particularly those such as Ex Ponto 4.15 or Tristia 3.10 which begin 'siquis …' ('whoever …'), are addressed to the person who happens to read the letter, just as a tombstone will address anyone who happens to be passing.

---

[76] Note that the 'Metamorphoses' could have been called 'Permutationes' since both words mean 'Transformations'.

This strategy articulates another metapoetic message which complements the allegorical meaning of 'littera commutata' explored above. Alphabetical letters may become 'litterae communes' just as epistles become 'litterae communes'. That is, a letter that formally belongs to the beginning or end of one word to one word may informally be considered to be shared by the word which the letter adjoins. Alternatively, a letter may gravitate away from its original word and attach itself to the adjoining word thereby losing all contact (temporarily) with the original word. The progression represented by the addressing of Suillius, Germanicus, and then Suillius again also suggests that a letter may reattach itself to its original word within the parameters of a different (by now, third) reading of the line. Meanwhile epistles that remain 'litterae communes' from beginning to end must allegorise the double use of a letter that suddenly finds itself at the end (or beginning) of a word as a result of the redivision of the text[77].

Redivisional Poetics in Action:

A brief but illuminating example will reveal the fertility of this strategy in uncovering fresh insights into the superficial narrative. At Tristia 3.10.39-40 the sea has frozen. Ovid is able to walk on the ice without getting his foot wet ('non udo sub pede'). However if the last 'n' on 'non' were to become a 'littera communis' (just as Tr.3.10 is a 'littera communis') one could reconfigure the text as follows: 'no[n] nudo sub pede' ('the top of the sea was not beneath my naked foot'). The ancients knew as well as we do the searing effects of ice on the skin. The human foot loses blood to the vital organs in extreme cold. The circulation along the soles of the feet is poor rendering them vulnerable to ice-burn. Any damage to the thick skin and fat layer on the soles of the feet is a cause for concern. Even ice baths can cause first degree burns. Ovid speaks of the burning effect of the cold elsewhere in the exile poems ('terra perusta gelu': Tr.3.4b.48).

Meanwhile an example of both 'littera missa' ('a letter lost') and 'ekthlipsis' or 'internal elision' comes from the Metamorphoses, where however we must posit the existence of a saying that is not attested in the literature. At 1.754 the young Epaphus, born of Io and Zeus, punctures the proud boast of his boyhood companion Phaethon that he was born of Helios. Epaphus' words are 'matri … omnia demens / credis ET ES TUMIDUS genitoris imagine falsi' ('in your madness you believe your mother in all things, and you are puffed up with the image of your false father'). Epaphus' words can be redivided however to produce a perfectly-aimed barb at the naïve arrogance of his friend: 'credis E TEST[A] [H]UMIDUS genitoris…' (= 'due to the image of your false father you, DAMP FROM THE SHELL ('e testa umidus'), believe all your mother says in your folly'). The word for 'shell' ('testa') may

---

[77] See however Frederick Ahl's analysis of 'capillos' meaning cap'illos' or 'cape illos' which we elsewhere relate to the allegorical concept of 'littera missa' ['lost letter']. In this trope the 'littera' at the join of the new division of the word is not 'communis'. One could also rationalise this form of verbal fusion as literary 'crasis' which we suggest is allegorised in the constant references to the [freezing] 'climate' ('κρασις') of Tomis. Like the waters of the Hister and the sea, Ovid's words have, as it were, congealed (3.10.25: 'concrescant … rivi; 31-32: 'undas … concretas'; rigidas … aquas': 48). However at certain times of year the waters melt ('liquidis … aquis': 8). In fact the fluidity of the subtextual meanings (such as those of 'cape'illos') is ever-present and is merely overlaid by the 'ice' ('Hister / congelat et tectis in mare serpit aquis': 29-3) Strictly speaking the Greek term 'ἐκθλιψις' (literally 'squeezing out') is more appropriate to this form of (presumed) internal elision ('cap'illos'). It also covers regular elision. It is allegorised by (we suggest) Ovid being 'squeezed out' of his position in Rome and by the 'overcrowding' in Tomis ('simul nobis habitat discrimine nullo barbarus': Tr.5.10.29).

be posited as a word that has been pre-elided from a division between '[tes]t-' and '-umidus'). The phrase 'damp from the shell' must mean 'green'. The image meanwhile is precisely that required by a slightly older teenager endeavouring to put his junior in his place. Phaethon's words ('magna loquentem': 751) and stubbornness ('nec sibi cedentem': 752) have tested his better-born companion's patience to the limit. Teenage rivalry spills over into a condescending remark from the descendant of Zeus to his inferior. Comically Phaethon betrays his 'greenness' in his inability to return the insult, and in his attempts in front of his mother to represent his tongue-tied reaction as a sign of strength ('ille ego liber / ille ferox tacui': 757/8). One wonders if the 'opprobria' of line 758 refers specifically to the hidden phrase 'e testa umidus' and that is why 'it could be said but not rebutted'. Phaethon is younger and too 'damp from the shell' to counter the clever tactics of his better who buries his real insults beneath the words he utters from the front of his mouth. 'Dampness from the shell' also suggests that the fledgling in question is still closely attached to the mother via the mother's eggshell. The expression therefore aptly characterises the 'mother's boy' Phaethon who appeals to what he senses will be his mother's strong emotional bond to him ('quo magis doleas, genetrix…': 757; 'inplicuit materno bracchia collo': 762). In general the image of the 'eggshell' crystallises the nature of the debate surrounding this story. Phaethon's self-image depends on the status of the person who has fertilised the 'egg' from which Phaethon has emerged. Ironically it is Phaethon's 'dampness from the shell' that will seal his fate, not the identity of the man who fertilised it.

A further example is important in that the meaning it produces feeds into and reinforces the methodology by which that meaning was accessed. At Metamorphoses 8. 245-6 the invention of the saw by Perdix is the subject under discussion:

'incidit… / perpetuos dentes et SERRAE REPPERIT USUM'

'he cut a row of teeth and discovered the use of the saw'.

The last three words could redivide as:

'…serrae RE [p] PERĪTUS [S]UM' or 'SERRAE RE PERĪTUS SUM'

'I am skilled in the practice of (or 'the craft of') the saw'.

Such a sentence, expressing the author's own facility for word-carpentry, not only provides a pithy image for Ovid's redivisional 'art', but also follows well-established literary models in its expression of a craftsman's skill. Thus 'peritus' with the ablative is found in an appropriate context in Vitruvius (1.1.14: pluribus artibus debet esse peritus')78. Meanwhile the combination of 'peritus' and 'res' ('craft' 'science') is common, as Gellius ('non rei grammaticae peritum': Noctes Atticae 16.10.4) and Varro (RR 1.17.4: 'qui periti sint rerum rusticarum') reveal. The use of a noun after 'res' to express the nature of the 'craft' can be exemplified from the phrase 'res Veneris' as used by Ovid himself (Rem. Amoris 431: 'a Veneris rebus surgente puella'). Such comparative evidence provides important support for the theory of 'redivided forms' since the phrases produced by the redivisions are composed of 'nexus' that are well attested in the literature, notwithstanding the use of 'litterae communes', the abuse of metrical quantities, and the reducing of double consonants to single[79].

---

[78] See also Cicero *Pro Cluentio* 107: 'iure peritior'

[79] Note also the redundant letter 'P' which is excised from the text. This is justified by the age of Ovid. He is now one of the 'veteres' or 'old-timers' of a Reublican era who, as grammarians delight in telling the reader, did not double their consonants. Ovid meanwhile will be living with numerous 'veterani' of the Roman army who will have retired to the Greek colonies. As someone who mans the wall during 'uncertain times' Ovid identifies

Works Consulted:

1. Andrei ARICESCU *Armata în Dobrogea romană* Editura Militara (1977)
2. *Inscriptiones Scitiae Minoris* vols 1-V, *Peuce* 6 (1977), *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaeorum*
3. LIDDELL, SCOTT, JONES, MacKENZIE *Greek Lexicon* (1996 ed),
4. LEWIS and SHORT: *A Latin Dictionary*
5. THE OXFORD LATIN DICTIONARY (ed. P.G.W Glare) (1982)
6. HESYCHIUS ALEXANDRINUS *Lexicon,*
7. *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum,*
8. *Inscriptiones Graecae,*
9. S.I RUDENKO *The Frozen Tombs of Siberia* (1970)
10. Christian RÄTSCH *The Encyclopedia of Psychoactive Plants: Ethnopharmacology and Its Applications* (2005)
11. Karl JETTMAR *Skythen und Haschisch* in *Rausch und Realität* Gisela Völger, Karin von Welck, Aldo Legnaro (1981)
12. Renate ROLLE *The World of the Scythians* (1980)
13. Frederick AHL *Metaformations* (1985)
14. *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*

himself with the role (and spelling abilities) of this Home Guard. That is, Ovid's provincial fellow-citizens will also reflect the old orthographic ways, though this will be a result rather of inexpertise with the Latin language than of any adherence to a former orthography. Most veterans will have served in 'alae' or auxiliary units. These will have been themselves of provincial origin and almost to a man Greek-speaking. On retirement they will have integrated immediately into the society composed of descendants of the original colonists. The word 'veteranus' since it also means 'experienced in professions other than the military' in its different meanings links Ovid to a specific cadre within Tomis.